of the Catholic magazine Commonweal, and Clinton Rossiter of the department of government of Cornell University. Included on the board of directors of the fund are such men as Robert M. Hutchins, Paul Hoffman, Chester Bowles, Erwin N. Griswold, Elmo Roper, and James D. Zellerbach. Certainly these men cannot be accused of the taint of communism, nor of having anything but the best interests of the United States in mind when they agreed to become associated with the Fund for the Republic.

The article follows:

FUND FOR REPUBLIC CONCERNED WITH DEFENDING CIVIL LIBERTIES

(By G. B. Holcomb)

Political columnist George Sokolsky wrote in his nationally-syndicated daily column last week a story which left two impressions:

That the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic which it sponsors are at odds with each other; and

That the Fund for the Republic is conducting "political propaganda" on behalf of communism.

Those impressions (whether intentionally promoted by Sokolsky or not) aren't correct, according to Ben Segal, labor consultant and the fund's representative in Washington.

The Ford Foundation set up the $15 million Fund for the Republic as a separate entity (with main offices in New York), but that doesn't mean they aren't speaking to each other.

Sokolsky wrote that the fund "has teams all over the country ostensibly investigating Communists, but actually seeking to discover what active anti-Communists have been doing."

As a matter of record, the fund is openly trying to find out what is being done to Communists, Socialists, atheists, fascists, Trotskyists, race bigots, security risks, fifth amendment Communists, etc., Segal said, in order to get a real picture of the effects on civil liberties in this country.

It has published a book on Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties, which describes some of its findings.

It has published another book, called a Bibliography on Communism, containing a list of authoritative documents on the Communist ideology and political organization.

RECORD OF COMMUNISM

A Digest of the Public Record of Communism in the United States, 753 pages thick and with pages as large as those of Fortune magazine, has been published by the fund.

These studies deal, Segal said, with the impact of communism on America today.

Daniel Bell, labor editor of Fortune, heads a division of this vast study which deals with the impact of communism on the trade union movement.

Other studies will deal with student organizations, veterans, educational welfare, old-age pension, business, and other groups.

John Cogley, editor of the Catholic magazine Commonweal, heads the study on the effects of blacklisting in the entertainment field.

The whole impact study is under direction of Prof. Clinton Rossiter of Cornell University's government department.

Rossiter, the Reverend Joseph M. Snee, S. J., professor of law at Georgetown University, and Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland of the Harvard law school, edited the Digest.

These men, like the members of the fund's board of directors, are interested only in arriving at the facts about communism and avoiding the ignorance which, all too often, helps shape public attitudes.

IGNORANCE IS DANGEROUS

Board members are:

Robert M. Hutchins, president; Paul G. Hoffman, chairman; W. H. Ferry, vice president; David F. Freeman, secretary; Bethuel M. Webster, counsel; Meyer Kestnbaum, M. Albert Linton, John Lord O'Brian (80, and called by Life magazine one of America's elder statesmen of the law), Chester Bowles, Charles W. Cole, Russell L. Dearmont, Erwin N. Griswold, William H. Joyce, Jr., Jubel R. Parten, Elmo Roper, Robert E. Sherwood, George N. Shuster, Eleanor B. Stevenson and James D. Zellerbach.

The former president of Columbia University is quoted in the frontispiece of the Digest of the Public Record of Communism in the United States. He said:

"The truth about communism is, today, an indispensable requirement if the true values of our democratic system are to be properly assessed. Ignorance of communism, fascism or any other police-state philosophy is far more dangerous than ignorance of the most virulent disease."

The author of these lines is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

"A sort of slogan for the fund," Segal told us, "is 'Feel Free' which I guess would mean to look any controversial issue squarely in the face.

"It is a tragedy today that too many people fear to speak up on issues if perchance the Communists are making or have made noise about it.

"By this time," Segal added, "everyone should know Communists have never been sincere about causes they espouse, except that of furthering the interests of the Soviet Union. It is the issues which are important, not who makes the noise.

"We have to be careful not to use the same tactics used by the Communists."

STIMULATES DISCUSSION

These are Segal's views, and not necessarily those of the fund. The fund, as such, has no views, unless it might be said to be in favor of the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The fund "tries to avoid taking a position." It seeks, instead, to stimulate others to discussion, or argument, or dissension (depending on the point of view).

A long-time project is to determine what union members think about such controversial questions as, "Should an admitted Communist be expelled from the union?" and "Should a man who favors Government ownership of the railroads be expelled from the union?"

Segal was asked his own opinion on the first question.

"In a sensitive job, both the Government and the union have an obligation to see that the security of the country isn't endangered," he said. "But when it comes to other areas, union members ought to think pretty carefully before they conduct activities which would deprive a man of the right to earn a living. That is the acid test."

SEGAL'S BACKGROUND

He drew a clear distinction between a professed Communist and suspects or persons who might exercise his constitutional right to plead the fifth amendment.

As example of a situation he fears, he related, was a Florida union which expelled a man who had pleaded the fifth amendment before a congressional committee. The company wouldn't fire him, but the members made his job so miserable that he quit.

Although he's not quite 39, Segal has an extensive background in the field of labor and civil liberties.

His previous job was as associate director of the CIO department of education. Last year he was one of two senior Fulbright scholars on workers' education in England, where he studied British trade unions. Segal taught and visited in Norway, Denmark, Switzerland (for the International Labor Organization), Austria, Yugoslavia, and Israel.

For 5 years he organized in the South for the CIO Textile Workers, was a Midwest organizer for the AFL Ladies Garment Workers; directed the Council for Equal Job Opportunities in Philadelphia, and served as president of local 189 of the AFL Federation of Teachers.

He now is on the local's executive board and is a member of the national executive board of the National Religion and Labor Foundation.

Segal met his wife, Elizabeth, in North Carolina. "That was one of my southern victories," he chuckled. They have a 22-months-old daughter, Doris Marie.

SEGAL ENCOURAGED

Segal, a pipe-smoking and scholarly appearing man with thinning brown hair, says he is encouraged by the interest shown in the increasingly complex problem of loyalty and security programs being run by both the Government and private industry.

He's becoming a major source of material on the subject, yet has no secretarial staff on hand to assist him. He's trying to keep the paperwork bureaucracy out of his job if he can. But it's a struggle when various groups call him and ask for 3 copies of this report or 25 of that study.

Segal likes his job, is constantly busy, and he believes in it, Sokolsky or no Sokolsky.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1955

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 14, 1955)

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

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

Eternal God, we thank Thee that Thou hast implanted within us the breath of a divine life, that there is an infinite in us which with all our cunning we cannot quite conceal by that which is of the earth earthy, and that by our very natures we hunger and thirst after Thee. Forgive us that knowing this we so often seek to satisfy the deepest cravings of our spirits with the fleeting things of time and sense.

We pray that in our pressing tasks we may be preserved from impatience and depression. Increase our faith, mellow our judgments, deepen our spiritual insights, grant us some part in the fulfillment of Thy mighty purpose in the world. Amid all the distractions of this complicated modern life, in which our lot is cast, keep our hearts childlike and trustful, that the gates of the kingdom of life and of light which are closed to the merely clever and conceited, may be opened unto us as we come in the simplicity as it is in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 14, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to return to the Senate the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls, and providing for a change in the reenrollment of said joint resolution.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6227) to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 157) reaffirming the desire of the American people for peace, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Alberto Cortez Cortez;

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of Kyung Ho Park (Syung Sil Park) and his wife, Mrs. Young Sil Lee;

H. R. 1002. An act for the relief of L. S. Goedeke;

H. R. 1401. An act for the relief of Ewing Choat;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Rosa Maria Phillips;

H. R. 1656. An act for the relief of Chen Chih-Keui;

H. R. 1974. An act for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alice Rose Spittler;

H. R. 3020. An act for the relief of Buonaventura Giannone;

H. R. 4359. An act to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 4659. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c);

H. R. 5146. An act to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade; and

H. R. 5398. An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6227) to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 157) reaffirming the desire of the American people for peace, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas it is the hope and prayer of the American people that peace will be established among all the nations of the world, thus avoiding the carnage and destruction of war, making possible the lifting of the burden of arms and thereby freeing the energies of mankind to work more effectively to overcome the ravages of hunger, disease, illiteracy, and poverty: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress reaffirms the deep desire of the people of the United States for an honorable and lasting peace, and expresses the hope that the people of all the nations of the world join with the people of the United States in a renewed effort for peace.

SEC. 2. The President is requested to convey an expression of such reaffirmation and such hope to the representatives of the nations gathered in San Francisco to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] may be excused from attending sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week, because of his attendance at the funerals of two very close personal friends.

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

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.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Col. William F. Cassidy, Corps of Engineers, to be president and member of the California Debris Commission, vice Col. Paul B. Berrigan.

THE AUSTRIAN STATE TREATY (EX. REPT. NO. 8)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on Tuesday morning the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously voted to report the Austrian State Treaty (Executive G, 84th Cong., 1st sess.), without reservation, to the Senate for its consideration. On behalf of the committee I should like to report the treaty to the Senate at this time. I should also like to ask unanimous consent that the committee may submit its report sometime Thursday, in the event the Senate is not in session. It is my understanding that the majority leader hopes to take the treaty up for consideration on Friday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The treaty will be placed on the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia is granted.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and for the information of the other Members of the Senate, that I have conferred with the minority leader, and it is the plan of the leadership to have the Senate take up the Austrian treaty—and, of course, in line with our policy, to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on it—on Friday, next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John B. Hollister, of Ohio, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration.

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

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald Ross, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Kenneth P. Grubb, of Wisconsin, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

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

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward G. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today 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 there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, with the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REGULATION OF EXECUTING BONDS FOR COMPENSATION IN CRIMINAL CASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act regulating the business of executing bonds for compensation in criminal cases in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT ON ARMY INDUSTRIAL FUND MANUFACTURING DIVISION, PHILADELPHIA QUARTERMASTER DEPOT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Army Industrial Fund, Manufacturing Division, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Quartermaster Corps, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1951, through June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, LOVEWELL DAM AND RESERVOIR, KANS.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be benefited by the supply canals and other facilities below Lovewell Dam, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Oahu County Committee of the Democratic Party of Hawaii, favoring the enactment of legislation to reapportion the Territorial legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Loretta Wagner Smith, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the delegate body of the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, at San Francisco, Calif., relating to the United Nations, etc.; ordered to lie on the table.

WATER CONSERVATION AND FLOOD CONTROL—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a resolution adopted by the directors of the Coffeyville (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce regarding water conservation and flood-control measures in their community.

This is an important project which deals with flood control, water supply, stream pollution, and related matters, and it is my hope that sufficient funds will be voted for preliminary survey of the project, as I feel certain the cost of the project will be justified by the studies.

I present the resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

Whereas Big Hill Creek, a tributary of the Verdigris River, frequently floods thousands of acres of valuable farming land in Labette and Montgomery Counties, Kans., and by its confluence with the Verdigris River at a point a short distance upstream from the city of Coffeyville has at frequent intervals had the effect of increasing the flood crest of the Verdigris River at Coffeyville and below, thereby adding thousands of dollars of flood damage; and

Whereas Big Hill Creek flows through a heavily wooded and hilly area in Labette County which would lend itself to recreational development in the center of an area of which a 100-mile radius would reach nearly 1 million people, a reservoir in the area would be of great value to these people in providing facilities for weekend vacations and other recreations; and

Whereas the cities of Coffeyville, Cherryvale, and Parsons are entirely dependent upon the storage of surface water and the establishment of adequate reservoirs for present domestic and industrial water needs as well as for any growth and development for this important industrial section of the State and Nation; and

Whereas the construction of a 29,000 acre-foot reservoir in this area would provide additional water supplies and reserves within piping distance of the cities of Coffeyville, Cherryvale, and Parsons, Kans.; and

Whereas inadequate water supplies during the past several years have caused curtailment of industry and brought about water rationing, thereby giving great concern and subsequent study by various civic groups, chambers of commerce, and local governing bodies of the various cities; and

Whereas conclusions reached by these studies indicate that there is every reason to believe that the construction of flood-control installations, including the construction of a reservoir on Big Hill Creek is entirely feasible and that the same is not only highly desirable but a matter of such vital importance to this whole area that the various cities would, if it was found necessary to do so, participate with the Federal Government in the cost of such installations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That an urgent appeal be addressed to the Honorable United States Senators ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL and FRANK CARLSON and to the Honorable MYRON V. GEORGE, Members of the Congress of the United States, petitioning them to use every influence at their command to secure a preliminary survey under a review of House Document 440, 76th Congress, 1st session, to see whether matters of flood control, water supply, stream pollution, and related subjects are of sufficient benefit to justify expenditures involved, and to determine the extent of benefits to be obtained.

This resolution passed by the Coffeyville Chamber of Commerce, of Coffeyville, Kans., at a regular meeting of its board of directors held on the 26th day of May 1955.

ALVIN I. GRAVERHOLZ,
President.

Attest:

LAWRENCE M. SMITH,
Secretary.

PER CAPITA PAYMENTS TO RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the general council of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians requesting that H. R. 5478 and S. 1632, relating to per capita payments to the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, be amended so as to provide two separate payments of $50 to each member of the Red Lake Band.

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

RESOLUTION 10

Whereas resolution No. 6, Serial No. 904, requesting a distribution of $150 to each member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians was enacted by the council on February 27, 1955; and

Whereas the area office of Minneapolis, Minn., in a letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs under date of March 15, 1955, stated that the amount requested would deplete the funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Red Lake Band; and

Whereas S. 1632 authorizing a $100 per capita payment has been introduced in Congress by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and H. R. 5478 authorizing a $100 per capita payment has been introduced by COYA KNUTSON, Member of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the general council, That the bills H. R. 5478 and S. 1632 may be amended so as to provide two separate payments of $50 to each member of the Red Lake Band, the first $50 payment to be made as soon as possible after the passage of this bill and the second $50 payment to be made the following spring or fall.

Unanimously approved.

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify this to be an exact copy of Resolution No. 10, in council proceedings dated May 29, 1955.

JOSEPH GRAVES,
Chairman.

[SEAL] PETER GRAVES,
Secretary.

REDLAKE, MINN., *June 3, 1955.*

REPRESENTATIVE VOICE OF RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS IN MATTERS RELATING TO THEIR TRIBAL PROPERTIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Red Lake Band of Indians at Red Lake, Minn., expressing their request for a representative voice on all matters pertaining to the future status and well-being of their tribal properties and rights.

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

Whereas it has come to the knowledge of the members of this reservation that Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, introduced a bill in Congress on January 14, 1955, bill S. 401, for total liquidation of all Indian tribal lands and to abolish all the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs within 3 years; and

Whereas bill S. 401 has many unfavorable aspects on the future status of the Red Lake Indian Reservation as being arbitrary and ambiguous, controvenes Indian treaties which solemnly guaranteed the remaining parcel of Indian estate belonging to the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians to own and hold in common forever; and

Whereas in view of the persistent and relentless pressure to abrogate the present status of our last remaining parcel of Indian estate with the threat of total liquidation and termination has created much unrest and causing the members to be apprehensive and insecure; and

Whereas there are about 3,295 members owning this reservation and they are unanimous in voicing their strong objection to any proposals of any legislation for complete liquidation of their common tribal property and rights; it is theirs and they are entitled to consultation with the prerogative of freedom of full expression regarding the future status of their reservation; and

Whereas the members are fully aware of the past injustices heaped upon them by the despoliation, plunder, and wanton waste of their once vast resources and now after being almost completely reduced to paupers, the United States Government is seeking to renege the responsibility with its threat of liquidation and termination; and

Whereas the Members of Congress are well aware and familiar on the manner in which their ancestors forced the Indians to retreat from their lands of heritage, the Red Lake Band wish to have their tribal views be recognized and respected and that the Members of Congress be fully cognizant of their rightful heritage: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Indian Affairs and Senator GEORGE W. MALONE be, and are hereby respectfully requested to give favorable consideration on this resolution, to grant consultations on any proposals of adverse legislations detrimental to the future status and well-being of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, that total liquidation of tribal property and abrogation of treaty rights will render a grave wrong against the Red Lake Band with a minority voice on any adverse legislations and it is their profound wish that the Congress of the United States would ascertain reaffirmation to the sacred, solemn promises pledged under treaties, wishing to remain autonomous and free from any further encroachment upon their vested tribal rights, thereby relieving the apprehensive state the Red Lake Band has become to the termination threat; and be it further

Resolved, That the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians wish to be on record that they be excluded from any future proposals on the complete liquidation and termination of their tribal lands and treaty rights; and be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to our Minnesota Senators and Representatives in Congress and enlist their full support and assistance to their Indian constituents of the Red Lake Band, to safeguard and protect their reservation.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by unanimous vote of approval by 39 members attending at a council meeting held at the Recreation Hall, Red Lake, Minn., on the 7th day of May 1955. Public notices were posted for this meeting in the three Indian villages on the Red Lake Indian Reservation, Red Lake, Redby, and Ponemah, Minn.

ROGER A. JOURDAIN.

Attested by:

OTTO THUNDER.

MEDICAL CARE OF DISABLED VETERANS—PETITION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this morning a petition was presented to me, in my office, by the Honorable George C. Cesana, department commander of the Disabled American Veterans for the Department of Rhode Island. The petition is addressed to the Congress of the United States and reads as follows:

To the United States Congress:

We, the undersigned, do hereby reaffirm our belief that we must, as responsible and grateful Americans, provide adequate hospitalization and medical treatment and equitable rates of compensation for our disabled veterans whose sacrifices we shall never allow ourselves to forget.

We look with disfavor upon the current arbitrary review which the Veterans' Administration is undertaking of all compensation cases and out of which scores of disabled veterans have been jolted with the tragic news that, after the passage of many years, the VA no longer considers their compensable disability of service origin. We also view with displeasure the obviously inhumane and inequitable policy which is being pursued by VA rating boards in no longer resolving every benefit of doubt in favor of the veteran.

Further, we rededicate ourselves to preserve and safeguard the welfare and well-being of our disabled veterans, and, in so doing, may it be known that we shall oppose with all the vigor and strength at our command any, and all, recommendations which may emanate from the deliberations of a varied and multiple nature now being undertaken in Washington, D. C., and which may weaken, or damage, existing laws affecting disabled veterans, their widows, and their orphans.

We, therefore, beseech the honorable Members of the Congress of the United States of America to consider our views and to express in a positive and unmistakable way the action which should, and must, be taken to reassure our disabled veterans, their widows, and their orphans that they shall not be forgotten.

Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that the petition has been signed by 15,000 residents and citizens of Rhode Island. I shall not request that their names be printed in the RECORD, because that would make the RECORD too voluminous; but I have already read into the RECORD the text of the petition.

The petition was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, a few days ago the Governors of Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado, and the representative of the Governor of Missouri adopted a resolution suggesting to the House that it pass a road bill more similar to that recommended by the Clay committee than the bill passed by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a letter from the Governor of Nebraska the resolution adopted by the governors' meeting at that time.

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

LINCOLN, NEBR., JUNE 10, 1955.

The Honorable EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: On June 1, 1955, Gov. Fred Hall, of Kansas, Gov. Joe. Foss, of South Dakota, and undersigned sponsored a meeting of Governors from the Missouri Valley Basin in Denver to discuss the proposed Interstate Highway System that is under consideration by the Congress.

Attached hereto please find policy statement that was adopted by the Governors in attendance that represented 8 of the 10 States in the Basin.

In the planning of a long-range Federal road-building program, one of the ramifications is coordinating State legislative bodies in their efforts to raise needed State revenue during the road-building period whether it be for 10 years or longer and still build and maintain our own State systems.

Also of major consideration by the Governors at the conference were methods to raise revenue for the project and the payment of interest—whether it be on the debt that we would create by further deficit financing or through the issuance of bonds.

We are hopeful that you will have an opportunity to study our joint policy statement in that it could conceivably be helpful to you in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

VICTOR E. ANDERSON,
Governor.

POLICY STATEMENT

Whereas the President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, earned the gratitude of the people of the United States when on July 12, 1954, he advanced a plan for providing the highways so necessary to the security and the commerce of America; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States after holding long and comprehensive hearings on the problem of roadbuilding enacted legislation thereon; and

Whereas we agree this program should be undertaken at the earliest possible moment; and

Whereas the people of our States desire that an accelerated road program be enacted by the 84th Congress.

Now, therefore, the Governors of Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado, and the representative of the Governor of Missouri, do here and now urge the Congress to proceed expeditiously with the enactment of the pending road program and furthermore that we urge the House of Representatives to bring the Senate bill more in harmony with the governors' highway proposal which was worked out by the Clay Committee.

Gov. John Simms, of New Mexico, was present but since New Mexico is not in the Missouri Basin he did not vote.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H. R. 5841. A bill to repeal the fee-stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (Rept. No. 550);

H. R. 5842. A bill to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State (Rept. No. 551); and

H. R. 5860. A bill to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms (Rept. No. 552).

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1966. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of documents evidencing the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers subject to such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 553).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1713. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes (with individual views); with amendments (Rept. No. 554).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H. R. 6410. A bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto (Rept. No. 556); and

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to modify the authorized project for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Tex., and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water supply feature of that reservoir (Rept. No. 555).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 2097. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in St. Croix, V. I. (Rept. No. 557);

S. 2098. A bill to amend Public Law 83, 83d Congress (Rept. No. 558);

H. R. 2973. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education (Rept. No. 559); and

H. R. 5188. A bill to prohibit publication by the Government of the United States of any prediction with respect to apple prices (Rept. No. 560).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1472. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen (Rept. No. 561);

S. 1757. A bill to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946 (Rept. No. 562); and

S. 1759. A bill to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico (Rept. No. 563).

By Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1400. A bill to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 564).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

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

S. 2238. A bill to authorize Maj. Gen. Kearie L. Berry, United States Army, retired, to accept and wear the Philippine Legion of Honor in the degree of commander and supporting documents conferred upon him by the Government of the Philippines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2239. A bill for the relief of Eva S. Winder; and

S. 2240. A bill for the relief of James Richard Hogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2241. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter at the post office at Taos, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2242. A bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of the Government-owned rubber-producing facility at Institute, W. Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2243. A bill for the relief of Mary Boone Lacson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2244. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Novak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2245. A bill to include certain service performed for Members of Congress as annuitable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2246. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands to the city of Wall, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2247. A bill relating to the authority of the Administrator of General Services with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus Government property under the control of executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2248. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, to provide a certain number of visas for persons of ethnic Armenian origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2249. A bill for the relief of Pil Nyi Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2250. A bill for the relief of Lea Marion Miao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 2251. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho and Wyo., the Narrows Federal reclamation project and a reregulating reservoir below the Palisades Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2252. A bill to close the membership rolls of tribes, bands, communities, and other groups of Indians in the United States for the purpose of ownership rights in the property of such groups; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. THYE, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 2253. A bill to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THYE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. MURRAY) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. YOUNG submitted the following notice in writing:

Pursuant to the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment: viz: On page 28,

line 3, delete the period and insert the following: *"Provided further,* That the Administrator of Veterans Affairs shall, during the fiscal year 1956, continue the maintenance, operation and availability of the John Moses Veterans Hospital, at Minot, N. Dak., to meet requirements of the Veterans' Administration and the Department of the Air Force."

Mr. YOUNG also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6042, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL—AMENDMENT

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HELEN KELLER

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on the 27th day of June one of the most outstanding personalities of recent times, and a world figure, Helen Keller, will celebrate the 75th anniversary of her birth.

Helen Keller was born in Tuscumbia, Ala. The little house in which she was born is still standing. On the anniversary of her birth the people of that area will hold appropriate ceremonies celebrating the 75th anniversary of the birth of this distinguished American woman.

As we all know, Miss Keller has just completed a trip around the world, a trip on which she was able to carry hope to physically handicapped people everywhere.

Miss Keller now lives in the State of Connecticut. On behalf of the two distinguished Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL], my colleague [Mr. HILL], and myself, I submit a concurrent resolution to carry the greetings of Congress to this magnificent woman. I ask that a copy of the concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), recognizing, on the occasion of her 75th birthday, June 27, 1955 A. D., the efforts of Miss Helen Keller in behalf of physically handicapped persons throughout the world, submitted by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. PURTELL), was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas Helen Keller will celebrate her 75th birthday on June 27, 1955; and

Whereas this remarkable woman, stricken deaf and blind in infancy, has for more than 50 years tirelessly devoted herself to the battle for the economic, cultural, and social advancement of the physically handicapped throughout the world, making her own conquest of disabilities a symbol of hope for millions; and

Whereas in her long and faithful association with the American Foundation for the Blind and the American Foundation for Overseas Blind she has traveled widely in the United States of America and to more than a score of nations throughout the world; and

Whereas in all these travels she has inspired immeasurable progress in services to the blind, the deaf, and the deaf-blind, and has won countless new friends for the United States of America and the cause of democracy; and

Whereas Congress and the Chief Executive have expressed deep concern in improvement of conditions among the physically handicapped, and have initiated constantly expanding program to this worthwhile end: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That appropriate recognition be made of the vast contributions of Miss Helen Keller to the well-being of all humanity; and

That appropriate greetings be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to her on her 75th birthday, June 27, 1955; and

That the governors of States, mayors of cities, and heads of other instrumentalities of government, as well as leaders of industry, educational and religious groups, labor, veterans, women, farm, scientific, civic, and professional bodies, and all other organizations and individuals at interest, are invited to participate in this recognition of Miss Helen Keller by making her 75th anniversary the occasion for reaffirmation of their determination to assist in the improvement and expansion of facilities for the relief, education, and rehabilitation of the physically handicapped.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Alabama was kind enough to ask my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and me to join him in the sponsorship of this concurrent resolution, which, of course, we were very glad to do.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Alabama for submitting the concurrent resolution, but more particularly for the real beauty of the resolution which he has drafted for the particular occasion. I think it is one of the finest resolutions I have read since I became a Senator.

I read a few lines from the brief biography of Helen Keller. I think these lines are very significant:

Helen Keller, "one of America's 12 great women leaders during the past hundred years," is best known for her willpower, her courage, her outstanding achievements in spite of her handicaps, and her self-sacrificing work to improve the condition of the blind.

That is a most appropriate way to begin an account of her life, because she is best known for her willpower and courage. One might think she was best known for being a blind person, but that is not true. She is best known for her willpower and courage in overcoming frightful handicaps.

Connecticut is very proud that this great American woman is a citizen of that State.

I thank the Senator from Alabama very much.

DESIGNATION OF PERIOD FROM SEPTEMBER 17 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 23 AS CONSTITUTION WEEK

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning September 17 and ending September 23, 1955, as Constitution Week, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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. WILEY:

Flag Day address delivered by him in Baraboo, Wis., on June 14, 1955.

Statement entitled "America's Cultural Offensive Throughout the World," prepared by him.

Address on technical assistance delivered by Hon. Hugh L. Keenleyside, Director General of Technical Assistance Administration of the U. N., delivered on June 13, 1955, before the National Press Club, at Washington, D. C.

Replies of United States foreign representatives to questionnaire regarding Overseas Information Program.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Statement prepared by him, entitled "Book Banning Versus Book Burning," together with article entitled "Book Burning: How the Librarians Do It," written by Victor Lasky and published in the June 11, 1955, issue of Human Events.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Articles and editorial from Better Farming for March 1955, together with a letter from a farm wife to Representative COYA KNUTSON, of Minnesota, on the subject of Voice of Farm Women.

BALTIC GENOCIDE DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the anniversary of that tragic event which has come to be designated as Baltic Genocide Day. Fourteen years ago Communist brutality was responsible for the forced deportation of thousands of innocent Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians. The infamous treatment of these helpless victims of tyranny remains a crime against humanity and a blot on the conscience of free men everywhere. On this anniversary let us again assert our determination to right the injustices committed during that dark period of Communist treachery. The peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia look to us for that sign of hope so they may continue to withstand the aggressor until their day of liberation.

INVESTIGATION OF NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, to which was assigned Senate Resolution 67, calling for an investigation of the illicit narcotic traffic in the United States, has developed evidence indicating that the dope traffic in this country exceeds $300 million a year.

With approximately 60,000 narcotic addicts, and with annual narcotic arrests in excess of 23,000, the narcotics traffic constitutes a criminal cancer which is not only destroying the lives of the addicts, but spreading other crime and suffering into the bloodstream of many communities throughout the Nation.

Our initial hearings have developed the fact that our country is the target for international narcotic racketeers who are smuggling dope principally from Communist China, Lebanon, and Mexico.

Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, who represents our Nation also on the United Nations Commission on Narcotics, has shown to the U. N. and to our committee proof that Red China is pushing this traffic for the twofold purpose of acquiring dollars and demoralizing the people of the free nations.

Commissioner Anslinger reports that he has received cooperation from certain officials in Lebanon and Mexico, but that some of the principal racketeers located in these countries still remain free to ply their trade and smuggle their poison across our own borders.

A good example was seen in the recent seizure in New York of two traffickers from Mexico City with pure cocaine valued at $2,500,000. This seizure was announced in New York Saturday, June 11.

It is said to be the largest amount of pure cocaine ever smuggled into this country at one time. According to Howard B. Gliedman, chief of the criminal division of the United States attorney's office in Brooklyn, with whom I talked yesterday, the two men who smuggled this cocaine in false-bottom suitcases from Mexico City to New York are Manuel Mendez Marfa, age 31, of Habana, Cuba, and Miguel Angel Gonzalez y Hernandez, 31, of Mexico City. They brought the dope by airplane from Mexico City on May 14 to Brownsville, Tex., and thence to New York City, arriving at Idlewild Airport. The pair registered at the Hotel Seminole at Broadway and 69th Street, and were to have rented lockboxes in two New York banks, but their plans were interrupted by Federal narcotics agents. Each was to have received $2,000 plus expenses for the trip.

A startling admission by these messengers, according to Mr. Gliedman, was that they were working for an international syndicate which has "a billion dollars worth" of narcotics in a warehouse in Mexico City. The chief of the syndicate has been named in a sealed indictment, and his identity may be revealed later today.

With the cooperation of Federal officials, your committee will soon develop other facts in connection with this narcotics syndicate.

I ask unanimous consent that an article concerning this matter from the New York Herald Tribune of June 11 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TWO AND ONE-HALF MILLION DOLLARS IN DOPE AND TWO MEN HELD—UNITED STATES SEEKS CHIEF OF MEXICAN RING

Seizure of two messengers from Mexico City with what Federal authorities said was the largest amount of pure cocaine ever smuggled into this country at one time—5 pounds, 12 ounces, with a retail value of $2,500,000—was disclosed yesterday.

The arrest and seizure occurred in Brooklyn on May 18, but were kept secret until a sealed indictment was opened yesterday in United States district court, naming the two men on three counts of violating the narcotics laws.

The reason for the secrecy, according to Howard B. Gliedman, chief of the criminal division of the United States attorney's office, was that Federal narcotics agents hoped to trap the man believed to head an international smuggling ring, identified only as Senor X.

SENOR X MISSING

Senor X was to have appeared on the scene within 2 weeks of the arrival of the messengers to pick up the cocaine from three safe-deposit boxes in as many Manhattan banks. Apparently he got wind of the situation, for he did not appear.

Another sealed indictment handed up with the first one is to be opened Monday by Judge Walter Bruchhausen, and it is believed that it will name Senor X.

The men in custody are Manuel Mendez Marfa, 31, of Habana, Cuba, and Miguel Angel Gonzalez y Hernandez, 31, of Mexico City.

TELLS OF MEXICAN CACHE

Mr. Gliedman quoted Hernandez as saying that there were "bags and bags of cocaine stored in Mexico City waiting distribution in the United States." Federal authorities have asked the aid of the Mexican Government in locating this cache, Mr. Gliedman said.

The two messengers left Mexico City on May 14 by air for Brownsville, Tex. From there they went to Houston and then to New York City, arriving at Idlewild Airport. The cocaine was carried in two false-bottom suitcases.

The pair registered at the Hotel Seminole at Broadway and 69th Street. By this time Federal narcotics agents had information concerning their activities and on May 18 raided an apartment occupied by a brother-in-law of Hernandez at 586 Hart Street, Brooklyn.

GET PURE COCAINE

There, they got 3 pounds and 3 ounces of the pure cocaine. The two messengers came in while the agents were there and were arrested. The agents next went to the hotel and recovered the rest of the drug.

Hernandez was to have rented the lock boxes in Manhattan branches of the Chase Manhattan Bank, the Colonial Trust Co., and the National City Bank. Upon their return to Mexico City, the messengers were to receive $2,000 each plus expenses.

After their arrest the men were arraigned secretly before Edward E. Fay, United States Commissioner, held in bails of $50,000 each, and remanded to the Federal House of Detention on West Street. If convicted, they face a maximum penalty of 5 years and a $2,000 fine on each of the 3 counts.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Daily Mirror of June 11, 1955, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TWO MILLION AND FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLAR SEIZURE NIPS BILLION DOPE PLOT

(By Harvey Singer and Erwin Savelson)

Federal agents have seized a record $2,500,000 worth of cocaine, nipping the plot of a billion-dollar international syndicate to flood the United States and Canada with dope, it was disclosed Friday.

Assistant United States Attorney Howard Gliedman, chief of the Criminal Division of the United States Attorney's office in Brooklyn, tabbed the cocaine shipment as the largest ever seized in this country.

Gliedman further revealed that authorities were informed that the syndicate has a billion dollars worth of the dope in a warehouse in Mexico City.

Two messengers who flew with the cocaine to New York City from Mexico have been arrested and a three-nation search, in the United States, Cuba, and Mexico, is under way for the syndicate's chief, identified thus far only as Senor X.

Disclosure of the syndicate's operations came when a sealed indictment, charging the two prisoners with Federal narcotics law violations, was opened by Federal Judge Inch in Brooklyn. The arrests had been kept secret since May 18 to permit authorities to hunt for the chief and other members of the ring.

The two prisoners, Manuel Mendez Marfa, 31, of Habana, and Miguel Angel Gonzalez y Hernandez, 31, of Mexico City, were arraigned secretly before United States Commissioner Fay in Brooklyn and held in $50,000 bail each pending their appearance next Wednesday before Federal Judge Bruchhausen in Brooklyn.

Both messengers, Gliedman and Federal agents said, boarded a plane in Mexico City on May 14, carrying two suitcases with false bottoms containing 5¾ pounds of pure cocaine.

After flying to Brownsville, Tex., the couriers changed to another plane and went to Houston. There, still dodging any possible pursuers, they boarded an Eastern Airlines plane and arrived at LaGuardia Field here on May 15.

Following instructions of their bosses, they placed the cocaine in safety deposit boxes in three banks here under the name of "Hernandez." One-third went to a box in the 42d Street branch of the Chase National Bank, another third to the Colonial Trust Co. in the Wall Street area and the balance to a branch of the First National City Bank. "Hernandez" was scheduled to arrive later and start distribution of the dope.

After Marfa and Hernandez checked into the Hotel Seminole at Broadway and 69th Street, Federal agents were tipped off and raided an apartment occupied by a relative of one of the messengers at 586 Hart Street on May 18. They found 3 pounds 2 ounces of cocaine.

The agents placed a "stake" on the apartment and the two messengers were arrested when they appeared, but it was decided not to make any announcement of the raid in the hope of nabbing the "chief."

The balance of the shipment, removed from the banks, was seized in the room at the Hotel Seminole and, according to Gliedman, the prisoners said there "are bags and bags of the stuff, at least a billion dollars worth in a Mexico City warehouse, awaiting shipment to the United States."

Gliedman said the two men admitted "making many previous trips with cocaine, receiving $2,500 per trip plus expenses on their return to Mexico City."

Narcotics agents said pure cocaine is very scarce and brings at least $1,000 an ounce in the legitimate market. The price nearly triples when the stuff is "cut" and peddled to illegal sources.

It was learned that a second sealed indictment, which may reveal "Senor X's" identity, will be opened in Federal Court, Brooklyn, Monday.

The two prisoners are charged with possession and concealment of narcotics, importing dope and transporting it in interstate commerce. If convicted, they can be sentenced to 5 years and fined $2,000 on each count.

An official source said the Government learned "Senor X" was tipped off that Federal agents were waiting for him.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, thus it is evident, early in the work of our committee, that the Senate was fully justified in authorizing this, the first nationwide investigation of addiction and traffic in illicit narcotics. Further, we are hopeful that your committee, upon completion of its investigation, will be able to recommend ways and means by which the Congress can assist in solving the serious problem of narcotic addiction and racketeering by strengthening present laws and enacting additional legislation to assist enforcement officials.

Incidental results of the hearings by our subcommittee may follow the pattern witnessed by police officers in Buffalo as reported in the Buffalo Evening News of June 7, 1955, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

HEARINGS STIR UP A PANIC AMONG NARCOTICS PEDDLERS—BUFFALO POLICE TAKE ADVANTAGE OF SITUATION—PICK UP TWO SUSPECTS IN INTENSIFIED DRIVE

(By Mike Benevento)

Stepped-up police activity, ordered as the result of a "panic on the street" in the narcotics-peddlers' world, brought about the arrest of two suspects here Monday night and a sharp warning to physicians and druggists to exercise greater precautions against theft. The panic was caused by Washington hearings.

Held are Herman Williams, 36, of 145 South Division Street, and John W. Evans, 33, of 76 South Division Street.

John E. Stanton, chief of the police narcotics bureau, revealed that Williams was arrested shortly before 11 o'clock Monday night after alighting from a train in the New York Central terminal. Police allege he was returning from New York and had on his person a quantity of powder.

Evans was arrested at Michigan Avenue and William Street. Authorities said he had 39 capsules.

A sudden scarcity of drugs followed the Washington hearings, creating the panic situation. At a time like this heroin users revert to barbiturates.

"I was fully aware of the situation and posted plainclothesmen for around-the-clock observation of all train, bus, and plane terminals, certain that efforts would be made to bring in new supplies," related Chief Stanton.

The plainclothesmen were familiar with the faces of drug peddlers. Williams was walking through the terminal concourse when collared. Search revealed the powder wrapped in wax paper.

Evans was stopped on the street and a search uncovered the capsules in a small cloth tobacco bag, which had been pinned to an inner coat sleeve. The arrests were made by Detective Sgt. Dean J. Gavin and Detective Henry S. Skrzypczak.

Chief Stanton issued a warning to physicians, drugstore operators, and others who have legal possession of drugs. "I strongly advise that physicians keep their medical bags containing the drugs with them at all times," he declared. "Don't leave them in autos."

THE BOOMING MARKET—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is a great age in which we live. It is a time of immense and imponderable dangers and opportunities, a period of tension and frustration. It is also a time of unprecedented achievement.

On last Sunday the most powerful corporation in the world, a corporation which produces Cabinet Ministers as well as motorcars, announced the availability to the public of the ultimate in technological perfection—its 1955 Cadillac—describing it as follows:

The stunning "St. Moritz" features a special white pearlescent finish with an interior of ermine fur and white English grain leather.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed.

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

THE BOOMING MARKET

Every man, woman, and child in the country, whether or not he owns a single share of stock in any company, has a stake in what is going on these days in the securities market. Each citizen's own money is involved in the rising prices of stocks even though he never sees a broker and would not know one if he did.

And how is each citizen's money involved even though he is not a shareowner? Because he has a stake in pension funds and pension fund administrators are going into the stock market. Because he pays premiums on his life insurance and certain life insurance funds are being invested in business securities. Because custodians of other funds with direct bearing on the individual's own economic well-being are buying shares.

Tuesday's news from Wall Street provides occasion for a review of the situation. Last April 26, prices of stocks broke through the 1929 crash-year historic highs. After the April record they dropped off only to begin soon to climb up again. On Monday prices went above the April top and on Tuesday they pushed above Monday's averages.

The Tuesday close showed a Dow-Jones average advance of 72 cents for 65 stocks to a record $161, with industrial stocks up $3.06 to a high mark of $434.55. Du Pont went above $200 a share. The trade in United States Steel totaled 81,000 shares for a rise to 48¼ after the recent 2-for-1 stock split. General Motors came within a fraction of hitting 100.

Where is the money coming from that is bidding up shares so sharply? A roundup in the Wall Street Journal shows that quite a bit of it is from "eager newcomers." A San Francisco truck driver sells one of his tractor-trailer rigs for $5,000 and puts the proceeds into the market. A restaurant owner in the same city accumulates $16,000 to remodel his place of business, but invests in stocks instead. A Cleveland woman cashes $45,000 in savings bonds and buys shares.

Figures on odd-lot purchases—buying in quantities of less than 100 shares—support the conclusion that "little people" are jumping in. A recent report showed an increase of 63 percent in odd-lot trading over a year ago with a 50 percent gain in New York Stock Market volumes as a whole.

The Federal Reserve Board has twice in recent months taken notice of the booming securities market. It raised the cash margin requirements from 50 percent to 60 percent last January. In April it increased the cash requirement to 70 percent. Still another increase may be in the offing, but thus far the increases seem to have had little effect on buying.

There are many differences between the economic-financial situation today and that which led up to the great crash of 1929. Today there are more than three times as many shares of stock as in 1929. This means, as U. S. News & World Report points out, that whereas in September 1929, 10 percent of the shares of stock were traded, in the busy trading month of April 1955, less than 2 percent of the total number of shares were traded. In September 1929, industrial shares of the blue chip variety cost 19 times their annual earnings per share. At present prices stock buyers pay less than 14 times annual earnings per share.

These favorable differences do not mean that there are not concerns in Washington and New York about the securities boom. After warning of dangers, the Senate Banking Committee under the chairmanship of Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, has drafted legislation to require companies with over-the-counter stocks to be subject to the same regulations that apply to companies on the stock exchange. Other bills are coming out of the recent inquiry into possible speculative activity. The stock exchange itself has just announced it will study the role of banks and trust companies in the market.

Whatever else this is, it is not a partisan issue. It is not one on which Democrats and Republicans can reasonably divide. Neither is it a matter which tests faith in the Eisenhower administration. To say that a potentially inflationary boom should be watched closely and put under proper restraints is not to undermine confidence in anybody or anything.

Honeyed words—and there were plenty of them—did not make everything right in 1929. They could do no more now. Secretaries Humphrey and Weeks owe it to the President to keep him fully informed. He needs to know the minus signs as well as the plus marks. So does everyone else.

SECURITY VERSUS DEMOCRACY—ARTICLE BY JOSEPH AND STEWART ALSOP

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Security Versus Democracy," written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop. The article is pertinent in connection with the Nation's military strength, as the Senate prepares to vote shortly on appropriations for defense purposes for the fiscal year 1956.

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

SECURITY VERSUS DEMOCRACY

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

Until very recently, the American people's right to know the basic facts of their national situation was never questioned for an instant. The people's right to know was properly regarded as the mainspring of our democracy.

Now, however, no one seems to doubt the American Government's right to bamboozle people by the concealing of the life-and-death facts. The Eisenhower administration

is actively seeking to install a peacetime censorship in America. The censorship has as yet aroused very little opposition. And there was no word of protest, or even comment, when the thinking behind that censorship was unblushingly confessed a few weeks ago.

The confession was made by the former secretary of the National Security Council, Robert Cutler, in a speech to the Associated Harvard Clubs. The Cutler views on the measure of truth that ought to be told the people have been specially commended to the White House staff by the President himself. This incredible speech, then, can be taken as accurately reflecting the official White House line.

In a morass of somewhat self-satisfied verbiage, Cutler makes two central points. First, he declares that the people should be told no fact included in any document classified confidential or above, and should be especially kept from knowing any facts about thermonuclear or other weapons; the status of our own defense effort; intelligence from the rest of the world which, of course, includes the status of the enemy defense effort and enemy intentions, and the reasons for our national security policies, and character of our current diplomacy.

In short, all facts of real significance—all the vast paraphernalia that goes into executive decisionmaking—are to be kept from the American people. This is because of Cutler's second point. "Theirs is not to reason why," he in effect says of the American people. According to Cutler, national decision should be made, not by the people, but by the President alone. At best, the Nation is to have a sort of pale privilege of postaudit on the President's decisions. "The people," Cutler generously says, "may always call [him] to an accounting for [his] acts and omissions to act.

The words in brackets are Cutler's, and if you read his speech, you will wonder why he did not also capitalize the words "him" and "his." He has need to believe that the President possesses divine attributes; for none but a president-deity could accommodate the Cutler system and the American system.

Our system, although Cutler forgets it, happens to be a democracy. In a democracy, the people are the masters; and even such high officials as the secretary of the Security Council and the President, himself, are the people's servants. And any democratic government will surely fail if its masters, the people, are successfully kept in the dark about the national situation.

The facts that Cutler would withhold from the people, on the ground that they are classified, are almost all the facts which define the national situation of this Republic. Such problems as the relative status of our own defense effort and the Soviet defense effort now have as much bearing on our national situation as the existence of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; and maybe they have more bearing. And if the Cutler recipe is followed in a free society—and the administration is going to any lengths to follow that system—three things automatically happen.

First, the society is automatically crippled because the people do not know the challenges that confront them, and therefore do not rise to meet those challenges.

Second, the society is crippled in another way, too. The official leadership starts whining that the "people won't stand for" doing the necessary things, whose necessity they themselves have hidden from the people.

Third, the temptation to cover up failures, instead of correcting them, becomes altogether irresistible to the leaders. For it is ridiculous to talk to the people about "holding the President accountable for his acts and omissions to act" when the people are being thoroughly and continuously bamboozled, and bamboozlement is established high policy.

All three of these results of the Cutler system are already beginning to appear in America. They must inevitably add up, in the end, to a kind of creeping national paralysis in the face of the deadly dangers of our times. And for what purpose, one asks, are we risking national paralysis by withholding the truth from our people?

For no purpose whatever, is the ironical answer. For even Cutler has not dared to suggest that we sacrifice the outward trappings of a free society; our budget is still public. The locations of our war plants, the patterns of our urban centers, all our new starts in industry, are not yet hidden matters. A great flood of technical publications will tell any subscriber who wishes to purchase them the current state of our military-industrial progress. And from these and other public sources, the Soviet intelligence is able to deduce with ease all those facts Cutler and others like him would hide from our people.

In short, the Cutler system, which is also the Eisenhower administration system, is not merely antidemocratic. Worse still, it is plain silly, unless its real purpose is to prevent those political embarrassments which officials of all governments have always wished to avoid.

AWARD OF HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS TO SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY AND SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last week in my State of New Jersey, Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey, at its 189th anniversary commencement conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws upon my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and upon the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. It will be remembered that Senator FULBRIGHT was my colleague last fall at the United Nations.

I am very happy to be able to make the announcement of these awards to my colleagues; and I ask unanimous consent that the very interesting and very descriptive citations by Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, in conferring the degrees upon the two Senators, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

CLIFFORD PHILLIP CASE

As a dedicated servant of your State and Nation, as a conscientious student of the complex problems of government, and as an enlightened leader in our country's highest legislative body, you have given your university and your State a deep and gratifying sense of pride. But deep as our pride in these accomplishments may be, even deeper is our affection for you as a devoted alumnus, able trustee, and loyal son of Rutgers. Your concern for the university and its important mission, and your always-gracious willingness to accept any task the university has called upon you to do—as well as your friendship which is so enthusiastically reciprocated—are sources of inspiration and affection which will never diminish in strength.

Therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the trustees of Rutgers University, I hereby confer upon you the degree of doctor of laws, with all the rights, privileges, and immunities appertaining thereto.

LEWIS WEBSTER JONES.

JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Rhodes scholar, university president, United States Senator, we honor you today for your achievement of that great goal you long ago set yourself—the furtherance of human understanding. We honor you for your perception of that obligation which a great Nation owes to make itself understood among all human societies, and for your practical realization of that obligation in the Fulbright Fellowships, which, by the end of the present year, will have effected the international exchange of 20,000 students and teachers. Indeed, your name is a symbol throughout the entire world of the international community of scholarships. As a university, we honor you perhaps more highly for your perception that in an age of divergent specialization the only real basis of understanding is a common vital human and humanitarian tradition which it is the business of the university to keep alive. Finally, we honor you for the most extraordinary of all perceptions—that a politician must also be a philosopher.

Therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the trustees of Rutgers University, I hereby confer upon you the degree of doctor of laws, with all the rights, privileges, and immunities appertaining thereto.

LEWIS WEBSTER JONES.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from New Jersey for his remarks regarding the action taken last week at Rutgers University. I am very proud of the degree and of the citation.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD letters which I have received from the mayor of Buffalo and the mayor of Plattsburg, N. Y., regarding grants-in-aid for airports.

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

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
June 2, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I am informed that the House has passed an appropriation bill increasing the amount for grants-in-aid to airports from $11 to $20 million for 1956.

While the $20 million is an improvement, the amount still falls far short of a practical realization of airport needs countrywise. I know Buffalo is an example of other cities throughout the Nation and in this city we have felt keenly the cut made in these appropriations during recent years. When you consider the size of the air traffic today the amount allowed becomes extremely small and very small, indeed, in comparison with the huge sums voted for highways and waterways.

Since airports are so closely integrated with national and civil defense as well as economic welfare of our country, it must be manifest that municipalities, particularly in these days, cannot meet the demands put upon them by air traffic.

May I ask your earnest and vigorous support of an appropriation of sufficient size to restore the original intent of the 1946 Federal Airport Act which has now been stymied for several years. I assure you Buffalo needs this assistance and stands ready to cooperate in the greatest possible development of air facilities.

Sincerely yours,

STEVEN PANKOW,
Mayor of Buffalo.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Plattsburg, N. Y., June 8, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Thank you sincerely for your kind letter of June 6.

It is heartening to know the House Appropriations Committee voted to substantially increase the grants-in-aid for airports, for apparently there is a dire need for such assistance by municipally owned airports, everywhere.

Particularly is this true concerning our own fine airport which we have been endeavoring by much sacrifice to operate and maintain in the manner it was originally intended it should be. To do so has been most difficult, due to the fact our already limited budget has been strained to the utmost because of the demand made on it for cost of installation of so many additional facilities because of the establishment of the Air Force base in our midst. As the time approaches for the full complement at the air base, which is expected within the next few months, we may expect a greater demand on the facilities at our Municipal Airport because of the number of people who will be attracted here for the business that will be afforded because of its establishment. Therefore, we anticipate a further expansion of the Municipal Airport may be necessary to meet this contingency. Therefore, any assistance you may be able to give us to obtain Federal aid will indeed be greatly appreciated.

Again thanking you and with kind personal regards and best wishes always, I remain,

Cordially,

JACK TYRELL,
Mayor.

AIRMAIL SUBSIDIES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Garth A. Shoemaker, president, Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., of the State of New York, a telegram regarding certain appropriations in connection with airmail subsidies. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ALBANY, N. Y., *May 31, 1955.*

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf taxpayers of New York we repeat our previous position and urge reduction CAB appropriation for airmail subsidies. Proper audits, compliance with Supreme Court entirety decision, disallowance of tax windfalls, disallowance of expenditures on hotel chains and other similar subsidiaries should be required procedure. No justification for continuing subsidies on extravagant scale outlined by CAB. Cut of $50 million would save taxpayers of New York State $6 million.

GARTH A. SHOEMAKER,
President, Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, sometime ago an editorial appeared in the New York Times on the Colorado River storage project which, from my reading at least, appeared to be one-sided and not representative of the type of objective reporting generally done by the staff of that paper.

I am pleased to say that the management of the New York Times saw fit to send one of their ace editorial writers, Mr. John Oakes, who is rather well known to many of us, to the upper Colorado River Basin for a firsthand field investigation of the project. Mr. Oakes has returned and written his account of that personal investigation, and a preliminary article appeared in yesterday's issue of the New York Times. It is objective and, with few exceptions, seems to be accurate. I commend both him and his paper for the service which they have rendered to the 3 million residents of the upper basin States in helping to present to the readers of the New York Times this unbiased description of the pros and cons of this giant reclamation project.

I ask, Mr. President, that the John Oakes article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DISPUTE RAGING ON THE COLORADO—RECLAMATION PROJECT, ONE OF BIGGEST IN NATION'S HISTORY, INVOLVES MANY INTANGIBLES

(By John B. Oakes)

SALT LAKE CITY, June 12.—In eight-column headlines the people of this placid city were informed last week that Echo Park Dam had been dropped from the Colorado River storage project.

To the stray easterner this might not have meant much. But to any literate citizen between Denver and Los Angeles and Wyoming and the Mexican border, it was full of significance. For it involved one of the biggest and most controversial internal-development programs in the country's history.

A bill authorizing the Colorado project will soon emerge from a House of Representatives subcommittee. It has already been reported by the Senate with the Echo Park provision, and it has White House backing.

COST ORIGINALLY PUT AT BILLION

As originally endorsed by the administration the bill involved an expenditure of nearly $1 billion over the next 20 years. As passed by the Senate, it called for another $500 million.

Everyone recognizes that, in the words of the Senate report, the works authorized constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive development of the area's water resources, involving an ultimate expenditure of undetermined hundreds of millions more.

Despite the huge amounts involved, which some analysts say may exceed $3 billion; despite the fact that if the project goes through it will affect the welfare of millions; despite the immense physical changes it will bring about, the project is relatively unknown outside the area immediately affected, and not too well understood even there.

The progress of the bill authorizing a gigantic plan to control and develop the water resources of the upper Colorado Basin has been marked by two major controversies.

One involves the storage project as a whole. Is it worth doing? The second involves two specific units of the project—the giant dam called Echo Park and a smaller, supplementary one called Split Mountain. Both are to be situated in canyons of extraordinary scenic and geologic value, which President Roosevelt included in the national park system when he added them to Dinosaur National Monument in 1938.

THE STORAGE PROJECT

If the project as a whole is worth doing, is it still necessary to construct these two dams that would impair, if not destroy, areas set aside for the enjoyment of future generations?

The storage undertaking calls for the regulation and use of the upper basin waters and 110,000 square miles of arid land in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. Water is the lifeblood of this region. It comes mainly from the top of snow-covered mountains from which the Colorado and its tributaries begin their long journey to the sea.

Rainfall is scanty; the ground is parched. There are no lush fields or verdant valleys except where irrigation has done its work. Wherever there is a clump of trees or spot of green, one can be certain that is where man has caught the water, retained it, and applied it to the land.

A hundred years ago Brigham Young told his followers, "Seek ye not gold but water." He advised them well, for in this country, except in Salt Lake City, where hydrants run freely to flush the streets, water is almost worth its weight in gold.

It was because of this critical scarcity of water that in 1922 the seven States of the Colorado Basin signed a compact dividing use of the river water among them.

The effect was to guarantee to the States of the lower basin—California, Nevada, and Arizona—an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet a year. (An acre-foot is the amount of water that would cover 1 acre to a depth of 1 foot.) The upper basin States—Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico—were allotted the same amount.

INCREASE IN CONSUMPTION

Although water consumption, in the lower basin particularly, has greatly increased since 1922, neither the lower or upper basin States are even now using their entire allotments. But the upper basin has vast plans and hopes for the future. The Colorado River storage project is the expression of those plans.

The project consists of three separate but interrelated parts—river regulation, power production, and irrigation. River regulation means control and storage of the Colorado's waters for future use. Meager as the Colorado flow is, it is still large enough to take care of present and immediately prospective water needs in the upper basin with much to spare.

Some experts of the Bureau of Reclamation calculate that 25 million acre-feet of storage in the upper basin is all that is needed to permit future use of the maximum practical amount of water available.

As the first step in regulating the river, the Bureau has proposed two principal storage reservoirs, Glen Canyon and Echo Park, with a capacity of 32,500,000 acre-feet, although it has several others in mind for future development. These two dams together will cost an estimated total of $600 million.

Glen Canyon would rise 580 feet and would back water 186 miles up the Colorado. Echo Park, to the north, would be 525 feet and would back water 63 miles up the Green River and 44 miles up the canyons of the Yampa.

These two major dams would provide no water for irrigation, industrial or municipal use in the upper basin in the foreseeable future. Glen Canyon would never do so, while Echo Park might under certain circumstances many years hence. The Senate bill would add four smaller dams, giving a total storage of nearly 40 million acre-feet.

Even when the people of the upper basin recognize this fact, which they sometimes do not, they insist on the construction of these huge storage reservoirs now. One reason is a natural desire to plan ahead because such projects take years to materialize. Another

is that the Colorado's flow is uncertain and probably less than it was believed to be a few years ago.

A third and basic reason is fear of California. The vast industrial and population growth of southern California has enormously increased its demand for water and power in recent years. Consumption is steadily pressing on available sources of supply.

The upper-basin States are worried that if they do not take steps to start to use their full allotment of water, California may be able to establish a claim to it, despite the terms of the 1922 compact, by putting it to use as it flows down the Colorado and into the lower basin.

Upper-basin spokesmen—bankers, industrialists, officials, farmers, engineers, and editors—constantly stress this point in discussing the project. Even when admitting they have no immediate consumptive use for the water that would be stored, they inevitably come down to this statement:

"If we don't do something about that water now, California will lay claim to it, and then we will never be able to get it back when we do need it."

They base this theory on the traditional Western rule that prior use of water establishes a right to it. They fear this rule may hold irrespective of the limitations of the compact, which may be subject to revision in a few years, anyway.

POWER PRODUCTION

Many persons mistakenly believe that the two major dams would immediately supply water for use of the upper basin. This is not true, but if the dams are built they will more than insure the guaranteed supply of 7.5 million acre-feet to the lower basin, and thus ultimately provide the means for the upper basin to use water that otherwise it might have had to release below.

But all that is far off. What is not far off is the power production of the two dams. Glen Canyon is scheduled to provide 800,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power and Echo Park 200,000, with lesser amounts coming from other elements in the system.

This is vital to the storage project, because power will pay about 85 percent of the total estimated cost of the entire program. The contention of the Bureau of Reclamation that this is virtually a self-liquidating proposition rests on the profit that the Government is expected to make from the sale of power.

Private public utility companies in the region have not committed themselves irrevocably to purchase the power. But they have shown interest in marketing it, although the anticipated price of 6 mills a kilowatt-hour is not considered cheap. (A mill is one-tenth of a cent.) Opponents of the project maintain that steam power can be produced as cheaply, if not more so, than hydroelectric power in the area. Private utility experts tend to confirm this.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, usually an advocate of public power, has cited figures to show that the construction cost of the Colorado power dams would be several times higher per kilowatt capacity than that of many other Government-built dams, including those of the Tennessee Valley, Bonneville, Hoover, and Grand Coulee, and that the sale price per kilowatt-hour would be correspondingly higher, too. He has denounced the power aspects of the Colorado project as a waste of money.

IRRIGATION PROJECTS

On the other hand, the Bureau of Reclamation insists that its figures show that power production will pay not only for itself but for a large part of irrigation costs as well.

Irrigation is the third facet of the storage project, and possibly even more controversial than the others. As proposed by the administration, the project includes 11 separate irrigation plans that would bring 130,000 acres of new land into agricultural production and provide supplemental water for 230,000 acres already under cultivation but with inadequate water supply.

The Senate added several other projects, and a frequently voiced suspicion is that some of the new ones were approved less on their merits than to obtain the support of important officials from the States directly affected.

In any case the principles governing these irrigation projects are substantially the same. They are, primarily, to furnish additional water to existing farms rather than to open new land. Only an infinitesimal part of the costs are to be paid by the actual water users. Repayments would stretch over 50 years without interest charges. Most of the crops to be raised are for the use of cattle.

Opponents of the projects estimate some irrigation costs as high as $4,000 an acre, or many times the value of the land. They say that if the intention is to increase agricultural production, the same amount of money spent on better grade lands would yield far superior results. Furthermore, the Bureau of Reclamation is accused of habitually underestimating costs and overestimating benefits to be received.

Defenders of the irrigation plans maintain, however, that the subsidy is not nearly so great as it appears, that the beneficiaries become permanently productive members of the community, that in the long run the Government and society gain from their increased output and that there will be an agricultural shortage in a few years when irrigated crops will be badly needed.

The major point they make is that to oppose spending public funds for irrigation and comparable assistance to farmers is to oppose development in the West. Some of the projects would benefit municipal and industrial as well as agricultural water supply, an important factor in the growth of an area as rich as this one in unexploited mineral resources.

The difficult problem facing Congress in the next few days and weeks is to determine whether the storage project is a grotesque boondoggle or a tremendous, imaginative step in developing what has been called the last great American frontier.

If it decides in favor of the project as a whole, there still remains the specific question of including Echo Park Dam.

ECHO PARK DAM

The House subcommittee's decision last week against Echo Park Dam removed the single most controversial feature from the bill.

In addition to being inside a national monument, the areas that would be flooded by construction of the dam constitute some of the most extraordinary canyon scenery in the West.

Defenders of the monument say that construction of the dams is not necessary for success of the entire project because the storage they would provide would not be needed for a generation or two, if then, and the few hundred thousand kilowatts they produced could be supplied from other sources, such as steam or from dams erected at other sites. It is argued that once construction is begun, the national monument will be hopelessly wrecked.

PRESSURE ON OTHERS

The conservationists say it would be dangerous to the National Park System to set such a precedent, for several other national parks are under pressure from diverse interests to exploit their resources, especially timber-rich Olympic National Park in Washington.

To all of these arguments, proponents of Echo Park have answers. Feeling on the subject is especially strong in Utah, which would benefit most directly from Echo Park.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, has developed a legal case to show that when the national monument was enlarged to its present size in 1938, provision was made for dam sites, and therefore no precedent would be involved in entering the area for that purpose now.

The difficulty is that lawyers can, and do, disagree over the precise meaning of the Presidential proclamation. Some conservationists take the position that no matter what President Roosevelt meant at the time and no matter what promises were verbally made to the citizens of Vernal and other neighboring communities, the dams still should not be constructed because of the damage they would do to an unusual area.

On this point, too, there is sharp disagreement. Many Utahans maintain that a lake where the rivers now run would make the canyons more accessible and enhance their grandeur.

The pros and cons of Echo Park ring back and forth through the valleys where the dinosaurs that gave the monument its name roamed 400 million years ago. Some of the arguments are technical, some spiritual; almost all are emotional.

The committee of independent nongovernmental engineers proposed in the House bill may eventually shed light on the scientific and practical aspects of the problem. But there is so much more than science involved. There are so many intangibles and subjective evaluations that it is doubtful that a strictly engineering survey can reconcile the deeply opposing views on this major controversy of the upper Colorado Basin.

REDUCTION OF WHEAT PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has set the wheat price supports for this year at the lowest dollar figure since 1946. These supports, combined with acreage reductions and cutbacks, now forecast a drop in income of substantial proportions for the wheat growers of the Nation.

This situation makes more urgent than ever a fair trial by Congress and the President for the domestic parity plan for wheat growing and marketing. This plan would get the Government out of the wheat-storing business, it would end the piling up of vast surpluses, and it would restore free enterprise and quality production to our Nation's wheatfields.

Today, the compulsion is heavy on wheat farmers to grow types of wheat which are not necessarily high in quality, but which will yield the maximum number of bushels an acre. This becomes increasingly imperative as acreage allotments are curtailed.

Such a situation points inevitably to a trial by the Nation of the domestic parity plan for wheat, which is provided for in S. 1770, which was introduced on April 20, 1955, by my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and myself, as well as by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a dispatch from the New York Times of June 11, 1955, on the price-support reductions recently announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

PRICE-SUPPORT CUT ON 1956 WHEAT; PROTESTS AROUSED IN CONGRESS—DEMOCRATS AND SOME REPUBLICANS ASSAIL BENSON—1955 HARVEST IS ESTIMATED AS SMALLEST IN 12 YEARS

WASHINGTON, June 10.—Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today set 1956 wheat price supports at the lowest dollar level since 1946. Congressional Democrats immediately accused him of trying to destroy the farm program.

Mr. Benson announced that next year's average support rate would be $1.81 a bushel, 76 percent of the fair parity price, provided growers approve strict acreage quotas in a national referendum on June 25. A two-thirds vote is required for approval.

If quotas are voted down, supports will drop to 50 percent of parity, or about $1.19 a bushel.

Earlier, the Department of Agriculture forecast a 1955 wheat crop of 845,215,000 bushels, smallest in 12 years. The shrinking output is the result of a withering drought earlier this year and sharp acreage cutbacks under the price-support program.

Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY of the House Agriculture Committee said the price-support announcement is pretty positive evidence that Benson intends to destroy the farm program.

"It is a clear indication," the North Carolina Democrat said, "that Mr. Benson ultimately will lower the price of every farm commodity in America and force a lot of people off farms and into the city streets to look for jobs."

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, said Mr. Benson's action shows why it is important for the Senate to act this session on House-approved legislation to restore rigid 90-percent supports on basic farm crops. He said Congress would have to act if quotas are defeated. Mr. MUNDT is a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Representative W. R. POAGE, of Texas, No. 2 Democrat on the House committee, said Mr. Benson might have figured this was a good way to defeat controls, and it may very well have that result. He said: "A farmer allowed only three-fourths of a fair price, and only three-fourths of a crop, can't be expected to be very happy about it."

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota Democrat, called the announcement "almost unbelievable" and said it "will be disastrous for American agriculture." He agreed it would lead to rejection of marketing quotas.

The Department said the new support rate would not be lowered, but would be raised if changes in parity values and the supply situation on July 1, 1956, call for an increase.

The Government is supporting 1955 wheat prices at $2.06 a bushel, or 82½ percent of parity. Parity is the price considered fair to farmers in relation to prices they pay.

The 1946 average support rate was $1.49 a bushel, which represented 90 percent of parity at that time.

House Democratic Whip CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, said the cut in the support level showed what would happen to growers of other basic crops under the administration's flexible farm price support program. He said farmers "couldn't live" with the administration's new wheat program.

Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, top Republican on the Agriculture Committee, also raised the possibility that farmers may defeat wheat curbs on June 25. He said it appeared Mr. Benson was "trying to coax" farmers into doing exactly that.

The new support rates will be available in commercial wheat States for those who comply with their individual farm acreage allotments. Support rates in the 12 noncommercial wheat States are set by law at 75 percent of the commercial rate.

The prospective 1955 crop is well below last year's harvest of 969,781,000 bushels and the 1,154,073,000-bushel average for the preceding 10 years. Because of huge surpluses, however, there is no likelihood of a shortage.

Today's estimate was based on June 1 growing conditions.

The total was pushed up by a forecast of 205,991,000 bushels of spring wheat. Previous planting intentions had indicated a 177-million-bushel crop. Winter wheat was estimated at 639,224,000 bushels, compared with last month's 652,686,000-bushel forecast.

Last year's crop totaled 790,737,000 bushels of winter wheat and 179,044,000 of spring wheat.

This year's rye crop was estimated at 25,786,000 bushels, compared with May prospects of 29,345,000 bushels, a 1954 harvest of 23,688,000 bushels and a 10-year average of 21,097,000 bushels.

DISTRESS PRICE-SUPPORT LOANS TO WHEAT FARMERS BECAUSE OF LACK OF STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Wheat Men Promised Distress Loans If They Can't Get Storage Space," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 13, 1955.

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

WHEAT MEN PROMISED DISTRESS LOANS IF THEY CAN'T GET STORAGE SPACE

WASHINGTON.—The Agriculture Department announced it will make distress price-support loans on 1955 crop wheat for a temporary period this summer to farmers who can't find regular storage facilities for their grain.

It said these growers can get 90-day loans at 80 percent of the going price-support rate, which will average at least $2.06 a bushel. The loans would be for wheat that can be stored safely on the ground or in temporary structures.

Price-propping loans at the full support rate will be available, of course, to all farmers who can get regular storage for their grain. These loans don't come due until spring of 1956. If market prices rise above the loan level, farmers can redeem their wheat and sell it in the open market.

Similar distress loans for wheat were made available for the 1953 and 1954 crops.

Department officials said storage in some States, particularly in the Great Plains area, may be short during harvest and some producers might not be able to put their wheat under the regular loan. Distress loans are designed to make it possible for producers to get some price support at harvest time, thus preventing premature marketings that might depress market prices sharply.

Farmers taking out distress loans will be responsible for any loss in quantity or quality of wheat during the loan period. That means if the wheat isn't worth as much as the loan rate after the 90 days, the farmer will have to make up the difference to the Government.

INSECT PROBLEMS OF FARMERS OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say to my fellow Senators who sometimes are opposed to rigid price supports that there are many calamities which the farmer must encounter, including hail, drought, and rust. I have just received from the North Dakota Insect and Plant Pest Reporting Service a list and description of insects and plant pests which are now prevalent all over the Northwest. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks two bulletins from the North Dakota Insect and Plant Pest Reporting Service, one dated June 4, 1955, and the other June 11, 1955, in order that Senators may understand what the small farmer is up against all over the Northwest.

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

[From the North Dakota Insect and Plant Pest Reporting Service, Fargo, N. Dak., June 4, 1955]

This report will be made available each week to workers in agriculture and is designed to help the people of North Dakota to meet insect problems as they appear and as far as possible to forewarn of indicated changes in insect activity.

Since weather conditions greatly influence insect populations, these reports can at most only indicate general or prevailing trends. All individuals should check their own fields to determine local conditions. Every effort will be made to anticipate problems and to secure the best available recommendation from the North Dakota Agricultural College extension service. Unusual insect abundance or damage should be reported immediately to the State entomologist so they can be investigated promptly.

European corn borer: Pupation averaged 50 percent on June 2 in southern Cass and northern Richland Counties. Some adult emergence was observed in these counties. Height of corn in this area averaged under 3 inches. Development of the borer appears to be earlier than reported in previous years. Early planted corn will generally sustain the greatest damage and should be watched for egg masses and early feeding in order to determine the need for control measures.

Army worms: A few adult armyworm moths have been collected from light traps at Fargo. These moths apparently originated in this area as they appeared fresh and did not indicate the symptom of long migration from southern sources. A certain number of this species overwinter in this area every year. When sufficient numbers of moths are present together with lush, grassy egg-laying hosts, survival of newly hatched larvae may be high. Farmers and county agents in areas where damage occurred in 1954 should begin watching grassy field margins and moist low spots in fields for the presence of green to greenish brown worms. Questionable specimens should be sent to this office for identification.

Wireworms: Survey conducted in the northern third of the State during the week ending May 20, revealed some stand thinning in a few small grainfields. This survey is conducted to supply information as to wireworm species distribution in North Dakota. Wireworm larvae were collected from 16 fields out of 33 fields sampled.

During the weekend of May 27, light wireworm damage was reported occurring in small grainfields in Bowman, Slope, and Golden Valley Counties. Infestations were localized in fields and in these counties.

Flea beetles: Adult beetles are now present in the Fargo area and are causing noticeable shot-holing of a seeded garden—vegetables and some transplants. In controlling these insects, use 5 percent DDT dust. Repeat application in 7 to 10 days if beetles continue to invade the crop. DDT 50 percent wettable powder may also be used at 2 pounds per 100 gallons of water.

Cutworms: Although no cutworm damage has yet been observed or reported in North

Dakota, fields should be watched for damage during the early growing season. Defoliation of leaves or cutoff plants at ground level are the more common symptoms of injury. If economic infestation should develop control by the following amounts of actual insecticide per acre should be applied: DDT 1½ pounds; Toxaphene 2 pounds; chlordane 1 pound; heptachlor or aldrin ½ pound. Poisoned baits may also be used.

Leaf beetles (species undetermined): Heavy leaf feeding by this beetle on willow, poplar, and cottonwood was reported this week in the Bowbells-Kenmare vicinity. Control measures recommended are DDT at 2 quarts of 25 percent emulsion per 100 gallons of water or in the case of shelter belt spraying by airplane use 2 quarts of 25 percent emulsion per acre.

Cotoneaster webworm: Larvae of this species were active and starting to web foliage together in the Dickinson area on May 25. This pest is widely distributed over the State and causes considerable damage to the shrub. For control, spray foliage with 2 quarts of 25 percent DDT emulsion to 100 gallons of water. Second application likely necessary in early August.

Aphids: These pests attack nearly all species of nursery and greenhouse stock, also shade trees, garden, and field crops. They are now reported infesting various trees and shrubs such as elm, boxelder, high lush cranberry, snowball, and certain other plants. Nicotine-sulfate sprays mixed at 1 tablespoonful to a gallon of water is the most common insecticide used. Malathion 50 percent emulsifiable concentrate applied in a mixture of 2 pints per 100 gallons of water, or 2 teaspoonsful per gallon of water will control aphids. Aphid control on large trees is generally not considered economical.

Cankerworms: Larvae of this insect sometimes called loopers or measuring worms are now feeding on leaves of elm, fruit trees, and certain other susceptible hosts in eastern North Dakota. Early feeding resembles "shot holing" in the developing leaves. Cankerworm larvae may be controlled with DDT at the rate of 2 quarts 25 percent or 2 pounds 50 percent wettable powder per 100 gallons of water. Tanglefoot bands applied to the tree trunk in early fall have been helpful in keeping wingless cankerworm females from depositing their eggs.

Gall insects and mites: Numerous specimens of leaf distortion exhibiting bladder or nipple-like growths on the leaf surface have been received by this office. Maple leaves infested with bladder gall mites have been the most numerous. Dormant sprays applied before growth starts in the spring may be of some benefit.

Spider mites: Populations of spider mites have been increasing rapidly in evergreen foundation plantings and certain other plants, especially in southeastern and south-central North Dakota. A careful watch for this pest should be made now until frost in all areas. Hosing down plants once a week with a strong stream of water will give relief. However, for more lasting control, the use of one of the new miticides will give adequate protection. Ovotran 50 percent wettable powder at 1 pound or dimite 15 percent or aramite 15 percent at 1½ pounds per 100 gallons of water. Ovotran is especially effective when applied early to kill the eggs.

Mosquitoes: Recent rains in southeastern and south-central North Dakota can be expected to help the hatch of mosquito eggs in and around areas of temporary water resulting in increased populations annoying man and livestock.

American dog tick or wood tick: These ticks appear more abundant through the Red River Valley this spring than during the last few years. Persons should examine themselves carefully for ticks each night. Ticks may be removed by pulling them off with forceps or fingers. Such wounds should be treated with a disinfectant. Dogs should be checked regularly for ticks. If found, the tick should be removed by hand or treat the animal with 0.5 percent DDT or chlordane sprays. DDT or chlordane applied at 1 percent strengths to wooded areas and lawns will control this tick.

Carpet beetles: Specimens of this destructive household pest which feeds on wool and wool products continue to be received. For further information on their control obtain Extension Circular A-166 or USDA Bulletin No. 24 from the North Dakota Agricultural College Extension Service.

[From the North Dakota Insect and Plant Pest Reporting Service, Fargo, N. Dak., of June 11, 1955]

Sugar beet root maggot (tetanops myopaeformis): Adult female flies were observed in sugar beet fields near Auburn, Walsh County, in considerable numbers during the first week of June.

Colorado potato beetles: Adults were observed in garden potato plantings in the Grand Forks vicinity on June 3. Some egg laying was also reported. In controlling this insect apply a dust of 3-5 percent DDT dust or 3-5 percent methoxychlor at 20-30 pounds per acre; 10 percent toxaphene dust at 10-15 pounds per acre. Sprays of 25 percent DDT or methoxychlor emulsion at 4-5 quarts per acre in 100 gallons of water, or 50 percent DDT or methoxychlor wettable powder at 2 pounds per 100 gallons of water, or 45 percent toxaphene emulsion at 1½ quarts per 100 gallons of water will give satisfactory control.

Blister beetles: Adult beetles, the large purple variety, were reported attacking legume plantings at the Fort Lincoln Nursery, Bismarck, on June 2. Control measures applied on June 3 resulted in a satisfactory kill of this pest. For control use DDT or toxaphene at 1-1½ pounds per acre as a dust or spray.

Cottonwood or willow leaf beetles: Larvae of this species had caused considerable defoliation of willow-cutting blocks at the Fort Lincoln Nursery, Bismarck, this week. Since both larvae and adult beetles feed on foliage, a careful watch for the emergence of adult beetles should be maintained, especially in nursery plantings. Control of this beetle and its larvae may be accomplished by spraying with 2 pounds of 50 percent DDT in 100 gallons of water.

Cutworms: Reports of cutworm damage to vegetable transplants have been received this week from several localities. The following amounts of actual insecticide per acre should be applied: DDT, 1½ pounds; toxaphene, 2 pounds; chlordane, 1 pound; heptachlor or aldrin, one-half pound. Poisoned baits may also be used.

Spider mites: Reports of spider mite buildups, especially in evergreen foundation plantings, continue to be received. Recent rains over the State may have diminished the rapid increase in population; however, with the advent of warm, sunny weather a careful watch should be kept and control measures applied in order to prevent injury to susceptible plant species. Control measures recommended are ovotran 50 percent wettable powder at 1 pound, or dimite 15 percent or aramite 15 percent at 1½ pounds per 100 gallons of water. Malathion 50 percent emulsified concentrate has given control at 2 pints per 100 gallons of water or 2 teaspoonsful per gallon of water. Dusting sulfur may also be used.

Rose cuculio: This is the time of year to employ control measures against this insect. The weevil eats holes in the unopended buds, leaves, and flower stems of roses. Bush roses, such as Hansa, seem to the most injured in this area. For control apply 3-5 percent DDT dust to foliage at weekly intervals.

Mosquitoes: Populations continue to increase following general rains.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO MAILING OF OBSCENE MATTER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 600) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first paragraph of section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Every obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance; and—."

SEC. 2. The fifth paragraph of section 1461 of title 18, United States Code, reading "Every letter, packet, or package, or other mail matter containing any filthy, vile, or indecent thing, device, or substance; and", is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately following section 1464 of such chapter, a new section, to be designated as section 1465, and to read as follows:

"§ 1465. Transportation of obscene matters for sale or distribution.

"Whoever knowingly transports in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of sale or distribution any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, film, paper, letter, writing, print, silhouette, drawing, figure, image, cast, phonograph recording, electrical transcription or other article capable of producing sound, or any other matter of indecent or immoral character, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"The transportation as aforesaid of 2 or more copies of any publication or 2 or more of any article of the character described above, or a combined total of 5 such publications and articles, shall create a presumption that such publications or articles are intended for sale or distribution, but such presumption shall be rebuttable.

"When any person is convicted of a violation of this act, the court in its judgment of conviction may, in addition to the penalty prescribed, order the confiscation and disposal of such items described herein which were found in the possession or under the immediate control of such person at the time of his arrest."

SEC. 4. The analysis of chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately after and underneath item 1464, as contained in such analysis, the following new item:

"1465. Transportation of obscene matters for sale or distribution."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to the mailing and transportation of obscene matter."

Mr. KILGORE. On March 14, 1955, the Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported S. 599, a bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce, and S. 600, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter. Both bills, as reported, passed the Senate on March 28, 1955. On June 1, 1955, the House Judiciary Committee reported H. R. 3333, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to the mailing and transportation of obscene matter. H. R. 3333, as reported, contained all the provisions incorporated in both Senate bills. On June 7, the text of H. R. 3333 was substituted for that of S. 600, which was passed by the House of Representatives.

Since the bill now before the Senate (S. 600) embodies the provisions previously agreed to by the Senate, I move, Mr. President, that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

BUNGLING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week I called attention to some of the fantastic bungling in the Department of Agriculture into which I have urged a thorough investigation.

I think this body should know that responsible officials of the Department now admit that 8,960 grain storage bins purchased and erected during the past 2 years were seriously defective and resulted in heavy losses.

My colleagues may be interested in knowing that conferences were held in the Department of Agriculture yesterday in regard to seeking restitution of more than a million dollars from suppliers of these bins.

I am glad to see this effort to recover some of this loss.

However, I would be more interested in finding out how much bungling occurred and making sure it cannot happen again.

Why did the Department of Agriculture continue purchasing these bins and ordering them erected long after complaints were made from the field that they were defective?

Is it possible that nearly 9,000 faulty bins could be erected before anyone realized they were so defective?

How did these now admittedly faulty bins not only gain approval of the Department of Agriculture, but also pass naval inspection?

Why did the Department of Agriculture ignore the recommendations of its own research bureau at Beltsville in regard to calking compounds in its desperate attempt to seal up the cracks and holes in these defective bins, with the result that heavy losses of corn and grain occurred?

Mr. President, these are among the questions which should be looked into and should be answered.

Never before under any administration have million-dollar losses as a result of bungling and poor judgment or worse been treated so casually, cause such little interest, or been paid such little attention by the press.

Have we a double set of standards?

Is such bungling simply written off as a mistake under a Republican administration, whereas it would be shouted from the housetops as corruption under a Democratic administration?

This grain-bin scandal is but one of the many examples of mismanagement in the Department of Agriculture under this supposed businessman's businesslike administration. Are they going to be ignored?

I, for one, feel that the Senate has a responsibility to take better care of the taxpayers' money, and erect safeguards against further repetition of such bungling and waste.

We must either do it through our own committees, or call upon the General Accounting Office to conduct a thorough investigation for us.

I do not intend to remain quiet while such things are going on. I have even further information available that should be laid before competent investigators.

But I assure the Senate until such an investigation is opened I shall continue to bring before this body these examples of the shortcomings, bungling, mismanagement, inefficiency, carelessness, and poor supervision in the Department of Agriculture.

As I have said before, I am not yet convinced that only bungling and mismanagement is involved. I want to be fair before making public even more serious charges.

For that reason I hope an investigation can be undertaken that will permit all sides to be heard.

I have brought the matter to the attention of the Subcommittee on Investigations, and I have asked it to make a full-scale report of its investigation.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the Secretary will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 14, 1955, pp. 8157–8158, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am glad to report that of the 29 amendments adopted by the Senate Finance Committee and by the Senate, the Senate conferees succeeded in retaining 26. One of those on which the Senate conferees receded proposed a technical change requiring changes in one of the other amendments. The amendments on which the Senate conferees receded were not vital to the purposes of the bill itself.

I desire to emphasize the fact that I do not believe any renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements law has received a closer and more exhaustive investigation by the Senate Finance Committee than H. R. 1, now pending. The hearings before the Senate Finance Committee lasted 4 weeks. More than 150 witnesses were heard. The executive sessions extended for another 4 weeks. Every single line of H. R. 1, as passed by the House of Representatives, was scrutinized and debated during 2 months of hearings and executive sessions.

I state this because I want the Senate to know how carefully this proposed legislation was considered by the Senate Finance Committee, and how keenly the membership appreciated its importance.

The effort has been made to convey the impression that the amendments adopted by the Senate Finance Committee crippled the reciprocal-trade program. I emphatically state that this is not true. Every single amendment adopted by the Senate Finance Committee was approved by the President.

I was a Member of the Senate when the reciprocal-trade-agreements program was first adopted in 1934. I supported it then and have supported it since. H. R. 1, now pending before the Senate, carries out the original principals of the trade-agreements program.

The Honorable Cordell Hull testified before the Senate Finance Committee in support of the first trade-agreements bill in 1934, and stated:

> The entire policy of this bill would rest upon trade relationships which would be mutually and equitably profitable, both to our own and to other countries.

He said also:

> The proposed reciprocity policy would, on the whole, enhance these benefits by increasing commerce which would result in increasing production and increased employment at home.

The reciprocal-trade program means what is says, namely, that its purpose is to stimulate and increase commerce between America and other nations on a basis of reciprocity. This is exactly what H. R. 1, as now presented to the Senate, will do.

This bill preserves the fundamental principle of the reciprocal-trade program by leaving the final decision in the hands of the President. It continues the program for 3 years and permits certain further reductions in the tariff rates on a restricted basis.

We must all recognize that world conditions have changed since the reciprocal-trade program was inaugurated in 1934. Since then the industrial wage scale in the United States has been increased much more rapidly than in other countries who import from us. It is likewise a fact that under the United States foreign-aid program the industrial plants of importing nations, especially textile and chemical plants, have been rebuilt and modernized, without cost to such nations. For these reasons the Senate Finance Committee adopted certain safeguards.

In view of all the conditions now existing, it is my sincere conviction that H. R. 1, as amended by the Senate Finance Committee and later practically in toto by the Senate, and then approved by the

conference committee, in adopting 26 out of 29 of the Senate amendments, offers the best approach that could be devised to continue our foreign trade on a basis of reciprocity, and, at the same time, protect, in reasonable fashion, the proper interests of American industry.

I will discuss briefly some of the more important amendments inserted by the Senate Finance Committee.

The first important amendments adopted by the Senate Finance Committee were Nos. 1, 2, and 3, which eliminated from the House bill all language indicating approval of the international organization known as General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The White House approved this action on these amendments in a communication addressed to me as chairman of the Finance Committee, as follows:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment strikes out the language in the House bill that sought to spell out the kinds of provisions that could be included in foreign trade agreements. The language stricken out was intended to be clarifying rather than substantive in nature. Since the language so stricken was merely declaratory of existing law, as uniformly interpreted, the administration has no objection to the Senate amendment striking it out.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment is merely a clerical amendment made necessary by amendment No. 1.

Amendment No. 3: The language of the House bill which this amendment strikes out was designed to make it clear that the enactment of the bill would not constitute approval or disapproval by Congress of the proposed new Organization for Trade Cooperation. The language which the Senate amendment proposes to insert is designed to make it clear that the enactment of the bill is not to constitute approval or disapproval by Congress of the GATT. Since the bill passed the House, separate legislation proposing congressional approval of OTC has been recommended, and hence it seems that the House language stricken out by the Senate amendment is unnecessary. The language inserted by the Senate amendment is similar to language which had been included in Trade Agreement Act extensions for the last several years, and the administration has no objection to it.

The second series of amendments were Nos. 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 17, 20, 21, 22, and 23, which eliminated the double jeopardy with respect to articles on which concessions are made in the forthcoming trade agreement with Japan.

The White House agreed to these amendments in the following language:

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 17, 20, 21, 22, and 23: All of these amendments relate to a single subject matter, viz, the elimination of the so-called double jeopardy with respect to articles on which concessions are made in the forthcoming trade agreement covering Japan. Under existing law the duties on these articles could be reduced by 50 percent of the duty existing on January 1, 1945, and then have been subject to a further 15-percent reduction under the House bill. Under the Senate amendments, if the duty on a particular article is reduced by 15 percent or more under the Japanese trade agreement, no further reduction could be made under the bill. If the duty on that article is reduced by less than 15 percent under the Japanese trade agreement, the duty could be decreased under the Senate amendments by the difference between a 15-percent reduction and the reduction provided for under the trade agreement. Thus, under the Senate amendments all articles, whether covered by the Japanese trade agreement or not, will be treated on the same basis. The administration has no objection to these amendments.

Amendment No. 7, as adopted by the Senate Finance Committee, eliminated the section providing for further reductions of tariff duties on all articles imported in "negligible quantity." This was agreed to by the White House in the following language:

Amendment No. 7: This amendment strikes out language in the House bill which would have authorized reductions in duty by 50 percent of the rate existing on January 1, 1945, in the case of articles which are normally not imported into the United States or are normally imported in negligible quantities. After prolonged consideration, it was concluded that "negligible quantities" constituted a standard that it would be difficult to apply administratively, and it was further concluded that a more precise standard could not be devised. Hence the administration has no objection to Senate amendment No. 7.

Amendment No. 26, inserted by the Senate Finance Committee, instructed the Tariff Commission to make a factual report once a year directly to Congress on the operation of the trade agreements program. Heretofore such a report was made to the President and only to Congress after the President had issued an order to that effect. The White House agreed to this amendment in the following language:

Amendment No. 26: This amendment directs the Tariff Commission to keep informed about the operation of trade agreement provisions relating to duties or other import restrictions and to submit to Congress, at least once a year, a factual report on the operation of the trade agreement program. The administration has no objection to this amendment.

Amendment No. 28 consists of three distinct parts. It provides certain safeguards to make it easier for the President to prevent serious injury to domestic enterprises, if he desires to do so. The White House agreed to these amendments as adopted by the Senate Finance Committee, but disagreed to an amendment to these amendments offered in the Senate by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The House declined to agree to the so-called Morse amendment and it was stricken from the bill by the conferees.

The White House statement on amendment 28 is as follows:

Amendment No. 28: This amendment consists of three distinct parts:

(a) One part of this amendment adds a provision to section 7 (b) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (escape clause provisions) which provides in substance that when the Tariff Commission finds increased imports to have contributed materially to the serious injury or threat of serious injury to a domestic industry, such increased imports shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to that industry. This provision seeks to eliminate confusion as to the proper interpretation of section 7 of existing law, and the administration has no objection to it.

(b) Another part of amendment No. 28 adds to section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 a subsection defining what is meant by "domestic industry" for the purpose of peril point determinations and escape clause procedure. There is no definition of what constitutes a domestic industry for these purposes in existing law. The amendment provides that a domestic industry means "that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing" products that are like, or directly competitive with, the imported article involved. It is also provided that where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than one industry, or more than one readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Tariff Commission shall, so far as practicable, distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury. This portion of the amendment gives the Tariff Commission greater latitude in consideration of applications for escape clause relief. No change is made with regard to the essential review powers of the President, and the administration has no objection to this portion of amendment No. 28.

(c) The third portion of amendment No. 28 has the effect of providing that the producer of any raw material contained in, or of any component of, a domestic article with which an imported article competes, may obtain escape-clause relief by reason of imports, not of the raw material or of the component, but of the finished article being manufactured by somebody else. This portion of the amendment also provides that evidence of serious injury or threat of serious injury to any readily determinable segment of the producing organizations shall, for the purpose of the bill, be considered evidence of serious injury or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products or articles. The administration feels that this third portion of amendment No. 28 goes to extremes, and would be impossible to administer. It would permit, for example, manufacturers of nuts and bolts to claim escape-clause relief on account of the importation of automobiles.

Amendment No. 29, adopted by the Senate Finance Committee, gives to the President authority to take action to regulate imports of strategic end critical items whenever necessary to protect the national security. The White House agreed to this amendment in the following language:

Amendment No. 29: This amendment rounds out the national security provisions incorporated in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act last year. Amendment No. 29 provides that whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobiliaztion has reason to believe that any article is being imported in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President is directed to cause an immediate investigation to be made. If the President finds, on the basis of such investigation that imports of the article in question are threatening to impair the national security, he is directed to take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security. Such action could take any form that was appropriate to the situation. The administration has no objection to this amendment.

On behalf of the Senate Finance Committee, I wish to assure the Senate that the legislation now pending represents the very best efforts of the Senate Conferees, and I hope the Senate will adopt the conference report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I appreciate the very lucid statement by the eminent Senator from Virginia. He

makes quite clear two things: first, that the restrictive amendments impeding freer trade which were adopted by the Senate are retained in the bill as it comes from the conference; second, that every one of these further restrictions upon international trade has met with the consent and the approval of the administration.

I congratulate the Senator from Virginia for the clear and honest record which he has made in this instance. But, Mr. President, I think the conference report marks a serious curtailment, if it does not mean the virtual abandonment of the principles of reciprocal trade which Cordell Hull supported, and to which we of the Democratic Party have given, until now, almost undivided allegiance.

Mr. President, there have been various commissions appointed to consider reciprocal trade. Most notable of these, perhaps, was the so-called Bell Commission, which was appointed by President Truman, but which made its report, I believe, in February 1953, 1 month after the new administration took office. The Bell Commission report, I think, is a landmark in the discussion of tariff policy and trade policy. It advocated, in the first place, the abandonment of the peril-point provision which had been inserted in the law under Republican rule. It advocated the repeal of the escape clause which had been inserted in the law under a Republican Congress. It recommended that with respect to any industries which were adversely affected by a reduction in tariffs, the country owed a duty to those industries to compensate them for their loss.

The Bell report was a very far-sighted and statesmanlike document. The new administration gave verbal support to the idea of broadening international trade. President Eisenhower, upon occasion, said it was the most important issue before the American public. He declared that unless international trade were broadened, the great alliance of the free nations might break down. But almost immediately a retreat began. The act was extended for only 1 year, with the promise made by the Secretary of State that no new reductions in tariff duties would be put into effect if the act were so extended.

A new commission was appointed, headed by a very fine gentleman from my city and State, Mr. Clarence Randall. It included amongst its membership several eminent Members of this body and of the other body, including some whose devotion to protection was deep and sincere.

The Randall Commission conducted a number of very interesting studies and then made a series of recommendations. The recommendations of the Randall Commission were greatly toned down as compared with those of the Bell Commission. The escape clause was to be retained; the peril-point provision was to be retained; there was to be no compensation for industries adversely affected by reductions in tariffs; and the reduction which was to be permitted was to be only 5 percent a year over a period of 3 years, with some doubt, because of the intervening steps which had to be taken before any reduction could be put into effect, whether the third reduction could ever take place. So that at the most a reduction of 5 percent in existing tariffs was permitted. This should be noted as not an absolute reduction, but as a relative reduction. That is, if the previous tariff was 20 percent, the most that it could be reduced would be 1 percent a year for 3 years, or a reduction to 17 percent. In practice, as I have said, since it would take some time for the steps in carrying out the reduction to take effect, the probable actual reduction in absolute terms would be only 10 percent of existing tariffs or, on a 20-percent basis, from 20 percent to 18 percent.

Those of us who believe in the principle of freer trade, those of us who believe that trade joins nations together, those of us who wish to have the free nations joined together in an economic as well as a political alliance, regarded the Randall Commission report as a very weak document.

It was in the very much watered down form of the Randall Commission that the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act came up in the House of Representatives this year. I am very proud of the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House, because it was the leadership of the Democratic Party, under Speaker RAYBURN, who put that bill through the House.

I tabulated the vote, and, in general, it can be said that while we of the Democratic Party were not as united on this matter as we have been in the past, and as I wish we were at this time, nevertheless, the Democrats voted approximately 2 to 1 for the bill. The Republicans voted approximately 2 to 1 against it. Those are the rough figures. It was due, therefore, to Speaker RAYBURN and the Democratic leadership of the House that the bill passed that body.

It came to this body and went to the Finance Committee, and, undoubtedly, a great many pressures began to bear upon the Finance Committee. I do not wish to criticize the individual members of the Finance Committee. I wish to pay tribute to them for the energy with which they worked under a heavy burden. But I should like to point out how seriously the amendments which they accepted, and which the administration sponsored, cripple still further the principle of freer trade. In the first place, as the Senator from Virginia has stated, there will be no reductions on approximately 1,000 items not now imported in appreciable quantities. It may be asked, What difference does that make? Since they are not imported in appreciable quantities, a reduction in their tariffs will not have any effect.

But here is the point: Some of those articles are not imported in any real quantities now because of the height of the tariff wall. Reduce the tariff, and the goods will come in. Keep the tariff up, and they will still continue not to be imported at all, or they will be imported in negligible quantities.

So this was the first body blow at the principle of freer trade, already pretty well battered, which the Committee on Finance permitted.

Second, the escape clause was still further loosened, making it possible for a tremendous amount of pressure to be brought to bear upon the President. The Tariff Commission must now make public its reports on escape-clause proceedings at the time it sends them to the President. Also, if I remember correctly the language of the Senate bill, if imports "contributed materially" to the serious injury of, or constituted a threat of serious injury to an industry, such imports would come under the escape clause.

There were other ways in which the escape clause was further loosened. It is a matter of open knowledge that these provisions will expose the President to tremendous pressure for increased tariff rates. Requests for increases will be coming from a multitude of sectors of the American economy. In view of the performance of the administration to date in acquiescing, and now, as the Senator from Virginia has said, in sponsoring the curtailment of the reciprocal trade program, the administration will have to show much more backbone than it has shown thus far, if this provision, in turn, is not to result in a great impairment of freer trade.

The escape clause was made more restrictive, even, than it is now by redefining industry, to allow individual commodities in industries which are otherwise profitable to proceed under the escape-clause provision. So now it will be necessary to judge not only the condition of an industry as a whole, but also the specific commodities produced within the industry.

There may be a very prosperous industry which in the case of one specific item it produces is at a fancied disadvantage, or which is threatened with a disadvantage. In that event the industry can file claims. The defenses are down, and the pressures are upon the President.

Finally, there was another clause placed at the very end of the bill, section 7 (b), as follows:

> (b) In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation, and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

All of us know what is behind that clause, even if the American public does not fully realize it. It involves, first, the question whether actual or relative embargoes shall be imposed upon residual oil from South America, in order to protect coal and some of the oil producers of the United States. We can be quite certain that those groups will demand severe limitations upon the importation of residual oils. The President will be

exposed to the pressure of those industries.

Lead and zinc will be involved, as well. I well remember the day on which my good friend, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] rose, with beaming face, and seemed to give assurance that the lead and zinc producers of his State, of the other great Mountain States, of Missouri and Oklahoma, where there are lead deposits, could be assured that their fears of foreign competition were groundless and that their hopes probably would be realized.

The senior Senator from Colorado, with the skill which characterizes him, and which has won the admiration of us all, was careful not to make any statement which would be binding. But as one read between the lines, and as one looked at his benevolent countenance, one felt that protection was going to be given to those groups.

I happen to be interested in one of the commodities affected, namely, fluorspar, because there are two counties in my State which produce an appreciable quantity of fluorspar. I think the answer to the lead and zinc question and also to the fluorspar question is to purchase for stockpiling.

I have introduced a bill to provide that fluorspar shall be purchased by the Office of Defense Mobilization at current prices. I am told that instead of doing this, the administration is endeavoring to dispose of wheat, with which it is swamped, in return for large quantities of fluorspar, therefore adding to the problems of the fluorspar industry.

Despite the pressure from the fluorspar industry and from the workers in that industry, I did not advocate and have not advocated any embargo or any increase in tariff on fluorspar. That issue should be met, if it is a defense issue—and I think it may well be a defense issue—through purchases and stockpiling. That is what I have advocated.

What has been done by the amendments sponsored by the administration has been to give away virtually the principles of reciprocal trade and of lower tariffs.

Another ominous note is the continued careful disavowal by the United States Congress of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade known as GATT. I suppose the person who knows most about GATT is the eminent senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I have read in years past some of the questioning which he has carried on; and every time I listen to the speeches of the Senator or listen to his questioning, my already high opinion of his ability is enhanced.

This is a complicated question, and I certainly do not pretend to have the technical knowledge of the subject which the Senator from Colorado possesses. But I think I know the main outlines. The main outlines are to provide a mechanism whereby nations can move together to reduce tariff barriers. That is fundamentally the principle involved. In that way they can deal with each other across the table, so that the reductions, when they occur, will be simultaneous and general, instead of being compelled to deal 2 by 2, with all the infinite complications which take place.

That brings us down to the question, Do we believe in the principle of reciprocal trade or do we not? The Senator from Virginia said he believed in it, and that the enactment of the bill would not imperil it. It certainly would imperil it. It would whittle the trade program of 1934, initiated by Cordell Hull, almost down to the vanishing point. The question is whether reciprocal trade, freer trade—I do not say free trade, but freer trade—is something we believe in, or whether it is something to which we give lip service, but which we betray at every conceivable opportunity.

Mr. President, I believe in the principle of freer trade. I believe that if there exists freer trade nations will produce those articles which they are both producing and comparatively best adapted to produce. As a result there will be obtained a distribution of energy over the world as a whole in the production of goods by nations according to their capacity to produce the maximum. I believe such a course helps all nations, because everybody benefits if labor is more beneficially utilized. There is nothing gained if we try to grow bananas in Maine or oranges in Vermont.

We have adopted the principle of free trade within the United States. We certainly should adopt the principle of freer trade among the nations as a whole.

There are products, such as certain luxury goods which France produces, which we would do well to import.

Certain of my friends tell me the Scotch produce good whisky, although I must confess that I do not have the money to buy genuine Scotch whisky.

The woolens from the north of England are probably the best in the world. In Australia and New Zealand wool can be produced more cheaply than it can be produced anywhere else.

Why should we not give the American consumer a break by giving him a chance to get such goods at lower prices, instead of being compelled to buy them at higher prices?

Then, Mr. President, there is something else. We speak of the industries which would be hurt by freer trade. Yet this body will remember that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] proposed that any industry which would be hurt should be compensated. I was proud of that suggestion, and hoped to support such an amendment. I tried to have a yea-and-nay vote upon it, but failed to get the necessary show of hands, one-fifth of those present. Of course, we believe that when industries are adversely affected, when, in short, they are being called on to make some sacrifice for the good of the Nation, their sacrifices should be paid for out of the general gains which will result. In other words, as the gains from freer trade are distributed generally, the burdens should be shared generally and not by 1 or 2 or a few industries.

But, Mr. President, I point out that there are two sets of gains. The first set of gains goes to the consumer, who will be able to buy at lower prices the goods which are imported. The second set of gains will go to those who are engaged in the exporting industry. We cannot export unless we import. If we shut off imports, as it now seems we are destined to do, the result will inevitably be to curtail our exports.

Let us see what has happened in that respect. We used to export almost half of the cotton produced in this country. I think the amount is now down to about 37 percent. But cotton is a highly exportable article, and the prosperity of the deep South, at least, largely depends upon the price of cotton, and the price of cotton in turn largely depends upon the market conditions.

We export at least a quarter of the tobacco raised in this country. We used to export more. We will not be able to begin to export as much tobacco if we maintain the restrictions or increase restrictions upon trade, because the inevitable result will be that the European countries will not have the exchange with which they can buy our tobacco. Such an eventuality would strike a blow at Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and the Connecticut Valley.

Ours is a great wheat-exporting country. As I recall, we export about one-third of the wheat grown in the United States. Formerly we exported more. If the European countries are not able to buy wheat from us because they lack exchange, the result will be a still further decline in the price of wheat, and the farmers of the wheat belt—those in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, eastern Montana, and certain sections of Texas—will suffer.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, when the Senator discusses wheat specifically, and selling it for dollars, I invite his attention to the fact that there exists authority now to sell wheat and other surplus agricultural commodities, and to receive in payment foreign currency of the country buying them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If that foreign currency were transferred into goods which could be imported, what would it mean?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would mean that those countries would not have to have dollar exchange to buy them and that the foreign currency received would eventually be expended for products and materials and supplies we need.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator agrees it will decrease the cost of maintaining our Military Establishment overseas; does he not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A considerable amount, I think, will be used for that purpose. I have personally pointed legislation on military construction to that end. We are also using some of the foreign currency for procurement of strategic materials.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The most satisfactory way is to exchange goods for goods. If we did not have imports, we would not have exports, and we would strike a blow

at cotton, tobacco, and wheat. We would even strike a blow at rice, because from 1949 to 1951, 43 percent of the rice grown in the United States was exported. The growing of rice was developed so efficiently in the Mississippi Valley region, I am told, that it is actually possible to export rice to the Orient, and to take part of the market away from oriental rice.

My State is a great producer of soy beans. Soy bean flour is an article of export. The production and sale of soybean flour will be curtailed if the bill shall be enacted.

There are other agricultural items which will suffer as well; but let us turn to the field of manufacturing. In 1951, 22 percent of the tractors which were produced in the United States were exported. The tractor industry is largely concentrated in my State, in Chicago and in the great cities along the Mississippi River, Moline, East Moline, and Rock Island. If European countries, to which tractors are primarily exported, are not able to sell goods to us, they will not be able to buy tractors from us; production of tractors will drop, and unemployment will increase.

In 1951 we exported 22 percent of the sewing machines manufactured in this country. The Singer sewing machine has gone around the world. If foreign countries cannot sell to us, they will not be able to buy many sewing machines from us.

In the case of rolling machinery and parts, we exported one-third of our production. That will decrease.

I wish to mention another article. In 1951 we exported one-sixth of the office appliances produced in this country.

Then we come to the great automobile industry, chiefly centered in the State graced by the present Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from the great State of Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. At the present time—even with all the restrictions which are imposed—approximately one-sixth of our motor trucks and coaches are exported. Here is a tremendous latent market. If we could sell to foreign countries more automobiles and trucks, some of the problems which now vex the automobile industry would be minimized. But the prospects are that, instead of selling more, we shall sell less. Other countries can purchase more from us only if they are able to sell more to us, and thereby acquire more funds to spend in our markets. Furthermore, if, in return for the lower rates which we grant to foreign countries on certain commodities produced by them, we demand lower rates on American automobiles, for instance the foreign market for our automobiles will be broadened.

Mr. President, many persons do not realize that reciprocal trade is not a one-way street. It does not mean that we grant concessions to other countries, without their granting concessions to us. We grant the concessions; and, in return, we obtain concessions from other countries, both by means of a reduction of their tariff rates and by means of a reduction of their import quotas. On May 3, I placed in the Congressional Record proof of this fact, and it will be found on pages 5432 to 5434. In fact, it constitutes proof, as the saying goes, beyond peradventure of a doubt. We have driven good bargains, and we have obtained tariff reductions and quota removals from other nations in return for the concessions we have made.

The damage which will be done to our exporting industries by the final approval of this bill is probably far greater than any benefit domestic industries may derive from it.

Mr. President, there is also a political situation which needs to be borne in mind. We are attempting to build up a great alliance of the free nations of the world, beginning in Europe, but now extending into Asia. We hope to join with us not merely the nations of Western Europe, but also Japan and the free countries of southeastern Asia. Japan is being tempted to trade with Red China. Red China is offering to accept Japanese-manufactured goods, and to give Japan, in return, steel products from Manchuria, insofar as the Red Chinese have any say about Manchuria. Also, they are to give raw materials to Japan. In a sense, that constitutes the natural economic alliance between those areas, for Japan is a manufacturing nation, and she formerly supplied manufactured goods to the continent of Asia. But we know that any such alliance would be accompanied by political conditions which would require Japan either to break or to loosen her ties with the West and to strengthen her ties with the Communist bloc. Those who say we should encourage Japan to trade with Red China, rather than to let Japan send textiles to the United States, however estimable their intentions—and I do not question their intentions—are, in effect, encouraging Japan, and are doing so by results, not by intentions, to tie up with the Communist bloc, rather than with the free world.

Mr. President, all the Members of the Senate may not be on the floor today; but, believe me, the nations of the world are watching to see what we do, following the surrender of the administration in the conference on the bill and the apparent insistence of the administration that the restrictions now contained in the bill shall be put into effect. Although Speaker Rayburn got through the House the administration's original bill, the administration's abandonment of Speaker Rayburn will strike a heavy blow at the confidence which the other nations of the world have in us. As the Senator from Virginia has said, in conference the conferees on the part of the Senate receded from one amendment, which, I believe, was the so-called Morse amendment; but the conferees on the part of the House receded on all the others; and the Senate won 26 of the 29 points, and won virtually every point which amounts to anything. That was done with the support of the President and the administration.

The delay and ambivalence of the President allowed two things to happen. First, it allowed the protectionists in his own party to get to him time and time again. Second, it gave the protectionists of the country and their pressure groups 2½ years to organize opposition to an extension of the Trade Agreements Act. Because of this, we have before us today a weakened, milk-and-water, emasculated piece of proposed legislation which preserves the symbol of reciprocal trade, but actually is a piece of legislation under which few or no effective trade agreements are likely to be made. I am afraid that the ominous words included in the bill, relative to GATT mean that in all probability, unless there is much more of a fighting spirit by the President on this issue than thus far he has demonstrated, GATT has gone where the woodbine twineth. If that happens, then—as the European correspondents of American newspapers have pointed out time and time again—we may expect foreign countries to raise their tariffs, we may expect a tariff war to break out in Europe; and duties, rather than being lowered, will actually be increased, and we shall move into a condition which will be worse than the one now existing.

Mr. President, to me it is a sad day, a day of abandonment of principle on the part of the administration. At the same time that we are calling for European union and for closer alliances, the administration and the Congress—if it approves this measure—make it more difficult for that alliance to come into being and to continue.

Mr. President, I believe we should practice what we preach. We should not say one thing and do another. We cannot ask for the European nations to join a union and lower their trade barriers at the same time we limit trade ourselves. If we find that something is right, we should stand by it.

Mr. President, I recognize that the Democratic Party has lost some of its fervor for lower tariffs. Historically, the Democratic Party has been the great party of freer trade. In a speech which I delivered in the Senate on May 3 I described the history of the tariff controversy. It showed how, historically, the Democratic Party has stood for freer trade. We have a great record, a record upon which northern and southern Democrats have united. It is true that in times past our southern friends had the advantage that they were helping cotton and tobacco, and had those two powerful economic interests behind them. We of the North—and I grew up, as some Senators may know, in New England—had to swim against the current, because the woolen industry, which had obtained protection in 1816 as an infant, was always insisting that it had not grown up, and that it needed still further protection. It has taken a long time to wean the woolen industry. But we northern Democrats learned in adversity what the principles of freer trade were. We were tried in the fire. We knew that the principles were sound, that they were, in a sense, eternal, and they became deeply graven on our hearts.

I am sorry to say that with the development of textile manufacturing in the South, and the fear of these textile manufacturers that Japanese competition will hurt them, there has been a falling away on this question from this section. The distressed areas have been used as an excuse for tariff protection.

There is another way of dealing with distressed areas, both with respect to coal and textiles. It lies in the improvement of our unemployment insurance machinery, in the retraining of workers who may be displaced, and in a special corporation to make loans to new industries, not merely giving them advice.

I have in preparation a bill dealing with the problems of the distressed areas. I hope to introduce it in the not too distant future.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator knows that a proposal was presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself along the lines of the one now outlined by the Senator from Illinois. Our proposal was laid before the Finance Committee at the time we were discussing House bill 1 at the Finance Committee level. I felt at that time that, rather than to be juggling tariffs and including weakening amendments in the reciprocal trade program, we should be giving consideration to the so-called trade adjustment features, or a trade adjustment bill, as a workable mechanism to relieve some of the distressed areas.

I join with the Senator from Illinois in supporting his proposal. Pride of authorship is nothing. What is most important is to get a reciprocal trade program which really works, for purposes of world trade, and then take care of our local domestic problems with the machinery which is available and can be used. That machinery would not be too extensive. It would consist merely of an application and acceleration of existing instruments of government and existing fiscal and financial policies which, if augmented a little, would be of great help.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree with the Senator from Minnesota. Earlier in my speech, when he was not in the Chamber, I paid tribute to him for submitting his amendment. It was with pride that I supported it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator certainly supported it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope it may now be dealt with separately.

What I am trying to say is that, under the guise of dealing with distressed areas, which could be dealt with far more effectively in another way, we are closing the doors on world trade and making international cooperation more difficult.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator, not only for his address today and the points which he is making in reference to the reciprocal trade program, but also for making the record clear. I think the record should be clear for those who will review it. The Senator from Illinois was consistent in his position at the time House bill 1 was before us, and the Senator from Illinois, as he has said, supported the adjustment features for the depressed areas at that time.

It seems to me that there is a great obligation upon the Senate and upon the finance committee to process legislation along the lines which have been jointly outlined here today. We should get on with this business before the distressed areas suffer even more. I am convinced that even the concessions which were placed in the trade bill, weakening the possibility of expanded foreign trade, will not prove to be concessions which are sufficiently meaningful to help the distressed areas. So what we have really done is to weaken the cardinal principle of American trade policy without giving any real relief to the distressed areas of the country, which are really feeling the pinch at the present time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct.

It is always dangerous for a man to set himself up as a prophet. As I stand here my mind goes back 25 years, to the period in 1930 in which the American Congress passed the Smoot-Hawley-Grundy tariff, designed to increase tariffs on goods, with the ostensible purpose of protecting American industry and American labor. The great depression had been in effect for 8 months. The bill was sent to the President, Mr. Herbert Hoover, to sign or veto.

While the bill was before the President, a group of American economists sent to him a petition which I had the honor of drafting, urging that he veto the bill, pointing out that the bill would increase the prices which domestic consumers would have to pay, that it would bring high-cost producers into the field, that it would shut off, or help to shut off, our exports, both of farm products and manufactured goods, and that it would provoke retaliatory action by other countries.

We were regarded as only a group of theorists, although 1,028 economists signed this petition. Someone once said that if all the economists in the country were laid end to end, they would not reach a conclusion. However, in this case there was virtually a unanimous opinion on the part of the economists of the country, who are highly individualistic. The almost unanimous opinion was that the bill was against public policy.

The President of the United States, however, signed the bill, and the Smoot-Hawley-Grundy Act went into effect. Everything that we had prophesied came true. Our exports fell off. European countries imposed retaliatory tariffs. Imperial preference came in Britain within a year and a half. France and Germany raised their tariffs, and we drifted into a state of economic anarchy—what was termed autarchy at the time. It was a condition in which the nations regarded themselves as self-sufficient. There was failure to cooperate economically, which was one of the characteristics of the 1930's. I do not wish to stress the point, but that all this was at least a contributing cause in the development of excessive nationalism, and the great war which broke out in 1939.

I do not wish to prophesy that anything as bad as that will happen this time. This is not a strangulation-all-at-one-time bill, as the Smoot-Hawley-Grundy tariff was. This is merely a refined process of strangulation, bit by bit. It will be a slow and gradual process.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator say it was dynamic progressive conservatism?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say it is progressive strangulation. As to whether it is dynamic would depend on which direction one wants to go. I do not believe it is even conservative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been unable to find out what is meant by the phrase "dynamic progressive conservatism."

Mr. DOUGLAS. No one has. It is a phrase born out of Madison Avenue and spawned upon the American people by high pressure public relations men at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his observations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it will seriously impair political alliances in the free world. I regard this as a surrender by the administration and a failure by them to support the heroic SAM RAYBURN, who for his defense of H. R. 1 was rewarded by this administration being called "irresponsible" and a "demagogue." It is a repudiation of those who fought for this program, and that repudiation will in the long run greatly worsen economic and political conditions in the country and in the world.

I am strongly tempted therefore, to vote against the conference report. But I recognize that to do so might create an even worse condition. We do need to go ahead with reciprocal agreements with Japan which are made partially possible by even the weakened bill we are now being called upon to pass.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am happy that H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act, as amended, has finally been approved by the conference committee because it affords a measure of protection badly needed by the cotton textile and other industries. I hope the Senate will approve this report.

Passage of this bill takes from the President authority to cut tariffs already reduced by the GATT Conference at Geneva in instances where reductions were more than 15 percent. For the next 3 years, under provisions of H. R. 1, the President would have the authority to approve up to a maximum of 15 percent tariff reductions on items which were not reduced at Geneva.

Under the old law and under H. R. 1 as passed by the House, there was virtually no protection against tariff reductions.

I think it should also be pointed out at this time that H. R. 1 not only provides more adequate protection for industry, but it also gives greater assurance that the farmer will not suffer from the loss of foreign markets which now consume much of our farm surpluses.

Failure to enact H. R. 1 could result in chaotic conditions which existed prior to 1934 when each country took the view that its tariff barriers had to be high enough to protect itself against imports. Without H. R. 1 the President would

have no authority to enter into any trade agreements.

If he were no longer able to negotiate trade agreements, we could certainly expect that foreign nations would fearfully erect new tariff barriers against the products of our farmers as well as against manufactured products.

I was greatly disturbed and disappointed to learn of the agreements entered into in the GATT Conference. The State Department officially announced that "among the concessions granted by the United States were moderate reductions of rates on some carefully selected cotton textile items."

As a matter of fact, I have learned reliably that these reductions on such basic goods as print cloths, broadcloths, poplins, oxfords, twills, and so forth, run as high as 27 to 48 percent of the present tariff rate. A spokesman for the textile industry has stated that these cuts represent "more than the current profit margin of the industry from the production of standard goods."

While I am astounded that State Department negotiators would agree to such severe reductions in products manufactured by this basic industry, I do want to point out that the possibility of just such action caused me to urge amendments to H. R. 1 for the purpose of providing more adequate protection against future cuts. The amendments I advocated were adopted, and they do prevent any further tariff cuts for 3 years on the items which suffered so greatly in the Geneva negotiation.

On March 17 of this year I appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and warned of the necessity of amending H. R. 1 to protect the textile industry and its million employees who annually receive $3 billion in wages and salaries.

At that time I pointed out that the industry and its employees were "exposed more than any other major industry to possible sacrifice on the altar of so-called reciprocal trade."

I told the committee: "They should not be subjected to the risks immediately threatened by H. R. 1 and the current negotiations at Geneva."

Also, I told the committee that "H. R. 1 in its present form contains provisions which would do injustice not only to the textile industry but also to many other types of American enterprise. For that reason I would be unable to cast my vote in favor of it unless it is amended."

Sixteen Senators joined me in asking the committee to amend the bill, and when the report on H. R. 1 was made, it contained the amendments and the effectiveness of these changes in the original bill has been preserved in the conference report. I hope that future negotiations affecting any of our industries will be conducted on a more realistic basis than the recent GATT Conference. In any case, this legislation provides protection for 3 years against further such damaging blows to industries such as textile manufacturing.

FREE TRADE CHARACTER OF H. R. 1—UNCHANGED IN CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the conference report on H. R. 1 has not changed the character of the legislation.

It leaves entirely to the President of the United States the final decision on the adjustment of duties and tariff rates within the purview of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended, including the so-called peril point, escape clause, and quota provisions.

ONE-MAN AUTHORITY OVER NATION'S TRADE AND ECONOMY IMPOSSIBLE

It seems to me that no President, indeed no one person on earth, should seek such a privilege, because it is absolutely impossible for one human mind or group of minds to encompass the meshing of the economic factors which go to make up our domestic economy, including our foreign-trade adjustments.

RECIPROCAL TRADE—EQUALITY BETWEEN STATES

It has been said before that true reciprocal trade presumes equality between the States or the nations parties to such a trade agreement.

As a great Republican, William McKinley said, our States are equal—and, I would add to what McKinley said, if they were not equal we wanted them to be equal. Yet we hear complaints between areas in the United States when industries are attracted to a particular area because they find a difference in the wages and the cost of doing business. However that is not a just complaint, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, because that is exactly what we do want, namely, equality in wages and living standards within the 48 States, so that any sacrifice on the part of one area necessary to equalize such standards on the basis of the natural adjustment of the domestic economy should not be prevented.

FREE TRADE DEMANDS DIVIDING MARKETS, WEALTH WITH FOREIGN NATIONS

When we come to foreign nations, whose situation is such that they will require much time and may never attain our living standards, we are admonished that there would be truly reciprocity, and we are told that all we can do is to divide our own wealth and our markets with them, which will bring us down to their standard.

That is the difference, Mr. President, between the two principles which face the Congress of the United States.

One is to hold our standard of living through the regulation of foreign trade by the Congress of the United States as set forth in the Constitution, article I, section 8. It is the duty of Congress to regulate foreign trade and the domestic economy.

PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE TRADE COMPETITION LONG GUIDED CONGRESS

Congress has long adopted as a basis of fair and reasonable competition, a flexible duty, or tariff, as we have come to call it, which continually adjusted made up the difference between the cost of doing business, between the wage standards of living and the taxes in this Nation, and those of the chief competitive nation.

The flexible tariff or duty could be lowered as the living standards rose in the chief competitive country and when the foreign living standards approached our own, free trade, which, of course, is the ultimate objective, would be immediate and automatic.

FREE TRADE AND FREE IMMIGRATION IDENTICAL IN PRINCIPLE, EFFECT

Mr. President, the Federal Unionist's program pointedly advocates a modification of our sovereignty, beginning with free trade and continuing through acceptance of offshore areas as States to pack the United States Senate, and freer immigration. No one can vote for free trade, the importation of the products of foreign low-cost labor, without an evener, called a duty under our Constitution, but which has come to be called a tariff, and vote against free immigration, because the ultimate effect is the same.

LOW-COST LABOR AND LOW-WAGE PRODUCTS BOTH LOWER NATION'S LIVING STANDARDS

Whether we import the low-cost labor or import the product of low-cost labor, the final result is exactly the same, namely, the lowering of the living standards of the Nation.

Mr. President, our economic one worlders and the public relations and propaganda organizations of foreign countries are continually selling the people of this Nation on the slogan that we must have foreign trade; therefore, we must have free trade.

EXPORT TRADE SHARE SHOWS DECLINE SINCE 1934 TRADE ACT

Mr. President, free trade, they do not stop to explain, is entirely unrelated to our foreign trade since foreign nations protect themselves regardless of what we do. For many years our foreign trade averaged in value 7 percent of the exportable goods of the Nation. Since the passage of the 1934 Trade-Agreements Act the percentage has been considerably reduced, because, Mr. President, the whole foundation and the reason for trade seemed to have been overlooked by the economic one worlders.

FOREIGN NATIONS REALISTIC ABOUT FOREIGN TRADE

It is not overlooked by the propagandists of foreign nations. They understand it and profit by it. They understand that no individuals or nations ever buy anything from other persons or other nations that they can conveniently produce for themselves.

When they cannot conveniently produce it for themselves, they buy the quality they want where they can buy it at the lowest cost. It has nothing to do with our contribution to foreign nations and the division of our wealth and markets with the other countries of the world.

OTHER NATIONS PROTECT OWN INDUSTRIES WHILE UNITED STATES GIVES THEM AWAY

They simply take what we give them and protect their own. That should be very plain to the Senate of the United States today, after 22 years' experience.

Mr. President, either the Federal Unionist policy of free trade, ultimately averaging our standard of living with the low-wage standards of the other nations of the world, as embodied in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as amended, is the principle we should accept, or we should protect, as we did for a century of time, the workingman and the investors of the United States through a flexible duty or tariff continually adjusted to make up the difference, as already ex-

plained, between the cost of doing business in this country and in the chief competitive nation on each product.

PROTECTION PRINCIPLE PROVED INCENTIVE TO UNITED STATES BUSINESS

During the period of the protection principle, all anyone wishing to go into business in this country had to determine was whether he could compete with his fellows, with other Americans in the business paying the same wages, taxes, and the cost of doing business.

If he could find raw materials, markets, transportation, power, and other elements of doing business, so that he could, in his judgment, compete with his fellow Americans, then he invested his money and that of his friends, often, selling stock to hundreds of stockholders, and he simply risked his money upon his own business judgment.

PRESENT FREE-TRADE POLICY CURBS AMERICAN ENTERPRISE, INVESTMENTS

Under the present policy, Mr. President, he would have to determine what every other nation in the world could do in that particular business paying low wages under varied conditions, and that it is impossible for him to do. That is the reason why, with the exception of a few larger companies doing business both here and abroad, little money is being invested in the common run of industry, such as the crockery business, the glass business, the machine-tool business, and the textile, and other businesses.

GREEN LIGHT GIVEN BY CONGRESS FOR FURTHER TARIFF CUTS

I just heard the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], complaining about tariffs and duties being cut already by the Geneva General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade before the conference report reached the Senate—which anyone who read the bill, the discussion, and the testimony, would know would happen. And the end is not yet. The movement has just started, I would say to my distinguished colleague.

FUTURE INVESTIGATIONS PREDICTED

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that when the Congress leaves to one man, whatever his integrity, the determination and adjustment of tariffs and duties which protect a business, or do not protect it, there is endless opportunity for graft and crookedness. His advisers can cause one industry or one area to be traded for another industry or area of activity.

I predict that within a comparatively short time congressional committees will be occupied with investigations of this very abuse of power which is going on at the present time.

GATT DELEGATES FROM 33 FOREIGN NATIONS SERVE ONLY OWN NATIONAL INTERESTS

Who in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, in Geneva, comprised of 33 nations besides ourselves, is determining the tariffs and duties? Whom do they think they are looking out for? They are looking out for their own countries and for their own friends. That is whom they are looking out for. So it is necessary to have a principle in order to avoid such favoritism and manipulations.

H. R. 1 AN ECONOMIC YALTA

I said in the Senate on May 3:

Mr. President, H. R. 1 is an economic Yalta. It is worse than Yalta for this Nation. Yalta was simply a sellout of a friendly foreign people, while H. R. 1, extending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, is a sellout of American workingmen and investors, making up dependent upon foreign nations across major oceans for some of the critical materials without which we cannot fight a war or live in peace, and we could not get them during an all-out war. Yalta is history. H. R. 1 is current.

TRAGIC LESSONS OF YALTA GO UNHEEDED

Mr. President, the only reason why we should be interested in Yalta and its allied treaties and promises is either to change something that was done at Yalta, or else learn how to conduct our affairs in the future. We seem to have done neither.

Mr. President, I further said on June 3:

Yalta has long been an accomplished fact; any investigation of it could only fix responsibility.

H. R. 1, which extends the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, signs the death warrant for American industries, workingmen, and investors throughout the Nation.

H. R. 1 provides for a continuation of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and, to all intents and purposes, of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly known as GATT. The Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has testified that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and, as amended, H. R. 1, give the President full authority to participate in GATT. The President, in 1947, proclaimed our adherence to GATT.

Now we have the spectacle of the Secretary of State promising the Senate Finance Committee that he will bring the organizational provisions of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, before the Congress.

PREDICTION ON SECRETARY DULLES' GATT ASSURANCE RECALLED

Mr. President, what I predicted then, and I again call attention to the fact, has now come about. On May 3, I said, at page 5396 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. President, I assert at this time that the bill introduced in the House will not bring the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to the Congress at all.

It will be remembered that there was a great to-do about all this; that, at last, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, made at Geneva by an organization of 34 nations, would be brought before Congress for ratification.

On that basis I presumed to say that the chairman of the Committee on Finance was willing to report the bill from the committee, because I heard him say to the Secretary of State: "If you want to get the bill reported, you had better bring GATT before the committee."

GATT CONTINUES WITHOUT CONGRESS SANCTION

What the bill provides is exactly what I said on May 3 it would provide. I said:

Should Congress approve the Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC—it will have approved GATT. If Congress should refuse to approve it, GATT will remain untouched. That is the situation. GATT will continue as organized in 1947.

That is exactly the truth today. If Congress ignores the bill, which it will without a doubt, it will have done nothing to the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

THIRTY-THREE NATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL GAME TO WIN AMERICA'S WEALTH AND TRADE

The agreement will continue as it was organized in 1947, with 33 other nations and ourselves sitting in on on international sucker poker game with our money and our trade, the only things there which are of any value.

I further said on May 3:

What was the object of the tariff, or duty? Abraham Lincoln's platform in 1860 stated the objective. It said the purpose was the development of the industrial interests of the whole country. That is what it was for.

Congress followed that principle for a century. Then in 1934 it repealed the principle. While article I, section 8, of the Constitution makes it mandatory for Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and to impose the duties, imposts, and excises, which we call tariffs, the Congress has forgotten its responsibility. In 1934 it said: "We will transfer to you, Mr. President, on your request, the right to trade any section of the domestic economy for a fancied foreign policy."

That was what we did.

That is what the original trade agreements act said, and that is what has occurred for 22 years. Since then the economy of the United States has been geared to wars and preparation for war, and our wars are never settled. After World War I was fought to prevent war, we had two wars.

Mr. President, presumably the trade agreements law was enacted as an emergency measure to improve the trade position of this country, but today several provisions to that effect are out of the act entirely. So what does the Secretary of State say? In his testimony before the Committee on Finance he said, in effect, that he could trade any job or any investment in America for a policy in Europe or Asia.

FREE TRADE SOLD AS "EMERGENCY" MEASURE PERPETUATED SINCE 1934

Mr. President, some of the programs which Congress enacts in emergencies seem to have a habit of becoming permanent. The trade agreements program was an emergency in 1934, and might not have injured the United States permanently as an emergency measure.

FOREIGN AID "EMERGENCY" PROGRAM NOW PERMANENT ADMINISTRATION POLICY

The Marshall plan was devised as a temporary emergency measure. But on the occasion of its consideration by the Senate, I predicted that it would become a permanent program, and it has become so, to all intents and purposes. The Stassens, the Dulleses, and many leading Members of the Senate all say it is permanent and that it is a part of our economy. Well, I still do not like it.

I quote further from my remarks in the May 3 debate, page 5397:

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, drafted by the State Department and requested by the President, authorized the latter to negotiate with foreign countries to cut tariffs. The President turned this authority over to the State Department and negotiations were conducted on a bilateral basis.

CONSTITUTION PLACED RESPONSIBILITY ON THE CONGRESS

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States placed this responsibility on the Congress. Why did it place it on Congress? Because Congress represents the people of the United States of America, the

people in every precinct in the United States. The Members of the Congress know what is good for this country and they know how to build the economic structure. It had been built for a century on the basis of fair and reasonable competition by adjusting tariffs so as to equalize the wages paid here and those paid in the chief competitive nation, on each product. So the Constitution placed the responsibility on the Congress.

CONGRESS THROUGH TRADE ACT AMENDED CONSTITUTION

Congress, by a simple act, amended the Constitution and transferred its responsibility to the President; the President lodged it in the hands of the State Department; and the State Department then placed it in the hands of GATT, which holds its sessions in Geneva 3,000 miles away, and conducts them on a secret basis. Prior to GATT 29 trade agreements were entered into on a bilateral basis. None of them was ever submitted to the Congress. These bilateral agreements did not come fast enough to suit the New Deal planners.

ITO INITIAL SCHEME OF GLOBAL PLANNERS

From 1943 to 1945 many bureaucratic planners were engaged in scheming up some device by which the distribution of American jobs and markets among the nations of the world might be speeded up and placed under some international agency which could apply them multilaterally or wholesale.

The first plan was to set up an international trade organization, but the planners made one mistake.

They submitted it to Congress, where the plan died in committee.

This did not stop the planners.

They also had set up a so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades, or GATT, which held its first session coincidentally with the meeting to adopt an ITO or international trade organization charter.

MALONE AMENDMENT OF MAY 5, 1955, RECALLED

Mr. President, today we are reaping the grim consequences of this action creating GATT.

On May 4, 1955, I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H. R. 1 which would have returned to the Congress its constitutional responsibility as provided for in the Constitution, or transferred to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, the duty of regulating foreign trade on a basis of fair and reasonable competition. My amendment also provided for quantitative imports, and established a definite method of determining the value of imports.

TRADE ACT SETS INDUSTRIES, WAGE EARNERS AGAINST EACH OTHER

Mr. President, on May 4 I said, as appears at page 5541 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. President, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to be extended by H. R. 1, sets industry against industry, workingmen's group against workingmen's group, investors against investors. One industry, group, or interest may be preserved while another industry, group, or interest may be traded off and sacrificed for some real or fancied political preferment. That is the policy embodied in the act and bill. It is a policy wrong in principle and disruptive in its effects. The bill which is before the Senate, H. R. 1, will help foreigners and will hurt Americans.

CONFERENCE REPORT WINS NO FRIENDS

Mr. President, I doubt that this conference report pleases anybody.

Certainly the Senate amendments have not pleased the champions of free trade and of continued State Department rule over America's economy.

Sponsors and proponents of H. R. 1 in the House debate yesterday were loud in their protests against Senate tinkering with their pet project to share our markets with the producers and manufacturers of foreign countries.

Opponents of turning our markets over to foreign nations are as vigorous in their opposition to H. R. 1 as they were before the Senate wrote a few piddling changes into the original Cooper bill.

PRINCIPLE IN BILL CONSTITUTIONALLY WRONG

The amendments to the bill do not alter one whit the principle of the free-trade program. The principle of that program is to turn over the constitutional responsibility of Congress to lay and collect duties—meaning tariffs—and to regulate foreign commerce, to the executive branch, meaning the State Department. That principle is wrong—constitutionally wrong—and it is found included in the pending conference report bill.

Mr. President, a bad bill cannot be patched up, and a wrong principle cannot be appeased.

MORE UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES MARKED FOR SACRIFICE

There have been some expressions to the effect that the conference report is a compromise. Where is the compromise?

Congress is still shifting its constitutional responsibilities to State Department underlings meeting in secret in foreign lands.

American industries are still being sacrificed and marked for sacrifice on the socialistic altar of free trade, international free trade.

American wage earners and investors are being sold down the river in order to grant some supposed preference to foreign wage earners and industrialists.

NATION'S ECONOMY SUBORDINATED TO FOREIGN POLICY

America's economic policy, which, under the American system of fair and reasonable competition, made this country rich and great, is being subordinated to a foreign policy that puts foreign prosperity and welfare above American prosperity and welfare.

American industries which are being sacrificed for what the State Department presumes to be some foreign policy advantage, will still, under the conference report, have to beg and plead and go through endless redtape and bureaucratic meddling merely to ask for recourse that will permit them to survive.

PRESIDENT RETAINS VETO POWER OVER ESCAPE CLAUSE

The President still holds supreme veto power over the fate of stricken industries, even when the Tariff Commission recommends escape.

As I have already pointed out, Mr. President, under the bill, the President of the United States would be the absolute dictator of the domestic economy of this Nation, and of foreign trade. All the strings and amendments attached to the bill are designed merely to embarrass, not to direct.

PRESIDENT CAN MAKE OR BREAK INDUSTRIES SUFFERING EFFECTS OF FOREIGN COMPETITION

I point out, Mr. President, that it is not a question of trusting the President of the United States to do his duty. The President, if he had the time, would not know how to do it, because no principle is involved. He can make or break any industry in this Nation which is dependent on a duty or tariff to make up the difference between the wage standard of living in this country and the wage standard, taxes, and the costs of doing business in the chief competitive nation.

FREE TRADE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

What we are considering is international socialism, Mr. President. That is all it is.

It is still, in my opinion, a dictatorial and tyrannical bill, incompatible with the United States Constitution, and I shall continue to oppose it.

Mr. President, proponents of free trade, ever since the free trade program was enacted, have ballyhooed it as stimulating exports.

"Trade is a two-way street," is their favorite cliche.

EXPORTS BEFORE, AFTER 1934 TRADE ACT COMPARED

In the 20 years before the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was passed, we were exporting an average of 7.1 percent of our national product annually. In the 21 years since the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, we have exported an average of 4.6 percent of our gross national product.

In other words, Mr. President, our export trade, percentagewise, was higher when Congress regulated tariffs and foreign commerce than it has been since the State Department took over that constitutional function of the Congress and began regulating the foreign trade and economy.

UNITED STATES OPENS MARKETS TO WORLD WHILE FOREIGN NATIONS CLOSE THEIRS

What have foreign nations done in return for the numerous trade concessions we have offered them, and which under this bill we shall continue to extend to them for another 3 years? The May 20, 1955 issue of the U. S. News and World Report has an interesting synopsis of how other nations have reacted to our largesse. It is headed: "Foreign Countries Limit Buying From United States." I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, this summary from the U. S. News & World Report of May 20, 1955.

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

FOREIGN COUNTRIES LIMIT BUYING FROM UNITED STATES

Britain: All imports limited. Only token amounts of nonessentials allowed. Machinery, cotton, tobacco, other raw materials imported in quantity. Tariffs protect some British producers.

France: Imports limited. Exporters can use 5 percent of United States dollar receipts to buy United States goods. Other imports from United States limited to essential machinery, raw materials.

West Germany: Rules being eased. Many United States products imported freely. But

quotas in force for food, consumer goods, textiles.

Italy: Quotas on most United States imports, but eased recently. Automobiles, ball bearings, typewriters, canned foods excluded partly to protect Italian industries.

Japan: Imports from United States increased slightly. Goods competing with Japanese industry excluded, such as steel, textiles, fertilizer, drugs, automobiles. Imports mainly raw materials, such as cotton, wheat, rice, iron, hides.

Australia: Low limits on imports; in general, less than 1950–51 level. Only essential raw materials, industrial supplies, machinery admitted; consumer products excluded.

Philippines: Dollars reserved mainly for industrial supplies, machinery. Increased imports of auto parts; finished cars excluded. Tobacco imports controlled to protect Philippine growers.

Pakistan: Quotas set on most imports; increased recently for such United States wares as metals, tools, automobiles, clothing, radios, hardware, phonograph records, sewing machines.

Brazil: Rules tightened. Importers pay special taxes if they buy from United States; tax depends on how essential import is.

Mexico: Quotas on long list of United States products, including automobiles, other things considered luxuries. Tariffs raised to protect Mexican industries.

HOW FOREIGN NATIONS DISCRIMINATE AGAINST AMERICAN PRODUCTS WITH QUOTAS, CONTROLS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the same issue of U. S. News & World Report carried an informative article headed "How United States Traders Fare in the World." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

HOW UNITED STATES TRADERS FARE IN THE WORLD

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Trade barriers stay high in most of the world, despite United States efforts to get them down. This article, based on study in several countries, shows what merchants are up against. United States tariffs and quotas look liberal compared with controls elsewhere.)

(Reported from London, Paris, Rome, Bonn, Tokyo, and Washington.)

The United States, now getting ready to take another snip off its tariff rates, is wondering what other countries are prepared to do in return that will make it easier for American businessmen to sell abroad.

Over the past two decades the United States has cut its import duties to levels that are quite low historically. You have to go back before World War I to find lower hurdles for foreign manufacturers.

In return other nations have made some tariff cuts, too, but often these have meant little. A high framework of other barriers has been raised—such things as quotas, exchange controls, bilateral agreements, and in some cases actually higher tariffs.

The chart on this page shows how these rules affect the United States merchant when he tries to sell in some of the important foreign markets.

WHERE UNITED STATES GOODS ARE EXCLUDED

Some nations have quotas limiting all imports, with a special aim of saving dollars. In practice this means quotas are tailored to keep out all but the most indispensable United States products. Such 100 percent control is found in Austria, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, and Turkey. Few things other than "essentials" are admitted also into Britain, France, and Australia.

Since World War II most governments have been claiming they need tight controls over imports because of the dollar shortage. They wanted to use scarce dollars for industrial equipment and vital raw materials instead of luxuries.

But in the past few years the dollar shortage has become less of a problem; many countries, especially in Europe, have been able, thanks partly to United States foreign-aid grants, to pile up some spare gold and United States currency. The shortage excuse for controls has become less persuasive.

United States diplomats as a result are becoming more insistent on moves toward freer trade. They are telling foreign leaders, "Congress won't go on voting for freer trade unless you take some steps in that direction, too."

WHERE UNITED STATES GOODS ARE WELCOME

Here and there countries are moving toward free trade, especially on the European mainland. Economists estimate that 98 percent of Switzerland's imports now are not affected by quota limits. In Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg trade free of such limits is put at 86 percent; in Greece, 90 percent; in Western Germany, 65 percent; in Sweden, 55 percent.

But only a few countries, chiefly in the Western Hemisphere, do business rather freely with the United States; Canada, Cuba, Panama, and Honduras are in this group, which controls few imports or none at all.

Britain, Denmark, and Italy are being urged to loosen up. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation is making a study, supposed to be finished next month, to see how much such countries can step up their purchases from the United States without running into the red.

Now that the dollar shortage is less of an excuse for controls, a more hardboiled reason is becoming prominent. This is protectionism, restricting imports to promote local intertsts.

Throughout the world the United States is labeled "protectionist." Yet United States merchants tell of many instances in which this charge can be turned against the foreigners.

WHERE INDUSTRY IS CODDLED

In Italy, for example, there is a demand for automobiles beyond what local producers can supply. However, United States cars are excluded to reserve the market for Italian makes.

At one time Italy bought carbon electrodes from the United States. Then a plant was built to make this product in Italy. Imports were shut off. The same thing happened in linotypes, American officials say. After Italy got a plant for making typesetting machines she refused licenses to import them from the United States.

Yet Italy allows dollars to be used to buy American phonograph records. This shows that controls are not merely to save money for essentials.

The Philippine Republic wants more tobacco grown at home; so it has set a smaller quota for imports. Automobile assembly plants are being set up; so auto parts are to be brought in but finished cars are to be excluded.

Western Germany, one of the freer-trading nations, uses import licensing to protect farmers and some manufacturers. The United States now is trying to get officials in Bonn to admit some canned fruits and vegetables, household appliances, and textiles.

HOW GOODS ARE KEPT OUT

The United States businessman trying to operate in these countries encounters a bewildering array of rules; no two countries have the same methods.

Some rely largely on controls over money. A number of South American countries have schedules of exchange rates that discourage certain imports; the less of a thing they want, the more of the currency they make the importer put up when he gets dollars to pay his supplier in the United States. Since the Government controls the money market, the higher rate amounts to a tax.

In Brazil, for instance, a 10-percent tax in Brazilian money, cruzeiros, is levied on all purchases of dollars. Then, in addition, the merchant who imports luxury items from the United States must pay 100 cruzeiros for each dollar he needs to swing the deal; this is 5 times the rate of exchange paid on imports of certain ores, medical equipment, and farm implements, which are considered highly important.

Of late, Brazil has made this control system more costly to importers.

Many other countries rely more heavily on quotas, setting specific limits on the amount of goods that can be brought in. In Britain, all imports are licensed. Blanket or general licenses are announced for many heavy essential supplies, such as tobacco, cotton, wheat, and fertilizer.

For a long list of nonessentials only token imports are cleared; these are confined to brand-name products sold in Britain before World War II.

Tariffs are another form of control, as in the United States British tariffs on some consumer goods range from 20 to 30 percent in value. Even if import licenses were granted, American merchants might find this barrier hard to scale.

Mexico, within the past few years, has raised many tariffs.

TIGHTER CONTROLS

Some other countries have been tightening up their controls over imports more recently.

Colombia, like Brazil, is hurt by the drop in coffee prices. She recently banned imports of 135 luxury products. Stiff taxes, ranging from 10 percent to 100 percent, were prescribed for all but the most essential raw materials, when imported.

Australia also has decided to cut down on imports. She has, all along, excluded many types of products.

OTHER BUSINESS PROBLEMS

The businessman who tries to get around the import barriers by setting up production in foreign markets also runs into numerous difficulties.

In Britain, the United States businessman has to get Government O. K. to build a factory or open some other business. Factories have to be shown to be essential.

An American hotel chain got permission to build and run a hotel, soon to open in London; this was considered important because it would show British hotel managers how an American hotel is run. Permission was denied to a second chain that wanted to buy and operate a British hotel; one example was enough.

Japan is eager for United States patents and technical help. But she does not welcome foreign investments unless control is given to local businessmen. One American drug company. in setting up a Japanese subsidiary, was forced to let Japanese hold 50 percent of the stock.

Italian business interests sometimes gang up on an invader. A United States company proposed to set up a plant for making files, but changed its mind when it realized the political power of the Italian manufacturers; it could get no assurance that licenses would be granted to get needed machinery into the country.

POINT OF VIEW

The American official or businessman who points to these obstacles is likely to meet with a variety of excuses abroad.

Foreigners emphasize that the United States still sells more than it buys in world markets. As United States aid diminishes, dollars to bridge the gap will be harder to come by.

If the foreigners buy more from the United States, it is argued, they may buy less from each other. If Britain or Germany takes more citrus fruits from America, Italy will lose part of her market.

In addition, it is noted, the United States also has some controls besides tariffs; quotas are set on imports of a number of important farm products.

All these arguments make the free, multilateral trade that was the United States postwar goal still seem a far-off dream. To the merchant they mean that barriers will he high for quite sometime, even though United States takes steps to reduce them.

FOREIGN NATIONS GREEDY FOR NEW UNITED STATES DUTY CUTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, today's issue of the Wall Street Journal carries, under a Washington dateline, an informative article on what tariff concessions foreign nations will request from the State Department. The article is headed: "Trade Bill's Passage Will Spark a Scramble for Duty Cuts, Boosts—Federal Agencies Hope To Swap Reductions for Some Concessions From Abroad—Whisky and Roquefort Cheese." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

TARIFF TURMOIL: TRADE BILL'S PASSAGE WILL SPARK A SCRAMBLE FOR DUTY CUTS, BOOSTS—FEDERAL AGENCIES HOPE TO SWAP REDUCTIONS FOR SOME CONCESSIONS FROM ABROAD—WHISKY AND ROQUEFORT CHEESE

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—The United States is about to begin preparations for a big new tariff-cutting conference. Target date: January 1956.

At the same time the Government is bracing for demands for higher United States duties from American businessmen bothered by competition from abroad.

Pinpointing the results in terms of specific commodities is impossible at this early date. But the United States in coming months will be pushing for tariff concessions on a wide range of its products, such as autos and synthetic fibers, and will be under pressure to reciprocate with tariff cuts on British whisky, French cheese, and Italian embroideries, among hundreds of other items. Similarly, producers of such things as wood screws and fluorspar are likely to be pressing for added tariff protection. The upshot is sure to be some tariff tinkering of vital interest to all kinds of United States businesses.

TARIFF TURMOIL

Signaling the start of this tariff turmoil will be President Eisenhower's signature on H. R. 1, a bill to extend the 21-year-old Reciprocal Trade Act for another 3 years. Yesterday, the House overwhelmingly approved a compromise version of the measure, and the Senate is counted sure to do likewise today. Mr. Eisenhower, who has made the bill a "must," is likely to waste little time signing it into law. Key provisions:

Authority for the President to trim United States tariffs 5 percent a year for the next 3 years, and over the same period to roll back to 50 percent of an import's value any duties above that figure.

Several new provisions to make it easier for United States industries to build a case for higher tariffs on this or that import. In some instances they may be able to plead that foreign goods are endangering national security by putting defense-essential United States firms out of business. New language in the law will also make it less difficult for United States businesses to prove they are suffering from foreign competition in United States markets.

NEW POWERS

The Eisenhower administration is itching to use its new tariff-cutting powers. The minute H. R. 1 clears Congress, the State Department and other United States agencies with a stake in world trade will begin preparations for the coming conclave, the fourth big multination tariff-cutting get-together since passage of the Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934. The first such session took place in 1947, in Geneva, where the United States and 22 other countries first agreed to a multilateral trade pact entitled "The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade"; at subsequent sessions at Annecy, France, in 1949, and at Torquay, England, in 1951, the GATT's members exchanged further trade concessions, and new members were added. Right now the GATT numbers some 34 signatories, who do 80 percent of the world's trade.

Before long the United States will likely send formal word to GATT's executive secretary proposing another meeting to revise the agreement by exchanging tariff concessions of one kind or another. Officials here are hoping representatives of at least two dozen countries will show up. Meanwhile, the State Department will start bilateral talks with GATT members to sound out their wants and see what the United States might offer in return. In fact, some of this spadework, on a strictly tentative basis, is already under way.

The pace of the preparations will step up sharply in coming weeks. Getting ready for tariff talks is a complex and time-consuming process, involving exhaustive study of trade and tariff trends for hundreds of commodities, lengthy talks with foreign diplomats, and long public hearings by an interagency committee on the Government's list of candidates for tariff cuts. The Tariff Commission has a hand in tariff cutting; it fixes peril points, beneath which, in the Commission's judgment, duties cannot be cut without injuring United States industries. The President can breach peril points simply by notifying Congress he intends to do so, but this is rarely done.

HASTE IS IMPORTANT

"We're going to be run crazy around here trying to get ready by the end of the year," says one top State Department man. But he notes that haste is important; the 5-percent duty reductions for the first of 3 years of the law must be negotiated by June 1956, or the authority is lost, under the bill about to become law. Officials figure they should allow almost 6 months for the negotiating. That's why they'd like to start the GATT negotiations in January.

What the United States gets from all this give-and-take depends a lot, of course, on what other countries are willing to offer in exchange. Predictions are hazardous, too, because a concession, for example, might be a tariff cut, or else simply a promise not to increase a duty or not to impose one. Also, generalizations are tricky because United States interests, or those of a foreign land, may vary widely between different varieties of one group of goods—between low-cost and expensive automobiles or cotton textiles, for example.

But talks with United States trade officials and a study of trade statistics do give a rough idea of where the tariff cutting may concentrate. A high State Department official sums up the coming trade confab this way: "Mostly we're going to be dealing with European countries, Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, also with Japan and Canada. Only a few raw materials will be involved, because they're mostly duty free. Much of the negotiations will center on finished manufactured goods, such as United States machinery, electrical appliances, and autos, and foreign glassware, finished textiles, toys, and fancy hand-crafted items."

WHISKY AND WOOLENS

Officials of a number of foreign countries have already jotted down a list of the items they'll want to talk about at the next GATT get-together. The British, for example, make no secret of their yearning for concessions on their whisky, certain kinds of cutlery, some woolens, and iron and steel manufactured items. The French would like easier United States tariff treatment on Roquefort cheese, laces, and candied cherries.

The Germans, Belgians, and Dutch are also said to be ready with plenty of suggestions on how Mr. Eisenhower should use his tariff-cutting authority.

But some experts at the State Department, the Commerce Department, and the Tariff Commission are quick to caution against any hopes or fears of widespread, deep tariff slashes. They believe the President's new authority won't permit enough sizable tariff cuts to tempt other countries into making a larger number of important concession in return. Their arguments are expressed in these statistics:

A Government study of the impact of the new law, based on 1952 trade patterns, indicates the President could cut duties on well over 4,000 items, by wielding his new powers to the hilt. Of the total, however, only about several hundred are in the over 50 percent tariff category that might be eligible for cuts of more than 15 percent in the next 3 years. Roughly 85 percent of all the 4,000 or more items are in the category for which a 15 percent cut in the 3-year period would provide the biggest reduction in existing duty rates. Of this 85 percent, moreover, most items now carry such low tariffs that a 15 percent cut would produce only a relatively small reduction in the actual rate of duty.

NOT MORE THAN TWO POINTS

Thus, the study shows, a 15 percent tariff cut would reduce the rate, measured as a percentage of the value of the item, not more than 2 percentage points in the case of 268 out of 498 chemical, oil, and paint items; 118 out of 375 earthenware and glassware products; 334 out of 879 metals and metal manufactures; 56 out of 105 wood products; and 326 out of 547 agricultural items.

All told, an across-the-board 15 percent cut on all items would produce a 4 percentage points or less reduction in the duty for about two-thirds of the items, representing 90 percent of the value of imports in 1952 that were subject to duties.

"When the duty is low, and the cut would be small, it's not a very tempting bait to offer for foreign concessions," says one official, who notes that United States tariffs, where they exist, already average about 12 percent of the value of the affected imports, while over half of all United States imports come in duty free.

The State Department's experts have one scheme to make the United States offerings more alluring: They aim to offer the full 15 percent cut to the foreigners in one package, even though it will have to come in three steps, at 5 percent a year. They hope these progressive cuts will please foreign countries which otherwise would have to engage in separate negotiations in each of the 3 years in order to benefit from the full 15 percent authority the United States will have until 1958.

"SEGMENTS" CAN PETITION

Some Government officials and some private trade experts are also convinced tariff boosting may not be as brisk as some free-trade advocates predicted during debate on H. R. 1. The new law contains one provision which grew out of past Tariff Commission rulings against United States firms

seeking protection against foreign wares. In several instances the Commission had denied relief on the grounds that the complaining firms did not represent an industry, but only a "segment" of an industry. The new law will permit the "segments" to petition for tariff relief.

Tariff Commission officials concede this might offer new hope to some manufacturers of wood screws and safety pins, and to a lone chalk-whiting producer, who were denied tariff protection at least in part because the Commission considered them only a segment. Other small parts of industries, as well as individual firms, might also flock to the Commission. But officials don't expect such a flood of applications. Says one:

"In past cases, the Commission never made the segment question the turning point in the case; other reasons are usually given in support of an adverse ruling, so there's no guaranty the Commission would reverse previous rulings simply because of the new law."

A NEW DEFINITION

The new law also will provide a new definition of the extent an industry must suffer from foreign competition in order to qualify for protection. The new language (the key words are substantially injured) is supposed to make it easier to prove hardship. How it will work in practice, however, is hard to predict. Says one Tariff Commission official: "The new wording pretty much reflects the way the Commission has been ruling; it won't change existing practice much."

The real key, it should be noted, is the President himself. The Tariff Commission can only recommend a tariff boost; the President will still be free to reject the Commission's recommendations, as Mr. Eisenhower has done on 8 out of 10 occasions since he took office.

As for the new provision to grant tariff relief when imports endanger national security, the decision again will be up to Mr. Eisenhower—this time on the advice of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The amendment was backed strongly by oil, zinc, and lead producers, and doubtless other industries will feel they fit its terms. But Tariff Commission men note that the Commission itself recommended a boost in lead and zinc duties last year, and was overruled by the President.

WON'T DECIDE CASES

Says one Commission higher up: "These new provisions won't in themselves decide cases; they'll make it easier for a Commission member who favors tariff relief on a commodity to buttress his case; and anybody otherwise inclined might have to work a little harder to document his arguments."

Perhaps more significant is this comment from an official of the protectionist-minded Tariff League: "We don't expect anything like a flood of petitions for tariff relief under this new law; in fact, there might not be any noticeable increase in activity." He reasons that prosperity is the clue to the question; if business turns worse, a lot of firms may be looking for help wherever they can get it, including more protection from foreign competitors. But if business stays good, this private trade official believes, most firms will prefer not to spend the money or take the time necessary to plead a case before the Tariff Commission.

In short, there'll be a lot more than the usual activity on the tariff front in the months ahead, but Washington's experts feel sure the tariff cuts won't be as plentiful or as deep as some protectionists predict; the foreign concessions won't be as generous as United States exporters would like; and tariff increases won't be as numerous as many free traders fear.

JAPAN TRADE PACT ENGINEERED THROUGH GATT TO COST UNITED STATES MORE JOBS, MARKETS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the State Department has just negotiated a trade agreement with Japan, our former enemy. The State Department did so through the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The trade contingent of the State Department were enabled to spend 4 months in Switzerland at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States, while figuring out new ways to give away American jobs and markets; and they were doing that while Congress was considering the bill to extend their right to do so.

They simply took it for granted that the bill would be passed, and that the 34 nations, including the United States, would continue to cut up and divide the markets of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Can the able Senator from Nevada tell us what happened to all the so-called "trade, not aid" in this case? We were told that if we would trade with these countries, we would not be called upon to make so much foreign aid available. But this year we have been asked to liberalize all our tariffs, and also to appropriate considerably more money for the giveaway program than we have ever done before. Where is the 'trade, not aid" coming in?

UNITED STATES DECEIVED BY SLOGANS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, no one ever said the aid would be less. We were simply given the slogan of "trade, not aid," but no one said how much the aid would be or to whom it would be given. We were simply provided a slogan which was mouthed by almost everyone in the United States, just as the phrase "dollar shortage" foremerly was mouthed, after the London bankers invented it, and just as the phrase "reciprocal trade" was mouthed in 1934. No one said then what it was or what it meant; it was simply a phrase to be mouthed at cocktail parties and other functions and to be finally adopted by the Congress of the United States without serious question.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Nevada knows that only recently the Congress passed a bill authorizing $3,500,000,000 for foreign aid.

Mr. MALONE. Of course I know that, and I voted against the bill. I must say that although General Marshall, when he read his speech at Harvard University proposing the plan that bears his name, did not know that a certain paragraph was in it until he read it, and did not know what the paragraph meant after he read it, the top Labor Party man in Britain, Mr. Bevan, and the Labor Party was in power then—knew what it meant, and "took it on the first bounce" and told us within 30 days just what it was going to cost us. It was collusion between high officials in the United States and England.

MANY NEW SENATORS BEGUILED BY FREE TRADE BALLYHOO

Mr. President, since 1934, a new generation of Senators have come to the floor of this Chamber. Those Senators apparently believe that we have always had free trade. However, it has been inaugurated since 1934. The new generation of Senators apparently think we have always divided the money of the United States taxpayers and the markets of the United States with the other countries of the world. We have heard the arguments.

PERPETUAL AID PROPONENTS WOULD SHAKE UNITED STATES DOWN TO WORLD LIVING STANDARD LEVEL

We have heard the statements made by Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dulles. They say the United States must have a permanent program of dividing the money of the taxpayers of the United States and the markets of the United States with the rest of the world, until the rest of the world lives like we do—or until we live like the rest of the world does. I think the latter will be what will happen.

No one ever said the amount of the foreign aid extended by the United States would be reduced. We were simply given a slogan, which was solely for the purpose of keeping the Members of Congress quiet for another 2 years. Next year we shall be given another slogan, no doubt.

FOREIGN AID DIRECTORS SHIFT AS PUBLIC CATCHES ON TO THEM

Now Mr. Stassen has been moved out of the line of fire, because he has been shown up for what he is. But someone else will take his place; and as soon as we learn about him, he will move on.

There have been 6 or 7 administrators of foreign aid, so far; and there have been 5 or 6 different slogans. So long as we are kept fairly busy and so long as we are doing fairly well, we do not stop to think. Only those who are lean and hungry stop to think. Some of the people of my State and some of the people of Louisiana are in that condition at the present time. When there are enough of them, there will be a change in policy on the floor of the Senate; there can be no question about that.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TRADE ACT BEING TESTED IN COURTS

We seem to pay no attention to the Constitution. Constitutional responsibility seems to mean nothing now. But before we get through, it may mean something, because of a certain case which has been filed in the United States Court. Regardless of who appointed the judges of the court, I believe they have integrity, and I believe that most of them are in favor of the United States of America; and it is my opinion that if they stop to think about this matter, the case will remain in court. If it does, we will win it.

So let the Congress take back its responsibility, Mr. President.

FUTURE EFFECTS OF TRADE ACT UNSEEN BY CONGRESS IN 1934

I was a State engineer in Nevada when the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was passed. When I heard of it, I nearly fell off my chair, for anyone could see where the country was headed under such a measure. But at the same time, Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives there was a lack of knowledge of the effect of the bill.

The then existing system had been going on for nearly a century, and had

worked fairly well; and many Members of Congress thought that if the proposed act went into effect, they could avoid their responsibility.

In short, they felt that after the act went into effect, they would be able to go home and, when their constituents asked, "Why didn't you do better in regard to sugar, and why didn't you do better in giving tariff protection to the products of our State?", they would be able to reply, "I am sorry, but the State Department is responsible for all of that; Congress is not responsible for it."

MANY NOW FOLLOWING THE CONGRESS' FREE TRADE ACTIVITIES

Mr. President, many persons now are looking behind that act. They know that the Senate is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world; and they know that the Senate and the House have passed an act, and since then have passed reenactments of it, shifting the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to regulate the economy of the United States of America and to regulate foreign trade to one man, an executive, who has said, "Oh, no! I will not hurt your industry."

No one man in America could know when he was going to hurt an industry, because he could not encompass all the economic factors which must mesh in order to produce a result.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY HURT BY STATE DEPARTMENT

The State Department was moving to destroy the textile industry in Geneva, about which my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] complained, while he was voting for the passage of the bill.

The senior Senator from Nevada made that statement on the floor of the Senate at the time. Everyone knew it. The situation had been in existence for 4 months. All it was necessary to do was to wait until the bill was passed, and then make the announcement.

Final action will be taken today. I am surprised that those in charge of the bill did not wait until tomorrow. That was the only mistake they made. They did not realize that no speeches would be made on the other side of the aisle today.

The votes are here to approve the conference report. I hope there will be a record vote. My vote will not help to approve it. But when it is approved, some think it will be 3 years before the question can be brought up on the floor of the Senate again. I do not agree with that view.

FREE-TRADE POLICIES DESTROYING UNITED STATES MINERALS INDUSTRIES

Two or three Senators on the other side of the aisle have discussed fluorspar, one little mineral product of several thousand which are being destroyed. The mineral field is only 1 field out of 50 that are being destroyed. We are treading water and keeping our heads above water by means of a war economy. We are buying everything, so that some company which is about to go out of business can be given a war contract, to enable it to convert its production.

What would we do tomorrow with free trade on our necks? If we are ever successful in arriving at the peace for which we pray, what will happen to our economy? It will be sunk without a trace in 30 days.

CASE FOR UNITED STATES FLUORSPAR PRODUCTION STATED

So we are for fluorspar, wherever it is produced, including Illinois and Kentucky. Let me say something about fluorspar. That subject has been brought up today on the floor of the Senate. It was discussed in committee.

Fluorspar is one of 5,000 products. The subject has been brought up because of fluorspar is used in the national defense. Of course, it is, but competition comes from Canada and Mexico, where it can be obtained just as well during a war as it can be obtained from Illinois and Kentucky.

However, there is one thing which we cannot get as well from Canada and Mexico as from Illinois and Kentucky.

SMALL UNITED STATES COMMUNITIES INJURED BY FLUORSPAR IMPORTS

We cannot assure preservation of the economy of the small communities in this country where fluorspar is produced. So we pay wages of $12 or $15 a day in Kentucky or Illinois to produce fluorspar, when we can get it from Mexico on the basis of wages of $2.50 a day.

FOREIGN MERCURY SQUEEZE CITED

Of course, it is said that the customers are entitled to a break. Let me tell the Senate what will happen. I refer to another mineral, mercury.

Competition in the production of mercury comes from Italy and Spain. We were producing all the mercury we needed in World War II, at about $275 a flask. When the war ended, in order to put the American people out of business in the production of mercury, the price was dropped to $67 a flask for Spanish mercury, and the Spanish producers were still able to make a few dollars.

American producers were thrown out of business, and some of the mines were flooded. Then when they were out of business where did the price go? It went to $350 a flask. That is about where it still is.

UNITED STATES MERCURY PRODUCERS FACE RISKS IN RESUMING OPERATIONS

Some of the domestic producers are trying to get back into business, but when no principle is adopted by the Congress to establish a duty or tariff on the basis of the difference between the cost of doing business here and in Spain, or in Italy, at an amount which will guarantee a price somewhere near the wage-standard-of-living cost here in this country.

Just about the time American producers get back into business the price will go down to whatever point is necessary to put them out of business again, whether that point be $67, $87, or $187.

UNITED STATES CONSUMERS FAIL TO BENEFIT FROM TARIFF CUTS

So, notwithstanding all the talk on the floor of the Senate, the customers do not receive the benefit of tariff rates which fail to represent the difference between the low-wage standard of living abroad, and the high standard here.

Residents of foreign nations have had long experience in this field. They know what they are doing. They take what the traffic will bear. Of course, they cannot be blamed for that. The only ones we can blame are Members of the House and Senate, who believe that the customers are to receive the benefit of a lower cost.

JAPAN'S PLIGHT SEALED BY TREATY

What is the situation with respect to Japan? Mr. President, I am not making a speech against the Japanese people. The present situation is our own fault. I spoke on the floor of the Senate shortly after the Japanese treaty was signed in San Francisco. Members of the Senate who acted as our representatives in San Francisco had just returned, and they were lauding Acheson to the skies. I was undergoing a "slow burn." I took the floor for an extemporaneous address. I said, "When we lost China deliberately, we lost Japan. When we signed this treaty, we completed the deal. Japan will have to trade with Manchuria and China."

At that time they were getting iron ore from Lovelock, Nev., and shipping it 10,000 miles at our expense. Of course, they could not do that and compete with anyone. So they had to get iron ore from Manchuria. A 5-year-old boy could have told them that.

EARLY FORECAST OF JAPAN'S SITUATION COMES TRUE

Everything I said in that extemporaneous address on the floor of the Senate at that time is coming true today. Of course, Japan is going to trade with China, Manchuria, and Russia. England will not allow her to trade with the Malayan States with respect to anything England can furnish the Malayan States. A similar situation prevailed with respect to Indochina, insofar as France was concerned, until she lost a part of it.

I stated in one of my addresses, on the third or fourth of May of this year, that I greatly admired the English people on two counts, especially. First, they have brains. Second, they are for England. We are the only nation on earth which produces people who are not for their native country.

STATE DEPARTMENT YIELDS JOBS, MARKETS, TO JAPAN

Mr. President, the State Department in its trade agreement with Japan, just concluded, sought new ways to give away American jobs and markets.

They succeeded.

TARIFFS CUT ON JAPANESE CHINAWARE, POTTERY

First, they gave Japan substantial reductions in tariffs on chinaware, earthenware, and pottery. During hearings on H. R. 1 both labor and management of this industry in America testified to the serious injury already inflicted on it from California to West Virginia and Ohio by cutthroat foreign low-wage competition stimulated by cutrate tariffs.

American spokesmen for American industries manufacturing these commodities opposed extension of the Trade Agreements Act, citing data on business and employment cutbacks caused by

imports from Japan and other foreign countries.

STATE DEPARTMENT BOASTS "SUBSTANTIAL CONCESSIONS" TO JAPANESE PRODUCERS

The State Department cut the tariffs still lower. They cut the tariffs on table and kitchenware, of which imports in 1954 amounted to $1,118,000, and on earthenware other than kitchenware, much of which is art pottery. Imports of art pottery from Japan in 1954 amounted to more than $2 million. Duties on chinaware not only were reduced but a new set of value brackets was established, in order to "give Japan a substantial concession on the particular types and grades of chinaware exported to the United States in largest quantities."

The ad valorem rate was reduced on china artware, which has already captured over 40 percent of the American market. Imports, mostly from Japan, last year totaled more than $5 million.

DUTIES REDUCED ON JAPANESE GLASS DESPITE STRICKEN UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES

Glassware industries in the United States are in distress, and one of them, the Morgantown Glassware Guild, has filed suit in the Federal courts to test the constitutionality of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and GATT.

GATT is the international sucker poker game in which 33 gifted and educated and experienced representatives in international trade sit down with the United States. We are the only ones who have anything of value in the pot.

If H. R. 1 were not passed and if we did not extend the 1934 Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, does anyone think the sucker poker game would go on? It would never be called to order again, because it is just like any other poker game in any town; if the man with the money does not sit down, there is no game; if he does sit down, the game goes on. So we sat down.

Duties were reduced on Japanese imports of certain types of glassware, blown or colored, cut, engraved, and decorated, on glass globes and shades and on glass Christmas-tree ornaments.

JAPAN GETS TARIFF CUT ON OPTICAL GOODS

In the optical field, duties were cut on Japanese low-cost spectacles, eyeglasses, goggles, lenses, prism binoculars, telescopes, and microscopes.

America's market for electric light bulbs and lamps was further opened up by our State Department negotiators, who boast that Japan was granted the maximum concession permitted by law or a straight across the board 50 percent reduction.

SMALL UNITED STATES FIRMS HIT BY TARIFF CUTS ON MIRRORS

A reduction was also granted by Japan on small glass mirrors. Says the State Department in its analysis:

> Such mirrors are used largely for vanity cases, ladies' pocketbooks and in shaving sets. Production of these mirrors in the United States is by numerous small firms employing a comparatively few people each, located in the large metropolitan centers, principally New York City.

In other words, little businesses are safe to single out, in State Department eyes, for damage or extinction.

Mr. President, for many years the American sewing-machine industry has vigorously opposed the trade agreements program, which is destroying it.

JAPANESE SEWING-MACHINE MAKERS GAIN HUGE UNITED STATES MARKET AND NEW TARIFF SLASHES

Some sewing-machine factories, I understand, have been shut down now for several years. Others have their backs to the wall. The sewing-machine industry in the United States, an industry which had its beginnings in the United States when an American, Elias Howe, invented the first one, is marked for extinction. The State Department seems determined to hasten its execution.

In 1953, the Department tells us 439,570 sewing machines were imported from Japan, and Italy and Germany, it adds, were also important suppliers. The 1954 import figures are not given. As soon as they are available I shall inform the Senate.

In 1948 GATT reduced the import duty from 15 to 10 percent. The State Department now magnanimously extends this rate to Japan and binds it against increase.

SEWING MACHINE DEMONSTRATION ON SENATE FLOOR RECALLED

Apropos of all of this, it will be remembered that in 1948 or 1949 I had a foreign sewing machine on one corner of my desk and a domestic sewing machine on the other corner of my desk. No one could tell them apart 15 feet away.

The name of the foreign make machine was inscribed under the framework, so that it could hardly be seen. Both machines were guaranteed to do the same work. So far as the wholesale price was concerned, 1 sold for $20, and the other for $70.

The machine which was imported was made by labor that was paid 12 or 15 cents an hour, and the domestic machine was made by labor that was paid $1.80 an hour, which was the only real difference between the 2 machines, aside from taxes, and the cost of doing business in this Nation, as compared with Japan.

UNITED STATES FISHERIES DEALT BLOW BY TRADE PACT

Mr. President, the tunafish industry and the shellfish industries are of great importance to the Pacific coast, employing thousands of fishermen in scores of small enterprises and companies.

For years this industry has been struggling to survive. Before Pearl Harbor it fought the Japanese inroads and imports. Since the war it has had to fight the State Department. It has done so vigorously and courageously. Now the State Department has struck back. Whether willfully or through ignorance, the State Department has struck back, not only at the Pacific coast tuna fishermen, but at other fisheries as well.

Japan was given the low GATT rate of 1½ cents a pound on fresh or frozen swordfish. The 1954 imports, of which nearly all were from Japan, totaled $2,825,000, for 14 times the value of American swordfish catch, which, as Japanese fish pour in has constantly declined.

FOREIGN PRICES INCREASE AS UNITED STATES PRODUCERS GO OUT OF BUSINESS

I wish to point out again that American consumers get the advantage of the lower price, whether it be tuna fish or sewing machines, or any other product, only until the American producers are either driven out of business or are so maimed and crippled that they can no longer offer competition. Then the foreign product will take all the traffic will bear.

Therefore the old saw that the consumer gets the benefit of the difference is only a hallucination brought about, undoubtedly, by the 20-year mental aberration we have experienced, in which our thinking has been just as crooked as the manipulations of foreign trade brought about by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and by the foreign nations.

TARIFF CUTS ON FOREIGN TUNA CITED

Japan was granted a duty reduction from 45 to 35 percent on tuna packed in oil and the rate on tuna packed in brine was bound at 12½ percent on an aggregate quantity equal to 20 percent of the United States pack.

FINEST JAPANESE TUNA TO COME IN FREE

But the State Department really reached the heighth of generosity in its concession to Japan on imports of fresh or frozen albacore tuna. It is to come into the United States free.

Says the State Department:

> The most important free list binding in terms of volume of trade was the binding of fresh or frozen albacore tuna.

The State Department further states:

> Albacore usually makes up the bulk of United States imports of fresh and frozen tuna. Albacore is generally packed as white meat tuna and brings a higher price in the United States market than imports of other species.
>
> The domestic albacore fishery has been sporadic and uncertain. In 1954 the United States catch of albacore appeared to have been about 24 million pounds, as compared with about 53 million pounds in 1952 and a record catch of 73 million pounds in 1950.
>
> With these wide variations in the domestic catch of albacore and the constantly growing consumption of tuna, substantial imports of albacore will be needed to enable domestic firms to schedule more even canning operations and provide steadier employment.
>
> Albacore represents a high percentage of the Japanese catch and the United States has been Japan's most important market for the product. Of total exports of frozen tuna amounting to about 114.7 million pounds in 1954, albacore represented 64.4 million pounds of which 61.1 million pounds were exported by Japan to the United States.

RECORD SHOWS FREE TRADE CUTS DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that many Senators and Representatives are fond of quoting the reduced production of certain materials in this country as a reason for free trade and further imports, when, as a matter of fact, two decades of free trade have caused a reduction of production. So, their slogans are very good. If they want to increase foreign trade, they want to increase production in this country. But their

policies reduce both. That is the cold, hard record, Mr. President.

I have not had time to hear from the tuna fishermen from California, as to whether they are delighted by the State Department's contention that free tuna imports from Japan will help them and their industry.

Perhaps they will not be so enthusiastic as the State Department diplomats, who I suspect have never had to face the hazards of fishing along the Pacific coast for tuna.

JAPAN WINS TARIFF CONCESSION ON CRABMEAT, CLAMS

Japan will supply us with the choice tunafish we need, and also with the canned crabmeat and canned clams, the State Department, in effect, assures us.

For no reason at all that I can see, the State Department informs us that the canning of crabmeat in the United States centers in South Carolina, Louisiana, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska.

Perhaps it considers them relatively unimportant States and areas. Certainly it cannot think they are as important as Japan, which, in 1954, shipped 4 million pounds of canned crabmeat, valued at $4 million, to the United States.

The duty on canned crabmeat was bound at 22½ percent and that on clams was reduced from 35 to 20 percent.

SOUTH LOSES; JAPAN WINS ON TEXTILE TARIFF SLASHES

The textile industry—and I now come to South Carolina, with reference to which I heard a complaint on the other side of the aisle today—particularly the textile industry in the South, has been vigorously opposing the trade-agreements program—except by their votes, Mr. President.

The State Department, meeting in secrecy in Switzerland, has given some of our American cotton-textile markets away to Japan.

I am still amazed that they announced a further reduction of the duty or tariff on textiles and dozens of other products, an act which will severely injure the workingmen and investors of this Nation until after the final adoption of the conference report.

SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES SINGLED OUT BY STATE DEPARTMENT FOR NEW BLOW

To quote the State Department:

> In this agreement reductions were made by applying the rates now specified in GATT to the lower-priced cloth. This amounts to a reduction of about 25 percent in the rates on the type of cotton cloth imported principally from Japan.
>
> In addition to providing substantial concessions to Japan these rates greatly simplify the entire tariff structure applying to cotton cloth. * * * The greater part of the cotton manufacturing industry is located in the southeastern United States.

It becomes very simple, Mr. President, and I hope the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is listening to the debate. It will become even simpler if, in the future, we take off all the tariffs, although that is not necessary, because the tariff is so low now that we would have to reduce wages 35 percent and write off investments in that amount, or else go out of business. It is a very simple thing.

JAPAN GIVEN CUTS ON VELVETEENS, TOWELS, AND ARTICLES OF APPAREL

Cuts also were made in rates on cotton velveteens from Japan, cotton towels, cotton gloves and mittens, and cotton outerware.

That should be happy news for New England and the South.

H. R. 1 will, of course, permit greater cuts to be made on Japanese imports of cotton cloth manufactured, as the State Department reports, largely in the Southeastern United States.

LAST RECOURSE OF SOUTH'S COTTON INDUSTRY COULD BE MOVING TO JAPAN

In other words, Mr. President, in the past few years, because of the discovery that wages were a little lower and the cost of doing business was a little lower in the South, factories moved from New England into the South. Now some of them have moved to Japan. It is just an economic situation, and so long as we follow the policy adopted by the administration, it is a happy solution to the whole problem.

Mr. President, in the next elections I greatly fear that some of the free-trade chickens are going home to roost, and when they roost they may find a roosting place on the shoulders of the free-trade champions.

ITO COMMISSION, REJECTED BY CONGRESS, LIVES ON

Mr. President, the International Trade Organization which the Congress repudiated in 1950 is not dead. It is only dormant, awaiting revival in part or in toto.

In 1949, I believe—I will correct the RECORD if that is not the correct date—54 or 55 nations banded together to determine each year the estimated production and consumption for the ensuing year, and to divide it on the basis of entitlement for consumption, whatever that may be. It means, on a basis of population. That is the only thing it can be called.

We did not take the International Trade Organization, just as we are not going to take the Organization for Trade Cooperation. But neither in the International Trade Organization nor in the Organization for Trade Cooperation was the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade involved.

TRADE ACT GAVE PRESIDENT AUTHORITY FOR GATT

It has been testified to by Secretary Dulles that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act gave the President all the authority he needed to set up GATT in Geneva, bringing together all the members; or he can set it up in Brisbane, Australia, or in Buenos Aires. He has the authority to do that. He does not have to ask Congress for any further authority in the matter. That was testified to, and I thoroughly agree that the act gives the President that authority.

VOTES FOR TRADE ACT WERE VOTES FOR GATT

So, Mr. President, when I hear someone objecting to GATT, either in the Senate or in the House, I look up the votes. If he voted for the Trade Agreements Act or any extensions of the act, I always hope he will pipe down, because he voted for the very thing which is now being done by the State Department. He never questioned it, and it was never questioned in the committee or on the Senate floor except by the senior Senator from Nevada.

Every vote for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, for its subsequent extension, and for H. R. 1, was a vote for GATT, the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, that same poker game which is off if we do not sit down to play. If we do sit down, the game is on. Now it is on for another 3 years.

But I predict that the Senate will bring the Trade Agreements Act before it for consideration long before it expires in 1958, because the people of the United States are learning more about it. The proof of that statement is that a suit has been filed by a glass company in West Virginia, where the people have always voted for free trade until this year, when they broke away from it. I give them credit; but the damage was already done.

ITO COMMISSION STILL IN EXISTENCE

Meanwhile, apropos the revival of ITO, the International Trade Organization, the United States is still a member of the Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization.

The Commission is not now active, but it is "officially in existence," and the United States is a member, as will be found on page 523 of the United States Government Organization Manual, or by contacting the State Department. The United States Government Organization Manual is an official publication, and the Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization will be found outlined in that volume on page 523.

Even though the ITO Commission now appears to be dead, it is not dead; it is simply bait, lying on the bottom. When the time comes to raise it, it will be in front of us again.

INQUIRY TO STATE DEPARTMENT BRINGS RESPONSE

On May 27, 1955, I directed an inquiry to the State Department relative to this commission, and on June 10, 1955, I received a courteous and informative reply from Assistant Secretary Thruston B. Morton.

Mr. Morton replied, in part, as follows:

> The Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization, of which the United States is a member, still exists. The commission, however, has not been active since 1948. At that time it created an executive committee, of which the United States is also a member, to which it delegated all its functions.

Mr. Morton added:

> The executive committee has not met since 1949.

That was the year it was knocked in the head by the Senate committee. The machinery is not working at this time, Mr. President, but it is still in existence, ready to go into operation if and when the State Department considers the time and congressional climate right to set it in motion.

REVIVAL OF ITO FORESEEN UNLESS PEOPLE RISE AGAINST IT

Since I have seen the Congress adopt the Marshall plan as a temporary expedient 5 years ago, and have seen it extended each year under another name and under the direction of another person, and have heard the argument in the Senate and from the Secretary of State and Mr. Stassen that it must be a permanent program dividing the money of the taxpayers of the United States with the nations of the world in the interests of peace; since I have seen the 1934 Trade Agreements Act passed as an emergency measure and now become the rule of the land; I do not doubt for a minute that the International Trade Organization will again come before the Senate and the House, and I have little doubt, from what I have seen of the actions on those floors, unless the people of the Nation rise up and assert themselves, that Congress finally will adopt it.

AROUSED PUBLIC ANTICIPATED

But, in my humble opinion, the people of the country will not wait for an election; they are going to move on the hot spot of Washington, where there is no public sentiment, but where people stay for a few months at a time and then leave.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How does the Senator expect to get the law changed, when a Republican has been elected who has said he is against the Democrats, and a Democrat seeks to be elected who says he is against the Republicans? When President Eisenhower assumed office, he continued foreign aid to the extent of $3,500 million a year. How does the Senator propose to change that?

Mr. MALONE. It does seem as though it is a game of heads I win, tails you lose. It is simply a round robin. A President in 1934 remade the industrial map of the United States. We now have war frequently and preparation for war continuously. We are simply treading water economically, to make things look good.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from Nevada believe that when the people elected Mr. Eisenhower as President, it was with the intention of repudiating our foreign policy so far as giving away our money was concerned?

FREE TRADE RECORD OF MANY SENATORS GUIDED PRESIDENT

Mr. MALONE. I am going to say something that I want the Senator from North Dakota to think about. Let him put himself in the place of the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, who is one of the finest gentlemen I know. He has been in the Army almost all his life and outside the United States probably a third of the time.

When he returned to civilian life and looked over the record, he found that almost unanimously the Republican Senators had voted for foreign aid and free trade. I say "almost unanimously"; I except the senior Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Nevada.

So the President, having looked at the great pillars of the Republican Party, said to himself, "They must be right. They have had more experience with this problem than I have had. Therefore, I must go along with them."

Would not the Senator from North Dakota think that the President would have ground to stand on?

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Nevada tell me the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans?

STATE RESOLUTIONS AGAINST FREE TRADE CITED

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that on May 4 I placed in the RECORD resolutions from a number of States in God's country—Idaho, Nevada, Utah, California, and Colorado—resolutions against the extension of free trade.

I placed in the RECORD also at that time a documentation of the platforms of the two parties for 100 years on the subject of duties or tariffs.

For a century the Democratic platform has been for free trade. The Republican platform, with the exception of the last one or two, has advocated the solid principle of a duty or a tariff to make up the difference in the wage standard of living, just as Lincoln and McKinley advocated.

But this is the first time in the history of the Republic that a Republican President has favored free trade.

I now come to the Senator's question. I first wanted the Senator to know that the background is already in the RECORD, so that he would not have to go to a great deal of trouble to learn what is what.

REPUBLICANS IN PAST FAVORED AMERICAN WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

There is no difference now between the policy of the Democratic Party and that of Republican Party; the difference is in the personalities. The Republicans have in the past always favored the American workingmen and investors in their own markets. The Republicans have advocated for the workingmen and investors equal access to their own markets—no advantage, but equal access.

The Democratic Party has always favored free trade, and has a history of one century of it. The Democrats were in office long enough for the first time in 1934, and for two decades thereafter, to put their policy into effect. Never before had they been in office long enough to do it.

President Wilson was in office long enough to put into effect a tariff act—perhaps the Senator can help me by giving the name; I have forgotten it—reducing the tariffs. Right after World War I a special session of Congress was called to raise the duties, in order that Americans might stay in business. We will find ourselves in that position again.

The Republican Party's policy has favored the protection of the workingmen and the investors of the United States, and generally the party has stayed with that policy.

Mr. LANGER. I am very curious to know the kind of speech the Senator from Nevada will make at the next great Republican dinner in Nevada.

NO COMPROMISE WITH PRINCIPLE

Mr. MALONE. The Senator has heard it here on the floor several times, and I do not propose to change it. The Senator was not elected on a free trade platform. He was not reelected on it.

In 1946, when I went up and down my State, as a State engineer, I looked the people in the eye and told them what I thought about the Trade Agreements Act, and I was elected.

I do not know whether or not the speeches had anything to do with it. I cannot tell the Senator that. But in 1952 my feelings were exactly the same as in 1946, only perhaps a little broader. They will be the same in 1958, and they will be the same in 1956 if I am asked to make speeches.

I have only one language, Mr. President: I cannot compromise with a principle.

I would resign from the Senate before I would vote for any one of three proposals which have been made.

One of them is a free trade which would destroy the workingmen and investors of this Nation, and which would divide the bodies of the investors and the businesses of the workingmen between the low-wage countries of the world.

Another proposal is to soak the taxpayers of our country in order to equalize the wealth of the world—a socialistic program.

The third is admitting offshore islands as States. I would not vote for anyone of these three propositions. I would first go home and tell my constituents to vote for another man before I would do so.

Mr. LANGER. I am curious to learn what the Senator is going to say in the State of Nevada as to why the people should vote for a Republican ticket rather than a Democratic ticket.

PRESIDENT'S FORECASTS OF WHAT CONGRESS WOULD DO CORRECT

Mr. MALONE. Last year, 1954, when there was an election, the people of Nevada reelected the governor and the Representative. We had been hearing for months speeches by the President about what Congress was going to do.

Unfortunately, from my point of view, the President has been about right. He had been saying what Congress was going to do.

The people in my State heard from me what I thought Congress ought to do. So, when I appeared on television, which was a little new in Las Vegas and Reno, I said, "You have been hearing in the speeches about what Congress is going to do and what the policy of the United States is going to be. I will tell you what it is going to be. It is going to be what Congress passes, after full debate, and the President signs." I guess the people liked it. They voted for the candidate, anyway.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am just a poor farm boy from North Dakota. I am not educated the way the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada is. I assume the Senator is going to go to some of those $100 banquets and tell the voters of Nevada why they should vote for the Republican ticket and vote against the Democratic ticket. I should like to have

the Senator from Nevada tell me what he is going to tell them the difference between the tickets is.

Mr. MALONE. I have told the Senator what the difference is. That is exactly what I am going to tell the people again. I attended the University of Nevada, and, when I started there in 1913, there were about 200 students, counting the prep students. I understand the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota is a graduate of Columbia University, and that is a great university.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Nevada is begging the question. I am trying to find out what he is going to say in his speeches as to why the people should vote for the Republican ticket rather than the Democratic ticket.

Mr. MALONE. I am going to send them the speech I am making today, to prepare them for the one I am going to make next year.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator told us a minute ago that the Republican platform on foreign trade is the same as the Democratic platform.

DEMOCRATS LEFT WITHOUT ISSUES

Mr. MALONE. We have simply adopted the Democrat platform. The Democrats have nothing left to run on. They are in the same position as Socialist Norman Thomas; when his program was adopted by the New Deal, he was left stranded. He has not run for office since.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the Republicans in 1956 are going to run on the Democratic platform. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. The programs are exactly alike now. They are exactly alike.

Mr. LANGER. I want to thank the Senator for his very illuminating answer.

PROTECTION OF WORKINGMEN, INVESTORS, SENATOR'S PLATFORM

Mr. MALONE. I do not think I have illuminated anything I have not been trying to illuminate here since 1947, but I want to say further to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota I am still standing on the platform of protecting the workingmen and investors of this Nation by a duty or tariff established by the Congress of the United States or its agent, the Tariff Commission, just as article I, section 8, of the Constitution provides we must, so that there may be made up, on a flexible basis, the difference on each product between the wage-standard-of-living cost and the taxes and the cost of doing business in this country and in the chief competitive nation. That is what the senior Senator from Nevada is saying, and that is what he will continue to try to prove to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Am I to understand, then, that when the Senator from Nevada runs the next time, he will run on the Republican ticket?

Mr. MALONE. I have always been a Republican.

Mr. LANGER. But the Senator will run on the Democratic platform?

Mr. MALONE. I do not know, but I will run on the Republican ticket.

Mr. LANGER. A moment ago the Senator said the Republicans had adopted the Democratic platform.

Mr. MALONE. That is what the Republicans did, but it has not been put in writing. The so-called escape clause and peril point are provided for in the pending bill. There is a clause which allows the President of the United States to fix a quota. I am asking that we proceed according to the provision of the Constitution of the United States, so the people of the United States will know how to invest their money. Today no human being with any horse sense would put a dollar in any business which needs protection in the form of a duty or tariff, to make up the difference between the costs of doing business in this country and in foreign countries, in order to exist. Investors have to put more money into a business in order to save their investment because of competition from low cost of living countries. Then some of us say on the Senate floor, "Well, we did not produce as much as we did last year, so we have to import foreign goods." It is our policies that have reduced domestic production.

PRESIDENT NOT AT FAULT FOR FREE-TRADE POLICIES OF CONGRESS

So far as I am concerned, it is my belief that while the President of the United States may be taking wrong advice now, he will listen, and if the Republicans have the guts that God gave little geese in San Francisco, and will write a Republican platform, he will follow it. But when for 22 years practically all the Members on the Republican side of the aisle have voted for free trade, one cannot stand here and tell the public that we are laying the blame on the President of the United States. If the President would take a look at the record of stalwart Republicans and say, "I have been following what you have done for 20 years," how would my colleagues like that? I suppose that is what he is saying to some of his close friends.

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT PLEDGED

Furthermore, if the President runs again, I shall be for him. If he wants to run, I shall be in favor of his nomination and in favor of his election.

I am like M. F. Flynn, editor of the New York News, who wrote a very informative editorial, pointing out the disagreements between him and the President of the United States. They coincided pretty closely to the disagreements the senior Senator from Nevada has with the President of the United States. But I agree with the last paragraph written by Flynn, which I thought was a masterpiece. I wish I had it. I would put it in the RECORD. He said, in effect: "When I stop to think what we would have had if we did not get Eisenhower, I am still for Ike."

That may explain quite a few things.

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

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. In the State of Nevada can one run on both the Democratic and the Republican tickets?

Mr. MALONE. No. A candidate has to run on the ticket of the party to which he belongs. Furthermore, citizens of Nevada know who a candidate is and what he stands for. They get around. It is a big State, approximately 400 miles by 600 miles, and there are nearly 300,000 of us, by the last census, or a little more than that. Our people get around. They cannot be fooled. A candidate can run on only one ticket, and he is pretty lucky to be able to run on one, and still make a showing.

Mr. LANGER. I am still puzzled how a Republican is going to run on a Democratic platform.

Mr. MALONE. I do not run on a Democratic platform. My speeches made during campaigns are like the ones made on the Senate floor.

Mr. LANGER. Was I not correct? As a matter of fact, the Senator from Nevada is nonpartisan, is he not?

Mr. MALONE. I am not nonpartisan. I am a Republican.

Mr. LANGER. But the Senator from Nevada is running on the Democratic platform.

Mr. MALONE. No; I am not. I am running on the Republican ticket and on the Republican platform, which has advocated protection for the workers and investors of this Nation for a century.

Mr. LANGER. But the Senator from Nevada says the Republicans have now adopted the Democratic platform.

Mr. MALONE. No; the Republicans have not.

Mr. LANGER. But a moment ago the Senator from Nevada said the Repulicans have stolen the Democratic platform.

Mr. MALONE. I may have made a slight error in my use of words. We were saying that, the next time, the Democrats will have nothing to run on. But the Republicans have not all adopted free trade, for at least some of us voted against it. The votes against it included several Members on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Nevada knows that I have voted with him on that question.

Mr. MALONE. I know that. Last year we got 14 votes, and this year we got 16. So we are increasing in number rather rapidly. Give us just a few years more, Mr. President.

WHY STATE DEPARTMENT SUSPENDED ITO SCHEME TOLD

Mr. President, the proposed International Trade Organization was submitted to the Congress, but the House and Senate committees refused to have any part of it.

Prior to the debate with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] I was discussing a letter written by Mr. Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, in response to an inquiry I had made of him concerning the ITO.

Now we come to the interesting part of Mr. Morton's letter:

> In 1950, the United States withdrew its support of the proposed International Trade Organization.

That was the year following the repudiation of the whole business by the Congress. It will be noted that there is no reference to the congressional turndown, but it is merely said that the United States withdrew its support from the International Trade Organization.

I read further from Mr. Morton's letter:

Since other governments deemed United States participation essential to the establishment of the organization, the practical effect of this action was to preclude the possibility of the establishment of the organization.

NATIONS FLED ITO GAME WHEN UNITED STATES DECLINED SUCKER ROLE

Mr. President, that establishes, once and for all, the status of the international poker game in which the United States is supposed to play the role of sucker. We did not sit in the game, so there was no International Trade Organization, because the 53 other nations—or whatever the proper number is—were not willing to participate in the game until the folding money of the United States was put into the pot. But that did not happen; neither were the markets of the United States put into the pot. The result was that the game was abandoned, or at least postponed.

Mr. President, Mr. Morton's letter is an honest and a splendid statement. It bears out what I have said many times on the floor of the Senate with respect to ITO—the International Trade Organization—and GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—and all the other international programs for giving American jobs, taxes, and markets to foreign countries.

NO UNITED STATES MONEY IN POT—NO GAME

Without American money and markets in the pot, none of our international friends want to play with us in any international game. When Uncle Sam's money, markets, and jobs are in the pot, all of the foreign countries want in the game. Without them in the pot, they all stay out of the game.

They may set up an interim commission to keep the table and chairs handy in the event the United States reconsiders and puts up the pot. They have done that in this matter of ITO. There is a chair for us, too. It is not being filled, but it is there; and we are members of the club, formally and officially, without paying any dues. The other nations just keep hoping we will enter the game or join the club.

SENATE VOTES

There is no game because we have not put up the pot. As long ago as 1949, the Congress rejected State Department proposals that we do so.

WORLD GIVEAWAY PROGRAMS CONTINUED ON THEORY THEY PROMOTE THE PEACE

So it is, Mr. President, that the Members of the Senate, in their innocence, continue all these programs, on the theory that they promote international peace.

I am reminded of a boxer who is very popular so long as he continues to win his fights. So long as he continues to win them, he has plenty of money; and when he steps up to a bar, the people are 20 deep, all around him, ready to drink with him. But when, one day, he loses a fight, and then has no money to put on the bar, he finds that no one else is even around the place; all his so-called friends have deserted him. Mr. President, that is what can happen to us, and very quickly, too.

AMERICANS SHOULD BE GRATEFUL ITO NOT BANK-ROLLED BY UNITED STATES

I repeat Mr. Morton's forthright statement:

Since other governments deemed United States participation essential to the establishment of the organization (ITO), the practical effect of this action was to preclude the possibility of the establishment of the organization.

Accordingly, the interim commission and its executive committee have been left without any functions to perform. The United States has no representative on the interim commission or its executive committee.

Mr. President, American industries, investors, and wage earners may be thankful that we have not yet bankrolled the ITO setup, and appointed to it representatives to give away more of our jobs and markets.

But so long as we reenact or extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the President—meaning, of course, the State Department—will have all the authority he needs to set up any international trade organization in the world; and it will be able to function, just as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has functioned at Geneva.

Mr. President, American industries, investors, and wage earners may be thankful that the Interim Commission and its executive committee, lacking our bankroll and a new gold-embossed invitation to our markets, have been left without any functions to perform. If we had the gumption and the horse sense not to pass House bill 1, it would not be possible for 33 foreign nations to divide the American markets on textiles and other materials, as is being done today at Geneva.

DEMISE OF GATT WOULD BE WELCOME NEWS

Mr. President, it would be good news if international GATT, in which our markets are being distributed among 33 foreign nations, had no functions to perform. What gave it a function to perform was the passage of House bill 1 by the Congress of the United States. Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has been set up, and it never has been excluded.

Mr. President, if you belonged to an organization with a board of 34 members, would not you like to have on the board one member, so that he would have a voice in determining what would be done? It is a wonderful idea—until we run out of talk, put a stop to inflation and continuous bond issues, and cease to have a war economy—which this year amounts to $32 billion, let us remember. If we were to stop our war economy tomorrow, the economy of the United States would, in 30 days, be deader than Julius Caesar.

So, Mr. President, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade would have no functions to perform either, if it were not for the fact that the United States has its money, markets, and jobs in the international pot, and State Department representatives to give them away at foreign sessions, such as the one recently concluded at Geneva.

GENEVA SESSION REQUIRED 4 MONTHS FOR LATEST DIVISION OF UNITED STATES MARKETS

Mr. President, it must be interesting to foreign nations to observe the way we operate. Congress is debating seriously whether or not to extend this monstrosity. Over in Geneva, for some reason, they knew we were going to extend it, and they went ahead with the division of the markets. They did not do all this in a week. They did it in 4 months, while we were debating the subject in Congress.

It must make Members of Congress feel pretty good to know that 33 foreign nations can take them for granted. As a matter of fact, many of those foreign nations have better public relations organizations in Washington than any Senator has, or than any group of Senators have. If any Senator keeps a clipping file from his hometown newspapers he knows what he ought to vote for, without making it necessary to do any research as to what the final outcome might be.

FOREIGN NATIONS WANT AMERICA'S RICH MARKET FOR THEIR SWEATSHOP GOODS

American markets are what foreign countries want. That is all many of them want. They want to sell their low-wage, sweatshop goods in the American markets, undercutting American industries and displacing American labor.

Shortly there will be a very important celebration in San Francisco, building up that great event in 1945, when the United Nations was created.

I attended that conference unofficially, as a representative of the old Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. I was a special consultant to the Committee on Military Affairs during World War II, in connection with the examination of military establishments and in connection with strategic and critical minerals and materials. I was also a special consultant to the Secretary of War.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Was not the Senator appointed by a Democratic President?

Mr. MALONE. I do not believe I was appointed by the President. It seems to me that my good friend Senator Ed Johnson, of Colorado, now Governor of Colorado, had something to do with it. He was a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. LANGER. It must have been a Democratic President who made the appointment.

Mr. MALONE. No. It was the Secretary of War who acquiesced in my consultant work in the War Department. Ed Johnson and Happy Chandler were the two, I think, who insisted that I be the consultant of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. Of course, at the present time I think no committee could do anything unless the President approved it. I think that is the situation at present.

Mr. LANGER. Ed Johnson is a Democrat, is he not?

Mr. MALONE. He is a Democrat; and he is about as good a Democrat as I have ever seen. I would trade some of our Republicans for Ed Johnson.

Mr. LANGER. So the distinguished Senator from Nevada did accept a Democratic appointment.

ALASKA, SOUTH SEA ASSIGNMENTS RECALLED

Mr. MALONE. I think we would have to call it that. But I was left alone, and I wrote my reports. They were not edited very much. That was the only way I could get my viewpoint across.

Then I was sent into Dutch Harbor, behind the Japs. I made a report on Alaska. Then I was sent to the South Seas with General MacArthur. I do not think General MacArthur was a Democrat. I did not look up his political affiliations.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that whenever I had an opportunity to plant the material, in whatever kind of soil happened to be available, I planted it. It did some good, too.

FOREIGN DIPLOMATS BRING EMPTY BASKETS FOR UNCLE SAM TO FILL

To repeat, foreign countries desire to sell their low-wage, sweatshop goods in the American market, undercutting American industries and displacing American labor.

It was my happy privilege in San Francisco, where I spent about 3 months, to entertain, in a small way, representatives from many foreign nations. I would have them to breakfast, lunch, or dinner. Usually there would be present one of the top officials, or his representative, and myself. There were two things they would ask me. The first was, "How are you?" I do not believe they cared very much how I was.

The next question was, "How much of the material which we have to sell can we sell in American markets, and when can we begin?"

When I reached Denver, on the way back to Washington, I was met by a number of newspaper correspondents. I know many people in Denver. The newspaper correspondents said, "Tell us about the United Nations."

I said, "There were 49 there. Forty-eight of them had a market basket on each arm, and only one had anything to put in them. What do you think about it?" That rather toned down the conversation.

UNITED STATES MARKET ONLY FREE, CASH MARKET IN WORLD

Why are foreign countries so avid to capture the American home market? The answer is quite simple.

The American home market is the richest market in the world.

It is the only market in the world where a foreigner can sell anything he wants to sell, in any quantity, excepting certain agricultural products, he wants to sell, and receive for his goods sound money of fixed value which he can take home or use in any manner he desires.

It is the only market in the world where he can undersell American labor and investors on any commodity he wishes to sell, certain that his labor and production costs are lower than the lowest labor and production costs of his American competitor.

It is the only market in the world where, again excepting certain farm commodities, he can be assured of neither import nor exchange restrictions, and no fluctuations in money value. He has only to dump his slave-wage product, stuff his pockets with our dollars, and run back to his homeland.

It is the only market in the world in which all protective safeguards to industry and labor have been removed, or, in the case of tariffs lowered to a point of being ludicrous. It is a free trade market, with only a few vestiges of tariffs here and there to preserve a hint of the long dead American system which created our rich market in the first place.

UNITED STATES ONLY COUNTRY THAT TAXES WAGE EARNERS TO SUBSIDIZE FOREIGN COMPETITION

It is the only market in the world where industrial and farm wage earners have high living standards and enough money left, after living expenses and taxes, to buy foreign goods.

Ours is the only country in the world that takes billions in taxes from its wage earners each year to give to foreign countries to produce more foreign goods to dump on our rich American market.

What made our market rich in the first place? First it was American independence and self-reliance.

George Washington urged a policy of encouraging and protecting our infant industries. Americans developed their own resources, built their own mills and factories, tapped their own mineral and water resources, created their own transportation systems.

FOREIGN NATIONS LAG IN DEVELOPING OWN RESOURCES, LIFTING LIVING STANDARDS

Mr. President, we in America do not have rich deposits. We have made our deposits available through research work and laboratory work. We have lifted ourselves by our bootstraps. Many other nations have much richer deposits of practically every material than we have.

For 5,000 years other countries have not raised their standard of living one iota. So we are to raise it for them in a few years by dividing our markets. For 150 years we minded our own business, and minded it well.

Countries wishing to trade with us could do so whenever they willed to do so on the basis of fair and reasonable competition with American producers.

Congress regulated the tariffs and foreign commerce to assure that such competition would be on a fair and reasonable basis.

Americans had equal access to their own markets, equal security for investments. They only took a chance on their own judgment. They did not take a chance on the judgment of Congress.

AMERICAN SYSTEM BROUGHT NATION PROSPERITY

The system—the American system it was called—continued for 150 years and America prospered.

Our wage rates became the highest in the world.

Our living standard became the highest in the world.

Our per capita wealth the highest in the world.

This did not please our one-world do-gooders, Socialists, share-the-wealthers, or our Harry Dexter Whites, Victor Perlos, V. Frank Coes, Harold Glassers, and Alger Hisses.

Let me say at this point it is not always the Whites and Hisses who cause trouble in this country. We isolate their kind. It is the good people, the honest people, who mouth the things such men say, who cause the trouble, by not knowing what is in back of what they say and by not analyzing the statements, or thinking them through.

We are still passing acts which espouse the principles of free trade and which provide billions of dollars to Europe which these two men helped fasten on us. In committee we heard the Secretary of State and Mr. Stassen say that this program must become a permanent program.

We have been told every year that we must send new money to Europe and to Asia and that we must divide our markets, because if we do not do so, someone might say that by working 18 hours—which is just about what most Americans do—we are living better than anyone else in the world; therefore we must divide our markets. If we divide them we will have nothing left for ouselves.

AMERICA'S ECONOMIC STRENGTH WORLDS ONLY REAL PROTECTION

The only protection the nations of Europe and Asia have from us is our economic strength. When that is gone we cannot even defend ourselves, to say nothing of other nations.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act destroyed the principle of the American system, which had made our country rich and strong.

It changed the policy of Americans for Americans, to one of Americans for foreigners and foreign exploitation.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act did not level down America fast enough to suit the one-worlders and proforeign groups, so multilateral trade agreements were invented to be negotiated through GATT, a 34-nation treaty organization which meets in GATT.

ITO was invented at the same time with the view of leveling employment and production to a world level at the same time international control was placed over world trade.

The process is still going on.

NEW WORLD TRADE SCHEME A MODIFIED ITO

An interim commission of the International Trade Organization, as I mentioned before, still exists and we are a member of it.

A somewhat modified ITO has been presented to Congress in the guise of an international organization for trade cooperation. The State Department drops the I and calls it OTC. In reality the initials should be IOT because the only cooperation there will be will be that of our State Department officials with their foreign friends.

NEW TRADE SCHEME DISCUSSED IN INFORMATIVE ARTICLE

The May 13, 1955, issue of the Wall Street Journal carries a very informative article on the new free trade approach of the State Department, written by an informed journalist, Albert Clark, under the heading "Surrender of Power? Congress Has Doubts About Proposal for Global Trade Agency."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, Mr. Clark's article Surrender of Power?

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

SURRENDER OF POWER—CONGRESS HAS DOUBTS ABOUT PROPOSAL FOR GLOBAL TRADE AGENCY

(By Albert Clark)

WASHINGTON.—The administration is preparing a determined drive for what Congress now interprets as a broad new grant of power—and a surrender of its own—to conduct this country's foreign economic affairs.

The actual request is for authority to join a proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. Technically this would merely administer the rules President Eisenhower and his predecessors have worked out under the Reciprocal Trade Act and their constitutional foreign policy powers.

The lawmakers, however, by ratifying OTC would by clear inference also be endorsing in a broad policy sense, though not necessarily in every detail, that mysterious instrument of global trade policy—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Such endorsement they have specifically withheld in a series of extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Act, including the 3-year extension they will shortly send to the White House.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the United States is and long has been a member of GATT. The difference is that the present GATT has no permanent organization, whereas OTC would set up a permanent, formal machinery, headed by a director-general. Congress feels it might be morally committed to GATT if it authorizes OTC.

What is this little-known GATT that OTC would administer?

Basically it is a collection of tariff rates and trade rules negotiated by the 34 member nations, which account for about 80 percent of world trade, in periodic, months-long bargaining sessions; the schedule of GATT tariff concessions now covers more than 50,000 items. To understand how GATT came about, it is necessary to look back at the way tariffs were formerly regulated and negotiated.

A DELEGATION OF POWER

Before the Reciprocal Trade Act was first passed in 1934, Congress, as a general rule, passed on all tariff rates. The legislators either passed laws fixing specific import duties or ratified treaties that specified rates. With the passage of the Trade Act, Congress delegated to the President its powers to reduce tariffs, within specified limits, and to enter into foreign trade agreements.

This authority was used to negotiate bilateral trade pacts—agreements between the United States and one other country—for fixing tariff rates and trade rules between the two countries. Up to the time GATT came into existence on January 1, 1948, the United States had concluded such separate agreements with 29 countries.

GATT grew out of proposals by the United States for a multilateral, or many-country, approach to global trade. Under the multilateral process, each nation still negotiates bilaterally, with the principal supplier of any commodity on which it is considering a tariff reduction. Then, all of the bilateral reductions are bundled up in one schedule of new tariff rates and each concession is applied to the same category of imports from all countries. This is called the most favored nation treatment, and was already a part of the Reciprocal Trade Act itself.

Since these multilateral negotiations are basically bilateral and since the most favored nation treatment was already on the books, what if any is the advantage of the GATT approach? The President argued in his recent message to Congress on the subject that multilateral negotiation enables this country to obtain more tariff concessions on its exports than would be forthcoming from bilateral dealing; he said the United States, for example, gets benefits from concessions which other countries would be unwilling to negotiate except in a multilateral undertaking.

Mr. Eisenhower further declared that through GATT the United States has persuaded foreign countries to remove restrictions against imports of such specific dollar goods as coal, apples, cigarettes, lumber, potatoes, textiles, autos, petroleum, wool, and motion pictures.

It is possible, too, that getting the representatives of 34 nations together at one time in one place makes for greater volume and convenience than would be the case in strictly bilateral bargaining. And, of course, it gives at least the appearance of a concerted international attack on the restrictions to world trade. Moreover, tariff concessions are just the beginning of GATT. It also commits the member countries not to cancel tariff concessions by putting up other trade barriers.

Each member country, for example, promises not to cancel the benefit of a tariff cut by levying a domestic sales tax that would offset the tariff concession. Each country is free to tax imported items, of course, so long as the rate is applied equally to imported and domestic articles.

REPEALING DOMESTIC LAWS

The GATT also contains a general prohibition against import and export restrictions. And by inference, if not explicitly, the GATT countries are committed to repeal domestic laws that conflict with GATT and to refrain from adopting new conflicting statutes. Therein lies much of the objection in Congress to GATT.

Despite the principle of nondiscrimination, however, the heart of the agreement lies in the exceptions to the general reciprocity rules.

Thus the United States is permitted by GATT to continue its preferred tariff treatment of goods imported from Cuba and the Philippines. The British Commonwealth countries are allowed to continue their preferred tariff treatment, one with another. Under the same rule, the French Union and the Benelux countries may perpetuate their tariff preference blocs.

Though the general GATT rule prohibits export and import quotas, a member nation may regulate the export of goods important to its defense. So-called underdeveloped countries may impose import quotas or other restrictions if necessary to protect a domestic industry in raising general living standards. Any member nation may withdraw a tariff concession or apply import restrictions if the member considers such action necessary to prevent a drain on its dollar reserves.

GATT critics complain that these exceptions, particularly the loopholes for underdeveloped nations, remove much of the reciprocity from what is supposed to be a reciprocal arrangement. The reason: The United States is the most prosperous of the 34 member nations. Thus the exceptions, when applied, add up to discrimination against the United States.

LITTLE USED LOOPHOLES

The principal loophole available for relief of United States industries lies in the escape clause, which is spelled out in the Trade Act and is also incorporated in GATT. Under this procedure, member countries may withdraw a tariff concession or otherwise impose restrictions on goods being imported to the detriment of a domestic industry. Actually the escape clause is used sparingly. The United States has taken advantage of it under GATT only four times, and no other member has used it at all.

But the real basis for congressional opposition to GATT—and OTC—lies in the age-old struggle between the legislative and executive branches of Government. How far, for example, should Congress go in delegating its powers over tariffs and interstate and foreign commerce to the Executive? And, once delegated, should the Executive redelegate its authority to an international agency that can make rules to which Congress is morally committed?

These are not altogether theoretical questions. The United States has a law, for instance, that provides for import quotas on farm products being imported to the detriment of domestic farm price support programs. This statute violates both the letter and the spirit of GATT. It is true that American representatives to the recent Geneva conference, which adopted several amendments to GATT, obtained a waiver that permits the United States to violate the agreement by limiting imports under this section of United States farm law. But why, ask the critics, should the GATT countries have authority to write rules that require such a waiver?

Right now, there is pending in Congress a bill to reclassify hardboard for international trade purposes. This measure would remove hardboard from its present paper product category and classify it as a wood product. A tariff increase would accompany the reclassification. But if Congress passes the proposed law, the legislators would be violating GATT's principles.

Suppose Congress authorizes United States membership in O. T. C.—and by inference endorses GATT—would it not be making a moral commitment to reject the hardboard bill and to repeal the provision for restricting farm imports? It is such questions as these that lawmakers, even now, are asking themselves.

Or take the case of Czechoslovakia. A provision of the 1951 extension of the Trade Act directed the President "to take such action as is necessary" to withdraw trade agreement concessions to imports from Communist-dominated countries. Thereafter, the United States, instead of acting unilaterally, asked—and got—GATT permission to cancel concessions to Czechoslovakia. Here again, the GATT critics want to know why the United States should ask permission of 33 other countries to carry out a law passed by Congress.

THE RIGHT TO VIOLATE

By disassociating themselves from GATT in each reciprocal trade extension bill, the House and Senate in a broad political sense are leaving themselves a free hand to violate GATT. But would they not be surrendering this freedom by okaying OTC—even though, technically, they would still have a right to violate GATT?

There is still another basic reason for Congress' reluctance to endorse GATT. This reluctance goes back to OTC's predecessor proposal by former President Truman for an International Trade Organization. The present OTC plan bears little resemblance to the ill-fated ITO scheme. ITO would have incorporated GATT as one chapter under a preamble that would have committed member countries to follow "national" as well as "international" policies designed to foster full employment, higher living standards, and the like.

Conspicuously missing from the present proposals are old ITO chapters dealing with domestic labor and business practices, to name a couple of examples. Mr. Eisenhower pointedly noted in his recent message on OTC that American representatives to Geneva went with specific instructions to reject all efforts to expand the functions of the new organization to fields other than trade. This mandate the OTC and the slightly revised GATT appear to follow.

Even so, the GATT countries themselves have the power to amend its rules. And once Congress ratifies OTC could not some future GATT conference, perhaps under some future administration, rewrite the agreement to cover the explosive chapters that caused Congress to reject Mr. Truman's ITO?

These, too, are questions that Congress will want answered when administration officials journey to Capitol Hill to make their case for OTC.

EDITORIAL ON FREE TRADE ARTICLE REPRINTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of the same date as Mr. Clark's article carried an editorial entitled "Free Trade and Free Action" based on the article previously referred to.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial "Free Trade and Free Action" from the Wall Street Journal of May 13, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FREE TRADE AND FREE ACTION

Since 1934 the broad effort of this government has been to reduce American tariffs in return for comparable concessions from other nations. That is the purpose of the Reciprocal Trade Act and its successive extensions.

Since 1948 the principal instrument of this purpose has been the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, discussed by Mr. Clark in adjoining columns this morning.

This effort, it seems to us, is unexceptionable. The broad purpose of the Reciprocal Trade Act is healthy and we have no quarrel, in principle, with the GATT approach to it, which is mainly getting a lot of nations together for tariff negotiations. Now, however, the administration wants Congress to give it authority to join an Organization for Trade Cooperation. This would formalize GATT and establish a permanent staff and a Director to administer it. A machine would in effect be transformed into a pseudo-regulatory global agency.

The request to authorize membership in OTC raises some serious questions. Is it necessary for the purposes of the Trade Act and GATT? Evidently not. GATT has functioned these 7 years, and OTC would confer no powers to negotiate tariffs or change trade rules not already enjoyed by national representatives meeting at GATT conferences.

More important, is it altogether wise for Congress to endorse GATT, which would be the effect of authorizing OTC? The way it is now, the very provisional nature of GATT gives this country considerable flexibility. If it decides that circumstances warrant a return to strictly bilateral dealings, or if it thinks up a better way than GATT, it can bow out without causing an international furor.

This flexibility also applies to the rules which the GATT nations try to draw up for themselves. Because of conflicting national interests, these rules are full of exceptions. The United States got, at the last GATT meeting, a waiver permitting it to discriminate against farm imports in accordance with its domestic farm price-support legislation. But the other nations knew that if they did not grant the waiver the United States would act as though they had anyway; there is nothing really binding about the rules of GATT in its present provisional state.

Solemnize GATT through congressional approval of OTC, however, and you get a different emphasis, if not something more. It is much more difficult to withdraw from a formal international bureaucracy than it is to give up a machine which is merely one machine among others.

It is also more difficult in that situation to disregard GATT rules which may conflict with domestic statutes. We do not happen to admire the farm price-support legislation, but we very much admire the right of Congress to pass such laws as the Constitution permits and it sees fit. If Congress blesses GATT it may feel logically and morally bound not to pass laws in conflict with GATT and to revoke existing ones that conflict. We do not contend this would necessarily happen, but it would be rather silly, to say the least, if Congress were to approve GATT in effect and proceed to violate its rules.

Now it is true that Congress has delegated limited tariff and trade powers to the Executive through the Reciprocal Trade Act. But for Congress to authorize OTC would be to put up one more fence between Congress and its control of trade policy. Perhaps the practical results would not be important, but they could be far-reaching.

We should, indeed, continue to work for freer international trade through the present machinery of GATT or however seems best within the meaning of the trade act. But we should not kid ourselves that the goal is advanced by joining one more global bureaucracy. And we should be very chary of sacrificing, in our pursuit of freedom of trade, our freedom of action.

EDITORIAL WARNS AGAINST HASTY ACTION ON OTC

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the same publication on June 2, 1955, published another editorial, also referring to Mr. Clark's article, and mentioning ITO which I discussed earlier in my remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks the editorial "Shortcuts Can Be Dangerous," published in the June 2, 1955, issue of the Wall Street Journal.

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

SHORTCUTS CAN BE DANGEROUS

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is what its name implies, a collection of mutual undertakings among Western nations. There has been proposed to Congress legislation which would make the United States a party to an Organization for Trade Cooperation which would formalize and administer GATT.

Recently our Mr. Clark, writing from Washington, summarized the reasons for congressional doubts about OTC. An accompanying editorial raised questions about the necessity of OTC.

Several readers for whose opinions we have respect and who are mindful that for something like 50 years this newspaper has opposed protectionism as a national policy are puzzled about our attitude toward OTC.

The questioning of OTC is based on two grounds.

One ground is that considerable more should be known about OTC's genesis, its purposes and its form of organization.

The other ground is that until these doubts are resolved, there is danger that insistence on OTC beclouds the issue of protectionism versus trade liberalization; that it may have the effect of making liberalization more difficult instead of easier.

The OTC proposal came after a conference on tariffs at Geneva. It was a lengthy conference dealing with technical matters. It did not get much public notice in this country. The actual submission of the OTC proposal to Congress received hardly more than perfunctory attention.

No international commitment ought to be undertaken on such a basis.

Investigation may prove that OTC is what its advocates claim, that is, an agency which would be instrumental in wiping out impediments to the trade of one nation with another.

However, it must also be recognized that sitting on OTC would be representatives of countries which are committed to such things as the managed economy and managed money and which at least tolerate cartelism in their economic structures. Those things are the antithesis of freedom of trade. Instead, they make for strictures on trade. And it would be well to determine whether those theories would find their way into the deliberations and decisions of OTC.

Many of the reasons advanced for adhering to OTC also were advanced for adhering to the earlier International Trade Organization. Congress refused to have anything to do with ITO and there is pretty general agreement now that Congress was wise in its decision.

The second ground for questioning OTC is that it has beclouded the issue of trade liberalization with another very touchy issue—the possible delegation of congressional authority to an international body.

GATT is a collection of agreements entered into by the Executive under authority of the Reciprocal Trade Act. The Reciprocal Trade Act is a delegation of congressional power to fix tariffs to the executive department. Congress can reclaim that authority from the Executive at any time, and it has checks on the exercise of this delegated authority.

However, if the GATT agreements were formalized by Congress by the acceptance of OTC, would that act commit Congress to honor not only all the present GATT agreements but such future actions as OTC might take? Would Congress by a roundabout method be delegating its authority to an international agency?

These fears may be quite groundless but they are certainly in the minds of Congressmen who are neither protectionists nor isolationists. Senator BYRD, who managed the bill for renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act through Congress at a time when renewal was doubtful, is among those who question OTC.

It is less than a quarter of a century since the protectionist policies reached their zenith with the adoption of the Smoot-Hawley tariff. Four years later the Reciprocal Trade Act was passed. The retreat from protectionism began then, and it has taken place much faster than the most optimistic would have predicted in 1935. It has been renewed under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

The progress away from protectionism has been steady and it is permissible to question the wisdom of attempting to hurry it by methods which are not fully accepted by those who are basically opposed to protectionism. We think we understand the impatience of those who see the economic illogic of trade barriers. But one must also be mindful that many worthy causes have been retarded when those in a hurry tried to feed the public more than the public would digest.

So there are here two issues. The issue of liberalizing trade, which so far as this country is concerned means a demobilization of tariffs. There is the other issue of a surrender by Congress of its powers over tariffs.

It seems to us better not to have the two become mixed. If they become mixed, and if those opposing protectionism seem to be insisting that their purposes can be achieved only by congressional action which some Congressmen believe to be a surrender of congressional power, then some of those who have been antiprotectionist may very well be alienated.

The mere fact that congressional veterans who have consistently supported tariff lib-

eralization measures have their doubts about OTC should cause those who are advocating OTC to proceed carefully.

Certainly OTC ought not to be approved merely because it claims to be a shortcut to tariff liberalization. Shortcuts are not always short. And sometimes they can be dangerous.

SUDDEN DEATH TO ECONOMY AGAINST ECONOMIC SUICIDE BY DEGREES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal, as one will note from reading the two editorials, cannot be called a protectionist publication.

In fact it advocates developing freer international trade using the present machinery for that purpose, a premise with which I wholly disagree. What it opposes is plunging into the free trade pit in one sudden jump as we would be doing if we approve the OTC version of ITO.

Personally I do not see any great difference between inviting sudden death to our domestic economy and that of slow suicide such as is occurring now under the 1934 trade agreements act and GATT.

The annual review number of the Survey of Current Business published by the United States Department of Commerce in February 1955 reports that during 1954 the number of employees in all industries totaled 53,427,000. During 1953 the number of employees in all industries totaled 55,151,000. In other words there was a decline of 1,724,000 employees from 1953 to 1954.

PRODUCTION EARNINGS DECLINE

Average annual earnings per full-time employee increased from $3,590 in 1953 to $3,662 in 1954, or 2 percent, but total earnings dropped from $197,980,000,000 in 1953 to $195,650,000,000 in 1954, or a loss of $2,330,000,000.

The same issue of the same publication also includes an interesting table showing the decline in production workers in manufacturing in 1954 from 1953.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TABLE 6.—*Production workers in manufacturing*

	1954 employment			
	Annual average (1,000)	Percent change from 1953	4th quarter average (1,000)	Percent change from 4th quarter, 1953
Manufactures	12,631	−8.8	12,688	−6.5
Durable goods	7,233	−11.4	7,223	−8.9
Ordnance and accessories	129	−30.6	110	−41.5
Lumber and wood products, except furniture	663	−6.0	710	3.3
Furniture and fixtures	288	−9.7	298	−2.9
Stone, clay and glass products	432	−6.1	439	−3.9
Primary metal industries	991	−12.5	985	−9.7
Fabricated metal products	837	−10.2	834	−7.3
Machinery except electrical	1,145	−12.1	1,096	−11.9
Electrical machinery	810	−12.9	826	−9.2
Transportation equipment, except automobiles	732	−6.5	696	−10.5
Automobiles	602	−20.8	622	−11.5
Instruments and related products	219	−9.5	213	−12.0
Miscellaneous manufacturing industries	384	−7.5	393	−6.9
Nondurable goods	5,398	−5.0	5,466	−3.1
Food and kindred products	1,093	−3.6	1,110	−3.6
Tobacco manufactures	94	−1.1	106	1.0
Textile mill products	984	−10.0	993	−5.2
Apparel and other finished textile products	1,041	−5.5	1,052	−3.6
Paper and allied products	437	−.9	440	−1.1
Printing and publishing	518	1.0	525	.2
Chemicals and allied products	527	−4.4	528	−3.5
Petroleum and coal products	177	−4.8	174	−4.9
Rubber products	197	−10.9	206	−2.8
Leather and leather products	330	−4.9	332	−.3

AMERICAN WAGES FAR HIGHER THAN THOSE PAID FOREIGN COMPETITORS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, American wage rates are 4 to 10 times those of any foreign country in Europe, Asia, or Africa, depending on the country.

Free trade is compelling the American workman to compete against foreign labor receiving only a fraction of the prevailing American wage.

The foreign producer now has the advantage of machinery as efficient as our own, and in many instances newer and more modern machinery, which our taxpayers have helped pay for through foreign aid.

UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS HAVE EQUIPPED FOREIGN COMPETITORS WITH WORLD'S BEST MACHINERY

There should be exploded once and for all the myth on which the free-traders and one-worlders ride, that with our know-how and machinery we can compete with anyone.

I have personally visited all the nations of the world except the Iron Curtain countries and a couple of the low countries. I say that with our taxpayers' money we have installed in many foreign countries the most up-to-date machinery there is in the world.

It makes no difference whether the plant is in England or in South Africa or in the Belgian Congo or in Australia.

When an American installs a plant in a foreign nation it is the best plant of the kind in the world, because it represents the last word. Then, what does the investor do? He does what any sensible person would do—it is just common horse sense of which there seems to be a great dearth in Washington—he sends trained foremen and superintendents to operate the machinery and to train the men who run the detailed work. There may be in the plant anywhere from 2 or 3 to 10 percent of Americans. That is true all over the world, Mr. President.

With the common run-of-the-mill labor operating the machinery, doing a certain type of work over and over again, who will say that the Australian, the Scotch, the English, and most of the world's citizens cannot do just as much work as an American can do? They do it, Mr. President.

IMPORTING PRODUCTS OF FOREIGN LABOR NEGATES IMMIGRATION LAWS

We are importing foreign labor at slave wages when we import competitive foreign products, just as surely as if we were importing the foreign workers themselves under a policy of free and unrestricted immigration.

We are nullifying our own immigration laws when we permit the products of low-wage foreign labor to compete against our own high-wage, high-living-standard American labor in American markets.

The more foreign labor we import in foreign products, the less production we will have at home, and the more cost pressure will be applied to force American wages down to foreign levels.

That, in my opinion, Mr. President, is the ultimate free-trade goal.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 1

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an extract from Senate Report No. 232, 84th Congress, 1st session, the minority views opposing the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, pages 7 to 30, inclusive.

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

EXTRACT FROM SENATE REPORT NO. 232, 84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

I oppose H. R. 1 for the following reasons:

1. H. R. 1 broadens and extends an act wrong in principle, disastrous in its effects, and adverse to the national interest, economy, security, and independence.

2. H. R. 1 continues a program which denies to American citizens rights and representation guaranteed them under the Constitution in matters of foreign trade and commerce, and which makes the resources and skills of millions of Americans pawns of international political manipulation.

3. H. R. 1 reaffirms a policy which denies American producers equal access with foreign producers to our own American markets, fosters gross discrimination against important segments of our national life, creates unemployment, and jeopardizes industries, jobs, and investments.

4. H. R. 1 proposes to chain the United States for 3 more years to a global authority, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, in which our markets are bartered away in secret on foreign soil by diplomatic underlings of the State Department to the advantage of foreign nations.

5. H. R. 1 is unsound, unfair, uneconomic and incompatible with article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America.

6. H. R. 1 reenacts the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which has failed in all of its stated objectives during the 21 years of its existence.

7. H. R. 1 perpetuates a plan conceived by a prior administration seeking power over the legislative branch of our Government, and sold to the 73d Congress through irresponsible pledges by the then President that "no sound and important American interest will be injuriously disturbed." Industries not only have been seriously disturbed but severely damaged and partially destroyed.

Spokesmen for many of these industries have testified to that effect in hearings on H. R. 1 before the Senate Finance Committee, and have expressed their vigorous opposition to H. R. 1.

8. H. R. 1 repeats the false premise of predecessor acts that the trade-agreements program is for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States. The program has survived for 21 years only through the artificial trade stimulation of foreign wars, preparations for foreign wars, a continuing war economy induced by threats of further foreign wars; gifts and grants of more than $100 billion to foreign nations financed by the American taxpayers, and through the susceptibility of the Congress to foreign and domestic propaganda linking our giveaway trade and dollars to fears of new foreign wars.

9. H. R. 1 reauthorizes a trade program geared to a war economy only, and which defeats normal international trade relations in times of peace by making such trade a tool of international politics, placing control over exports in the hands of central governments which include not only republics such as ours but monarchies and dictatorships.

10. H. R. 1, like the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and subsequent extension acts, grants to the President authority to enter into future international trade agreements of any type, applicable to any products, and subject only to a blanket percentage limitation. In other words, H. R. 1 bestows on the President a blank check to remake the industrial and economic map of the United States.

11. H. R. 1 requires no referral of trade treaties and agreements to the Congress to which the Constitution, article 1, section 8, confers the total responsibility of laying and collecting duties or tariffs and of regulating our trade and commerce with foreign nations. Nor is ratification by a vote of two-thirds of Senate Members present required, as stipulated in article II, section 2, of the Constitution with respect to treaties. The executive branch has chosen to avoid this obligation by labeling trade treaties "trade agreements."

12. H. R. 1, as did its predecessors, permits the President to transfer the authority delegated to him by the Congress to subordinates. Throughout the life of the act and program the Chief Executive has, to all purposes and effects, so redelegated his authority under the act, principally to subordinates in the State Department.

13. H. R. 1, like its predecessor acts, not only permits the President to transfer his delegated powers to subordinates, but permits these subordinates to transfer their authority to GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which meets in Geneva, Switzerland. Subordinates of the President have so done since 1947, transferring to, and diluting their authority among, the 34 nations now participating in GATT.

14. H. R. 1 in no way precludes the delegation of authority to the President from being passed on by him to subordinates in the State Department or in any other agency of the executive branch of his choosing. Nor does it preclude the State Department from continuing to pass on its delegated authority to an international GATT. Thus the ultimate delegation is thrice removed from the Congress, to which the Constitution entrusted responsibility for the regulation of foreign commerce. It is thrice removed by the Congress own hand.

15. H. R. 1 not only continues this delegation thrice removed but broadens it. Unlike its predecessor extension acts, H. R. 1 grants the President direct authority to commit the United States to GATT, to a revised GATT, or to GATT-type international organizations, as witnesses of broad legal experience have testified before the Senate Finance Committee during hearings on H. R. 1. GATT has never been before the Congress for approval or rejection on its merits, but the back door approach to such sanction is being utilized under subsection A of section 3 of H. R. 1.

16. H. R. 1 employs the word reciprocal in relation to so-called concessions which it infers other nations may make to the United States. Neither word appears in the original 1934 Trade Agreements Act. Both words are inventions to sugar-coat an act which has never been administered with other than one purpose—to cut tariffs on imports to the United States. Other nations have not reciprocated these tariff cuts. Testimony has been offered in Senate Finance Committee hearings that 32 nations favored by cuts in tariffs on products they export to the United States have increased their own tariffs within a recent period. Of 91 trading countries, 68 required import licenses on American products generally, and 9 others on some products or a total of 77; and 38 require exchange permits. Ten others link exchange permits to import licenses. Only 10 apply no control regulations at all on imports from the United States.

17. H. R. 1 would authorize further tariff reductions on imports to the United States.

18. H. R. 1 unlike any predecessor act, authorizes the President to commit the United States in a trade agreement with one country in behalf of trade concession by it to a third country. The object of this device which has no relation to our own foreign exports, is to assist Japan.

19. H. R. 1 proposes that the 84th Congress extend the Trade Agreements Act 3 years beyond the present termination date of June 12, 1955, or for more than a year and a half beyond the life of the present Congress. Foreign situations may well change during this period that will increase the adverse effects of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act on American industries and markets. Yet H. R. 1 would commit the 85th Congress and a possible new administration for a year and a half to an obsolete trade-agreements program, subject only to repeal.

20. H. R. 1 would likewise, to all purpose and effect, commit the next Congress and administration for a similar period to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, in which our markets are put on a foreign auction block to the advantage of 33 foreign nations and, as has occurred frequently in the past, to the disadvantage of the United States.

21. H. R. 1, while extending the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, would require the President to submit to the Congress an annual report on the operation of the program. The value of such a report is vague, considering that Congress already has, in derogation of the Constitution, article 1, section 8, delegated to the President complete authority to regulate foreign commerce. The value of such a report is further diminished in view of the fact that GATT sessions are held in secret and its decisions are at times restricted for periods of more than a year. It should be obvious, therefore, that this provision in H. R. 1 is merely "window dressing" to make a bad bill appear more attractive. Public knowledge of our foreign trade needs and problems can come only when the Trade Agreements Act expires and the United States is freed from its present chains to GATT.

22. H. R. 1, in extending the firm life of GATT, is making a European colony out of the United States with respect to trade and commerce, subject not to a king as in pre-Revolution days, but to the governments of 33 foreign states through their representatives in GATT.

23. H. R. 1, by continuing GATT, jeopardizes the Nation's farm program by subjecting our restrictions on imports of certain agricultural commodities and our price-support system to continual attack and negotiation in an international organization in which the United States has one vote. At the ninth session of GATT, held recently in Geneva, Switzerland, GATT was given assurances by the State Department that it will seek to modify provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, imposing import quotas on certain products, as "changing circumstances warrant such modification" and will "promptly" terminate them when "circumstances requiring the action no longer exist." Thus H. R. 1 could be used to negate other legislation passed by the Congress, such as the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

24. H. R. 1 would entangle the Nation's economy, industry, and trade further in an international web which leaves neither Congress nor its victims, the American producers, any recourse other than the so-called escape clause, which in turn vests sole final authority in the President. Dying industries may apply for relief under the escape clause, but in all the cases filed to date the Chief Executive has granted relief in only five.

25. H. R. 1 would admittedly injure some American industries, according to the Secretary of State who testified before the Senate Finance Committee on March 15, 1955:

"I do not think you can have imports without some damage, and if your rule is that you will not have imports or tariff reductions or sustain them if there is any damage to anybody, then I think it becomes unworkable."

26. H. R. 1 is not a "trade" bill. It is a foreign policy bill. It is a bill to permit the President's subordinates in the State Department to sacrifice industries, jobs, and investments in the United States for a presumed advantage to foreign nations if, in the opinion of the State Department such a sacrifice will implement its foreign policy.

27. H. R. 1 provides the State Department the chips of our domestic economy to use as pawns in its game of international politics. In return for the sacrifice of domestic industries such as coal, textiles, lead, zinc, glassware, and other resources and commodities, the State Department seeks only lipservice good will from nations governed by self-interest. Secretary Dulles' argument for H. R. 1 was on the assumption that it is an instrument of foreign policy and that "international repercussions would be major and their consequences would be grave" if it were tampered with by the Congress, to which sole responsibility for foreign-trade regulation is given by the Constitution.

28. H. R. 1 will weaken our defense potential. Further tariff cuts will be authorized on imports of critical and strategic minerals and materials in which this country is self-sufficient. Imports of these materials, many of which are produced in the shadow of the Iron Curtain, will be encouraged, despite the fact that they would be cut off from us completely in time of war. More American mines, vital to our national security but unable to meet low-wage foreign competition, will be closed down and more American miners will be idled. Many of these mines and much of our mining skills will be lost entirely and cannot be restored in time of national emergency.

29. H. R. 1 will compel American workers in manufacturing as well as mining fields to compete for 3 more years in their own American market against foreign products produced at foreign wage rates one-fourth to one-tenth the prevailing wage in the United States for comparable work and skills. Invasion of our markets by the products of this low-wage foreign labor will continue to be actively encouraged by the State Department, intent on encouraging increased competitive imports.

30. H. R. 1 perpetuates in a modified degree the fraud perpetrated by sponsors of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act that it was legislation to benefit agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce. The act has, instead, worked injury on these segments

of our domestic economy. Used as an instrument of foreign policy the program has encouraged and developed foreign agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce at the expense of our own industries, investors, workingmen, and markets. H. R. 1 extends this wrong.

31. H. R. 1 contains not one word of assurance, hope, or encouragement for the American workingmen or investors in industries producing for the American market. There is not one word guaranteeing any American market or supplier against suffocation by foreign imports. There is not one word in this bill that offers real safeguards from cutrate foreign competition to any American employed in a domestic industry or whose dollars are invested in America. The fact that no assurances in behalf of domestic producers for the domestic market are contained in the bill may explain the many verbal expressions of the administration in this field of discussion. There have been a plethora of verbal assurances, but none of them are embodied in the bill. They are not in the bill because the administration did not want them in the bill and opposes their inclusion.

32. H. R. 1, stripped to its basic purposes, is a bill to cut tariffs on imports at whatever cost to America's welfare, economy, and security.

THE ECONOMIC EFFECTS

The Trade Agreements Act, which H. R. 1 would extend, was sold to the 73d Congress by the then administration "as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic employment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce." It also was promoted as being "for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States."

Sponsors of H. R. 1 have somewhat modified this extravagant language in the 1934 act. In both instances the State Department has been the chief proponent of the legislation and the original author.

H. R. 1 omits references to unemployment, purchasing power, and living standards. It retains the language that it is for the purpose of expanding foreign markets, and also that it is being done as a means of "establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce." It is significant that after 22 years of administration the administrators of the program are still proposing it as a means of establishing such better relationship.

The Trade Agreements Act was approved June 12, 1934. The first agreement, with Cuba, was signed in September of that year. Agreements with Belgium, Sweden, and Haiti became effective in 1935. But it was not until 1936 that trade agreements with important exporting countries became effective. A limited agreement with Canada was concluded, and expanded in 1937. Agreements also became effective during 1936 with Brazil, Colombia, Honduras, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Nicaragua, Guatemala, France, Finland, Costa Rica, and San Salvador.

In 1937, after 16 trade agreements had been concluded, 7,700,000 American workingmen and women were unemployed. In 1938 there were 10,390,000 unemployed, and in 1939 there were 9,030,480 unemployed, a milion and a quarter more than in 1931, more than double the number in 1930, and more than 6 times the number who were unemployed in 1929.

Relief from unemployment came with the war boom, not as a result of the Trade Agreements Act which, 5 years after its enactment found 17.2 percent of the Nation's labor force out of work.

In 1947, after 29 bilateral trade agreements had been negotiated, President Truman, on December 16 of that year, proclaimed the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in effect as of January 1, 1948, thus substituting multilateral trade treaties for bilateral agreements as envisioned in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. The President claimed the Trade Agreements Act as authority for this action.

Two million sixty-four thousand Americans were unemployed in 1948, or 3.4 percent of the civilian labor force. One year later, in 1949, 3,395,000 civilian workers were unemployed, or 5.5 percent. In June 1950, the President involved the United States in the Korean conflict and unemployment dropped to 3,142,000 or 5 percent. Unemployment fell to below 2 million in the war years, but returned to 5 percent at the conclusion of active combat. In 1954, according to the Labor Department, 3,230,000 Americans were unemployed.

Agriculture has suffered an even more severe drop in employment, despite the assurances of the Trade Agreements Act. In 1936 the number of Americans employed in agriculture was 10 million. In 1954 the number had been reduced to 6,504,000, the lowest number in 25 years for which statistics have been made available by the Labor Department.

In January 1955, the American labor force, including members of the Armed Forces, totaled 66,700,000. Of this number, 3,203,000 were serving in the Armed Forces and 60,150,000 were employed in civilian activities. Agricultural workers had been further reduced in number to 5,297,000. The Labor Department listed 3,347,000 workers in all activities as unemployed, 1,205,000 more than the 2,142,000 in 1947 when President Truman propelled us into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Of equal pertinence is the fact that 2 years ago there were 37 distressed areas in the United States; 1 year ago there were 80, and as of March of this year, the latest month on which the Labor Department has reported, there were 156.

These areas and the principal industrial or other source of their economic distress are listed in Senate Report No. 60 of the 84th Congress, and in remarks made by the senior Senator from Nevada on the floor of the Senate on April 18, 1955. At that time he pointed out that coal mining, which is suffering from imports of petroleum products from foreign nations, including the Near East and Indonesia, is the principal industry in 33 distressed areas, while other areas in which lead, zinc, or fluorspar mining is a leading industry also are in distress.

Textile manufacture is the No. 1 industry in 20 distressed areas and the second dominant industry in 5 others. Electrical machinery is the industry most adversely affected by unemployment in 7 distressed areas and among the principal industries affected in 5 others. The chemical industry is suffering unemployment in four areas. All of these industries are being forced to compete against an import flood from low-wage foreign nations.

Unemployment in machinery industries, reflecting injury caused by competitive imports from abroad, has brought distress to 19 areas and contributed to distress in 9 others. Electrical machinery is manufactured in 13, nonelectrical in 10, and farm machinery in 5. Metal industries are hurt in many areas, and mining, including lead, zinc, and fluorspar; pottery, china, and glassware, machine tools, leather products, and lumber are suffering in others.

Bureau of Census records show that in 1954 the United States imported approximately $800 million in textile fibers and manufactures; $350 million in machinery of which $70 million represented farm machinery; a quarter billion dollars worth of chemicals and related products; $1,700 million in metals and manufactures not including machinery and vehicles; $1,200 million in nonmetallic minerals, including more than $825 million in petroleum and petroleum products brought in from foreign lands to compete against America's own fuels industries and workers; a quarter billion dollars in lumber and sawmill products and $100 million in manufactured woods such as plywood, shingles, and veneers.

More than $200 million in meat and dairy products were imported to compete against America's agriculture, dairy, and livestock industries, and imports of fish, shellfish, and fisheries products totaling more than $200 million contributed to the distress of coastal fisheries and fishermen.

Every import of a foreign product that competes with products produced in the United States puts American dollars in pockets of foreign workers and investors, and takes dollars out of the pockets of workers and investors in identical or similar production here.

Every imported product that is competitive against American mined or manufactured goods competes against American producers for America's own markets, and every tariff cut under the Trade Agreements Act and GATT has augmented the advantage of foreign producers in such competition.

The original Trade Agrements Act authorized the President to reduce tariffs 50 percent. Subsequent legislation authorized him to cut remaining tariff rates 50 percent, or a total reduction of 75 percent from 1930 rates. On the overall, a 68-percent reduction has been granted. Actually, the reduction has been greater than that as a result of inflation and dollar devaluation.

House Resolution 1 permits further reductions of 5 percent a year for 3 years, a bonus to foreign producers who receive it greater than the dividends paid by many American industries affected by import competition.

This bonus to foreign producers may well add to the distress of the 156 areas scattered among 32 of the 48 States, or create new distressed areas in these or other States.

Of these States Alabama has 7 distressed areas, Arkansas and Connecticut, 1 each; Georgia, 2; Illinois, 4; Indiana, 8; Iowa, 2; Kansas, 1; Kentucky, 11; Maine and Maryland, 1 each; Massachusetts, 8; Michigan, 11; Minnesota, 1; Missouri, 4; New Jersey, 2; New Mexico, 1; New York, 8; North Carolina, 5; Ohio, 9; Oklahoma, 2; Oregon, 1; Pennsylvania, 20; Rhode Island and South Carolina, 1 each; Tennessee, 5; Texas, 1; Vermont, 2; Virginia, 4; Washington, 1; West Virginia, 13; and Wisconsin, 4.

Senators from these States may obtain further information on this by consulting Senate Report No. 60 of the 80th Congress, or the table printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1.

Witnesses appearing for many industries testified in specific and concrete terms before the Senate Finance Committee concerning job cutbacks in their respective industries, caused in whole or in part by import dumping.

No witness presented specific and concrete evidence of any nature concerning increases in employment in any industry resulting from the trade-agreements program. Estimates have been offered from time to time by proponents of reduced tariffs relating to employment in foreign trade, but in every instance they have been general, vague, and not backed up by facts, figures, or evidence.

The employment cutbacks sustained by industry as a result of import competition from low-wage countries reaping the advantage of our open, low-tariff markets are very real, and are supported by statistics.

H. R. 1 will increase unemployment and distress in the United States if it is enacted, and the State Department, the principal proponent of the legislation, knows it.

Perpetuation of a foreign policy which has brought 3 wars in less than 40 years has been placed above the interest and protection of American industries, workers, and investors, and H. R. 1 will enable the State Department to continue this policy.

THE RECORD ON EXPORTS OF FARM COMMODITIES

H. R. 1 will continue a program which has failed its promises to agriculture and which threatens agriculture with grievous injury.

Cotton exports during the 14 years prior to passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act averaged more than 7 million bales a year. In the 4 depression years of 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933, they were 7,048,000, 8,989,000, 8,647,000, and 8,366,000 bales, respectively. During the prewar years following passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act they averaged less than 5 million bales a year. Exports from 1946 through 1953, the postwar years, averaged only 4,234,500 bales per year, and in 1952 and 1953 were 3,110,000 and 3,798,000, respectively. The peak export year for cotton was 1926, when 11,281,000 bales were shipped abroad, and the lowest year was 1941, 7 years after passage of the Trade Agreements Act, when only 1,202,000 bales were exported. Pearl Harbor occurred on December 7, 1941, too late to have caused this tremendous drop in exports.

Neither the trade-agreements program, which H. R. 1 would extend, nor GATT, which it would continue, have expanded our cotton export markets.

Tobacco exports during the 14 years prior to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act averaged more than 500 million pounds per year; topped 600 million pounds in 1929, a record that has never subsequently been equaled. Under the trade-agreements program, tobacco exports averaged 369 million pounds per year prior to Pearl Harbor, and averaged 400,043,000 during the war years. They hit their low in 1940, 6 years after passage of the Trade Agreements Act—179,626,000 pounds. Since the war they have averaged slightly less than 480 million pounds per year, or 20 million pounds less than the average for the pre-1934 trade-agreements period.

The Trade Agreements Act has not expanded export markets for tobacco. Whatever effect it may have had at all has been to decrease them.

Butter exports during the 14 years prior to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act averaged 4,777,000 pounds per year. Following passage of the Trade Agreements Act in 1934 they averaged 2,514,000 pounds per year for the 7-year period, 1935 through 1941.

Butter exports in 1952 and 1953 totaled 387,000 and 521,000 pounds, respectively.

The Trade Agreements Act, which H. R. 1 would extend, has failed to expand our butter export market.

Wheat exports prior to the depression averaged 214,784,000 bushels per year without foreign aid or other forms of surplus disposal abroad. For the 7 years following passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act through 1941 they averaged 55,887,000 bushels per year. Since the war wheat exports, including shipments under gifts and grants, have averaged 385,482,000 bushels per year. In 1953 they dropped to 219,359,000 bushels, or approximately the average in the 1930's.

The Department of Agriculture advises us that it has no breakdown distinguishing between exports shipped in the course of normal trade, and those financed in whole or in part through foreign aid or subsidies.

Rye shipments during the 1920's averaged 27,186,000 bushels per year. Both in 1922 and 1925 exports of rye exceeded 50 million bushels. For the 14 years prior to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, including depression years, they averaged 19,524,000 bushels per year. Following approval of the Trade Agreements Act, rye exports averaged 1,231,000 bushels per year. During the war they averaged 2,592,000 bushels per year, and since the war the average per year has been 3,164,000 bushels. In 1952 exports of rye dropped to 320,000 bushels, and in 1953 to 7,000 bushels. The Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which H. R. 1 would extend, obviously has not expanded the export market for this agricultural commodity.

Oat exports during the 10 years prior to the depression averaged 17,039,000 bushels per year. During the depression years prior to approval of the Trade Agreements Act they averaged 3,778,000 bushels.

The average for the prewar years from 1934, the year the Trade Agreements Act was passed, through 1941, was 3,872,000 bushels. Since the war oat exports have averaged 12,979,000 bushels per year, with exports declining each year since 1948 to 4,143,000 in 1952 and 3,446,000 in 1953.

The Trade Agreements Act, which H. R. 1 would extend, does not appear to have expanded our oat export market.

Farm commodities subject to quantitative restrictions under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act are cotton, wheat, oats, rye, rye flour and meal; barley and barley malt; butter, cheese, dried whole milk, dried skimmed milk, dried buttermilk, dried cream, malted milk and compounds; and peanuts. These restrictions are the subject of vigorous action in GATT, and may be jeopardized if GATT is continued. H. R. 1, by continuing the Trade Agreements Act, also continues the authority presumed by the State Department to authorize American participation in the GATT.

Manufactured articles in the United States have no protection from import competition such as quotas or quantitative restrictions. Neither have our domestic mines and mineral resources.

The following table, prepared by the Department of Agriculture, lists the quotas which are applicable to agricultural commodities, and which our continuance in GATT would jeopardize.

TABLE I.—*Commodities currently subject to quantitative restrictions under sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, including the quota and beginning date of quota year*

Commodity	Unit	Beginning date (1954)	Quota
Cotton:			
Long staple (1⅛-inch and longer but less than 1 11/16-inch)	Pounds	Feb. 1	45,656,420
Short staple (under 1⅛-inch other than harsh or rough)	do	Sept. 20	[1] 14,516,882
Harsh or rough under ¾-inch	do	do	70,000,000
Cotton waste [2]	do	do	[1] 5,482,509
Grains: [3]			
Wheat [4]	Bushels	May 29	800,000
Wheat products [5]	Pounds	do	4,000,000
Oats, hulled, unhulled, and unhulled ground	Bushels	Oct. 1	[6] 40,000,000
Rye, rye flour, and meal	Pounds	July 1	[7] 186,000,000
Barley and barley malt	Bushels	Oct. 1	[8] 27,500,000
Dairy products:			
Butter	Pound	July 1	707,000
Cheese:			
Cheddar	do	do	2,780,100
Blue mold	do	do	4,167,000
Edam and Gouda	do	do	4,600,200
Italian [9]	do	do	9,200,100
Dried whole milk	do	do	7,000
Dried skimmed milk	do	do	1,807,000
Dried buttermilk	do	do	496,000
Dried cream	do	do	500
Malted milk and compounds	do	do	6,000
Peanuts:			
Peanuts [10]	do	do	1,709,000
Supplemental quota for period ending June 30, 1955 [11]	do		[12] 51,000,000

[1] Country quotas are prescribed for short-staple cotton and cotton waste.

[2] Card strips made from cotton under 1 3/16 inches, comber waste, lap waste, sliver waste, roving waste, however, not more than 33⅓ percent shall be filled by cotton wastes other than comber waste made from cottons of 1 3/16 inches or more in staple length in the case of certain countries.

[3] Excludes all certified or registered seed approved for planting under the Federal Seed Act.

[4] The quota excludes wheat and flour "unfit for human consumption" or for experimental purposes.

[5] Includes flour, semolina, crushed or cracked, and similar wheat products.

[6] The annual quota of 40 million bushels permits 39,312,000 bushels from Canada and 688,000 pounds from other foreign countries.

[7] Of which not more than 15,000 pounds may be rye flour and rye meal.

[8] Permits not more than 27,225,000 bushels from Canada and not more than 257,000 bushels from other foreign countries. The Canadian Government indicated it will voluntarily limit exports of feed barley to the United States to 35 million bushels during this same period.

[9] Italian-type cheese made from cow's milk including Romano, Reggiano, Parmesano, Provoloni, Provolette, and Sbrinz.

[10] Shelled basis, including whether shelled, not shelled, blanched, salted, prepared or preserved (including roasted but not peanut butter).

[11] By Presidential proclamation an additional quota of 51 million pounds became applicable on March 10 for the quota period ending June 30, 1955.

[12] Shelled basis. Includes peanuts shelled, blanched, salted, prepared or preserved (including roasted peanuts but not including peanuts not shelled or peanut butter).

With respect to the total export picture:

The United States exported 12.9 percent of its production of movable goods in 1921; 9.1 percent in 1923; 10.1 percent in 1925; 9.9 percent in 1927; 9.6 percent in 1929; 7.3 percent in the depression year of 1931; and 6.5 percent in the depression year of 1933. Economic aid for foreign countries at the expense of American taxpayers had not then been invented and all exports were in the normal course of foreign trade and commerce.

In 1935, 1937, and 1939, still without the advantage of American economic or military aid, the United States exported 6.7, 7.5, and 7.5 percent of its total production in movable aid.

In 1941, after lend-lease had been inaugurated, exports totaled 7.9, but of these only 5.8 percent were normal commercial transactions.

Not including exports financed solely by the American taxpayer, exports for the postwar years, beginning in 1946, have amounted to the following percentages of the total production of movable goods in the United States: 4.9, 7.3, 5.4, 4.8, 4.1, 6.2, 5.8, 5.1, and 6. These percentages were prepared from basic data and with the assistance of the Department of Commerce.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act has not served to expand foreign markets for the products of the United States.

H. R. 1 AND GATT

H. R. 1., in providing the legislative authority under which the State Department expects to continue United States participation in GATT, contributes to the subordination of the national policy on agriculture commodities to an international organization meeting in foreign lands.

Dispatches from Geneva, Switzerland, on March 7, 1955, reported:

"The 34 member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) have granted permission for the United States to continue to impose quantitative restrictions on certain agricultural imports. But the members also gave other countries permission to retaliate and seek compensation if affected by the restrictions which are contained in section 22 of the United States Agricultural Adjustment Act.

"This section mainly concerns imports of dairy produce and had led to clashes with several nations in the past. Holland once retaliated by slashing imports of wheat from the United States. The United States is understood to have assured GATT that it will end any restrictions under the act as soon as they are no longer needed and consult with interested countries before taking further action."

Confirmation of this report comes from GATT itself in a release titled:

"Decision To Grant a Waiver to the United States in Connection With Import Restrictions Imposed Under Section 22 of the United States Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 as Amended."

Under a subhead: "Conditions and procedures" the document states:

"1. Upon request of any contracting party which considers that its interests are seriously prejudiced by reason of any import restriction imposed under section 22, whether or not covered by this decision, the United States will promptly undertake a review to determine whether there has been a change in circumstances which would require such restrictions to be modified or terminated. In the event the review shows such a change, the United States will institute an investigation in the manner provided by section 22.

"2. Should the President of the United States acting in pursuant of section 22 cause an investigation to be made to determine whether any existing import restriction should be modified, terminated, or extended, or whether restrictions should be imposed on the import of any additional product, the United States will notify the contracting parties and, in accordance with article XXIII of the general agreement, accord to any contracting party which considers that its interests would be prejudiced the fullest notice and opportunity, consistent with the legislative requirements of the United States, for representations and consultation.

"3. The United States will give due consideration to any representations submitted to it including:

"(a) When investigating whether any existing import restriction should be modified, terminated, or extended, representations that a greater volume of imports than is permitted under the import restriction would not have the effects required to be corrected by section 22, including representations that the volume of imports that would have entered in the absence of governmental agricultural programs would not have such effects.

"(b) When investigating with respect to import restrictions on additional products, representations with regard to:

"(i) the effect of imports of any product upon any program or operation undertaken by the United States Department of Agriculture or any agency under its direction, or upon the domestic production of any agricultural commodity or product thereof for which such a program or operation is undertaken, including representations that the volume of imports which would have entered in the absence of governmental agricultural programs will not have the effects required to be corrected by section 22:

"(ii) the representative period to be used for the determination of any quota.

"(c) Representations by any contracting party that the portion of a total quota allotted or proposed to be allotted to it is inequitable because of circumstances that operated to reduce imports from that contracting party of the product concerned during the past representative period on which such import quota is based.

"4. As soon as the President has made his decision following any investigation the United States will notify the contracting parties and those contracting parties which have made representations or entered into consultations. If the decision imposes restrictions on additional products or extends or intensifies existing restrictions the notification by the United States will include particulars of such restrictions and the reasons for them regardless of whether the restriction is consistent with the general agreement.

"5. The United States will remove or relax each restriction permitted under this waiver as soon as it finds the circumstances requiring such restriction no longer exist or have changed so as no longer to require its imposition in its existing form.

"6. The contracting parties will make an annual review of any action taken by the United States under this decision. For each such review the United States will furnish a report to the contracting parties showing any modification or removal of restrictions effected since the previous report, the restrictions in effect under section 22 and the reasons why such restrictions (regardless of whether covered by this waiver) continue to be applied and any steps it has taken with a view to a solution of the problem of surpluses of agricultural commodities."

Elsewhere the GATT "decision" states:

"(a) To help solve the problem of surpluses of products for which section 22 import quotas now are in effect, the United States Government has taken positive steps aimed at reducing 1955 crop supplies by lowering support price levels or by imposing marketing quotas at minimum levels permitted by legislation; and that it is the intention of the United States Government to continue to seek a solution of the problem of surpluses of agricultural commodities.

"(b) The assurance of the United States Government that it will discuss proposals under section 22 with all countries having a substantial interest prior to taking action, and will give prompt consideration to any representations made by it.

"(c) That it is the intention of the United States Government promptly to terminate any restrictions imposed when it finds that circumstances requiring the action no longer exist, and to modify restrictions whenever changed circumstances warrant such modification."

All of these spineless pledges and commitments, of course, leave the American farmer behind the eight ball and beholden to the whims of his foreign competitors.

The representations, pledges, and commitments reported in this GATT document, relating to legislation passed by the Congress in behalf of the Nation's agriculture industry, were not made by the Congress but by subordinates in the executive branch representing the United States at the GATT sessions in Geneva. The State Department contends that authority for such representation and participation in GATT is given to it in the Trade Agreements Act. H. R. 1 would extend this act and therefore the presumption of this authority by the State Department.

GATT has been assured by United States representatives in Geneva that the United States will end any restrictions under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act when it is found that circumstances requiring the action no longer exist. GATT has further been assured that restrictions will be modified whenever changed circumstances warrant such modification.

Before H. R. 1 is brought to the floor of the Senate the State Department should be subject to an inquiry on the following points:

1. Who is to determine if and when the safeguards under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act are no longer needed?

2. Who is to weigh the circumstances requiring or not requiring action with respect to quotas on imports of agricultural commodities?

3. Who is presumed to exercise the authority to modify restrictions embodied in legislation passed by the Congress and affecting agriculture, and who is to determine when changing circumstances warrant such modification?

H. R. 1, by assuring continuance in GATT, opens the door to international meddling and obstructive tactics in other legislation passed by the Congress, namely, the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Nowhere in the Agricultural Adjustment Act is there provision for scrutiny or review of an agricultural program upon request of any contracting party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Nowhere does the Agricultural Adjustment Act provide for notifications of foreign countries when investigations are made at the request of a foreign nation or nations "to determine whether any existing import restriction should be modified, terminated, or extended." The modification, termination, or extension of quota provisions in section 22 are legislative matters for congressional determination.

Nowhere does the Agricultural Adjustment Act provide for "representations and consultation" with foreign nations which consider their interests prejudiced by administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Nowhere does the Agricultural Adjustment Act set up a criteria such as prescribed in paragraph 3 of the GATT decision taking into account the estimated volume of imports, were import restrictions not applied, and the effects on domestic production that unlimited imports might have.

And nowhere does the Agricultural Adjustment Act provide that "as soon as the President has made his decision following any investigation the United States will notify the contracting parties and those contracting parties which have made representations or entered into consultations," plus explaining the reasons if restrictions are continued.

The authority to make the commitments made by the State Department to GATT is not embodied in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, section 22. The authority to make the commitments it has made is assumed by the State Department to grow out of the Trade Agreements Act, which H. R. 1 would extend to June 12, 1958.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act has therefore superimposed an international coalition of 34 nations, including Communist Czechoslovakia, over not only agriculture and industry in the United States, but also over the powers and responsibilities of the Congress, as provided in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

GATT falls or survives, insofar as American participation is concerned, depending on whether H. R. 1 is approved or rejected.

If H. R. 1 is approved GATT continues to meddle in our domestic economy and, by implication at least, in our legislative processes.

If H. R. 1 is rejected, the United States will be free of GATT strictures, control, and interference.

GATT has never been submitted to the Congress for rejection or approval, and the substantive provisions of GATT never are to be submitted according to the present thinking of the State Department.

But GATT is inextricably bound to H. R. 1 which would continue the Trade Agreements Act, the only substance on which any authority of GATT over the Nation's trade, tariffs, and economy is based.

Because the shadow of GATT hangs over H. R. 1, and is a dominant motivation for continuance of the 1934 trade agreements program, it is important in the consideration of H. R. 1 to discuss its origins and background.

GATT sessions are secret. They are held invariably on foreign soil. Information concerning actions and deliberation is scanty and released through official sources. The author of these views is in possession of a document listing 24 decisions and 3 resolutions, 3 declarations and 1 recommendation by GATT between February 1954 and March 10, 1955, involving the United States and 16 other countries including Czechoslovakia.

The document is marked "Restricted," and a note attached reads as follows:

"Although it is not definitive as yet, it is expected that this document may be derestricted as of May 1, 1955."

No information bearing on the national security of any nation is contained, and at least one decision has been made public by the State Department. The restricted document deals only with trade, finance matters, and investment, actions which should be public knowledge to the workers and investors of America.

In the opinion of the author of these minority views, the only purpose of the restriction is to conceal information from the public and possibly from the legislative bodies of the various nations until such time as GATT deems it appropriate to inform them.

GATT and the 1934 trade agreements program have been welded together since 1947. The Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934. The Trade Agreements Act delegated to the President power to enter into trade pacts with foreign nations, the type of agreements contemplated being bilateral. Prior to entry into GATT by Presidential proclamation on December 16, 1947, bilateral trade treaties had been negotiated with 29 foreign countries, of which 27 treaties were still active.

THE ORIGINS OF GATT

GATT, however, had been in contemplation for several years. As early as December 22, 1941, an Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy was set up, with subcommittees on economic policy and economic reconstruction. This was replaced on April 9, 1943, by a Committee on Postwar Foreign Economic Policy.

This committee set up special committees to consider various phases of postwar foreign economic policy. Dean Acheson, then Assistant Secretary of State, was given general supervision of "Shipping, relaxation of trade barriers, commodity agreements and methods of trade, private monopolies and cartels, food, and agricultural products, metals and heavy industries, petroleum, and rubber."

On November 23, 1944, Mr. Acheson announced the Department's intention "to seek an early understanding with the leading trading nations, indeed as many nations as possible, for the effective and substantial reduction of all kinds of barriers to trade," adding that "a trade conference of the United and Associated Nations should be held at the earliest practicable date for the negotiation of an agreement for the reduction of all kinds of barriers to trade."

"This agreement," he continued, "would of course be submitted to the Congress for its consideration," an assurance that has never been borne out since the evolvement of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT.

Among those serving on the Special Committee on Relaxation of Trade Barriers was Harry Dexter White. Alger Hiss served on the Special Committee on Petroleum.

Earlier, on April 5, 1944, President Roosevelt created an Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy, with Acheson, White, and Lauchlin Currie of the Executive Office of the President as initial members.

An additional committee established in this period was an Interdivisional Committee on Problems of Overall Economic Organization, with Mr. Charles P. Taft, then Director of the Office of Wartime Economic Matters, State Department, as Chairman. The Committee served during the spring of 1944 within the Department's preparatory function, and was specifically concerned with the possible establishment of "the international commission of technical experts in the economic field," to quote the State Department.

"It was also concerned," the State Department adds, "with the formulation of proposals for permanent economic organization to accompany those being developed in the political field for the maintenance of peace and security."

However, it was the executive committee created April 5, 1944, which submitted the document "Proposals for the Expansion of World Trade and Employment" which was the forerunner of GATT. Harry Dexter White, V. Frank Coe, and Harold Glasser were among those who participated in preparation of this document, representing the Treasury Department.

"Proposals" called for setting up ITO. On December 15, 1945, the executive branch announced that it was following up the document by inviting 15 other countries, including the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, to prepare projects for consideration at an international conference on trade and employment.

In February 1946, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, on motion of the United States, undertook to sponsor such a conference, setting up a preparatory committee to arrange for a conference to be held in London in October 1946. V. Frank Coe, Harold Glasser, and Victor Perlo of the Treasury Department were members of this preparatory committee.

The preparatory committee recommended procedures for carrying through the negotiations in such a way as to give effect, according to Tariff Commission Report 160, "to certain provisions of the charter of the International Trade Organization by means of a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade."

Tariff negotiations were conducted at Geneva from April to October 1947, as part of the second session of the preparatory committee for a United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment. GATT was born at this Geneva session, and included many provisions identical with those of a Geneva draft of a proposed charter for an International Trade Organization.

Representatives of 56 nations met in Habana, Cuba, in the late fall of 1947 and early spring of 1948, there drafting a Habana charter for an International Trade Organization. The first formal session of GATT was held at Habana at the conclusion of the ITO sessions, but meanwhile, on December 16, 1947, President Truman proclaimed that GATT would be placed in effect by the United States as of January 1, 1948. Other nations entering GATT at that time were Belgium, Canada, Cuba, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

ITO was submitted to the Congress in 1949 but was not reported out by committees of either the House or Senate. GATT has not been submitted to the Congress. GATT, however, included provisions identical with or similar to provisions in the ITO Charter. Similarly or duplication between ITO and GATT provisions is spelled out in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee held February 17 through 23, 1949.

Thus GATT survives although its twin, ITO, was still-born, and it survives because the State Department prefered to withhold it from Congress after ITO was scuttled, basing their participation in GATT on the Trade Agreements Act. Even at this late date, the State Department declines to lay the substantive provisions of GATT before the Congress.

The State Department has agreed, however, to submit to the Congress a new international trade organization to be called the Organization for Trade Cooperation. OTC contains clauses and language similar to provisions and language in the ITO Charter, which the Congress declined to approve. OTC also is prefaced with what it refers to as "objectives" which to all intents and purposes duplicate the objectives of the Habana charter for ITO. The purported purpose of OTC is to supervise GATT.

Rejection of H. R. 1 will end the controversy over GATT. It will also end the authority under which the executive branch presumes to participate in GATT. Withdrawal from GATT is essential to the restoration of our commercial and economic independence.

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY QUESTION

GATT's powers over the Nation's trade and economy, which H. R. 1 would continue, are being challenged at the present time in the United States courts as unconstitutional.

The Glassware Guild, Inc., of Morgantown, W. Va., which has been seriously injured by imports of glassware from foreign countries, including several Communist countries behind the Iron Curtain, is plaintiff in the suit.

The complaint contends that GATT and GATT-prescribed tariff rates and duties are "illegal, unlawful, and of no effect," and are "violative of the supreme taxing authority of Congress, the treatymaking powers of Congress, and the foreign-commerce regulating authority of Congress."

Plaintiff further alleges that GATT is an "unconstitutional and unlawful attempt by the President to exercise power and authority not delegated to him in the Federal Constitution for the purpose of limiting certain powers delegated exclusively to Congress and transferring said powers to an international administrative agency neither recognized by the Congress nor approved by the people's elected Representatives."

The suit is now pending before the Federal courts, and a decision on it when made will have far-reaching importance on industries throughout the United States subject to foreign competition or facing the threat of foreign competition.

Congress should withhold action on H. R. 1 until the Supreme Court has rendered an ultimate decision in this case.

Constitutionality of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act likewise is challenged in this suit, and for the first time since the Trade Agreements Act was enacted.

However, constitutionality of the act has been seriously questioned since its inception.

In the 73d Congress, 10 of the 23 members of the Ways and Means Committee termed the trade agreements bill unconstitutional and un-American. Their reasons for this view are set forth in House Report No. 1000 of the 73d Congress. However the act was passed, proponents arguing that it was an emergency measure of temporary duration.

The minority contended that the bill "delegates to the President's discretionary legislative power in tariffmaking and thereby provides for an unconstitutional delegation of the supreme taxing power of Congress contrary to * * * fundamental provisions of the Constitution."

It cited article I, section 1, of the Constitution providing that all legislative powers therein granted shall be vested in the Congress; section 8 providing that Congress shall have power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises," and to "regulate commerce with foreign nations," and article II, lodging the executive power of the Government in the President, and the judicial power in the Supreme Court.

The minority report also stated correctly that the Supreme Court has many times held that, under this division of powers, it is a breach of the Constitution for Congress to delegate its legislative powers to the Executive. It also pointed out that the 1934 trade agreements bill constituted an unprecedented delegation of authority, and cited numerous Supreme Court decisions to prove it unprecedented.

Subsequent to enactment of the Trade Agreements Act the Supreme Court also held delegation by Congress of legislative powers to the executive branch to be unconstitutional in several notable decisions, among them that in *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388, 421), and *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *U. S.*, the famous NIRA or Blue Eagle case (295 U. S. 495, 529).

The Supreme Court ruled that "the Congress manifestly is not permitted to abdicate, or to transfer to others, the essential legislative functions with which it is thus vested."

The Congress may authorize administrative officers, or the President, to fill in the details of legislation, but in so doing the Congress must fix a primary standard to guide the administrative officers in carrying out the details of a law.

The limit to which Congress may go in delegating legislative making powers to the executive is set out in *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *U. S.*:

"Congress cannot delegate legislative powers to the President to exercise an unfettered discretion."

Possibly the latest expression on this constitutional question comes from Chief Judge John J. Parker, of the Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals who said in the case of *U. S.* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.*, decided April 15, 1953, in that court:

"While the President has certain inherent powers under the Constitution such as the power pertaining to his position as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and the power necessary to see that the laws are faithfully executed, the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce is not among the powers incident to the Presidential office, but is expressly vested by the Constitution in the Congress."

Further in his decision Judge Parker cited the Supreme Court decision in the steel seizure case of *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer*, in which the Court stated:

"In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. The first section of the first article say that 'all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.'"

Further in his decision, Judge Parker said:

"Imports from a foreign country are foreign commerce subject to regulation, so far as this country is concerned, by Congress alone."

Today GATT regulates our foreign commerce, and H. R. 1 would underwrite GATT's operations for 3 more years. The question then, is whether the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and H. R. 1 violate the Constitution.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 attempts to delegate to the President, to exercise in his absolute discretion, all of the legislative authority possessed by Congress in article I, section 8, of the Constitution. The only limitation on this total delegation in the original act is a provision that existing duties might not be varied more than 50 percent, and the only limitations in H. R. 1 are percentage limitations.

As stated earlier in these minority views, the authority which the Congress attempted to delegate in the Trade Agreements Act, has been to all effects redelegated to the State Department, which in turn had redelegated much of it to GATT, an international organization in no way regulated by or answerable to the Congress.

There is no thought or wish on the part of the signer of these individual views of attempting to prejudge the decision of the Federal courts or the Supreme Court in this important litigation. Nor should there be a wish or attempt by the majority of the Senate Finance Committee or of the Senate to in effect prejudice the decision by action on H. R. 1 prior to a determination by the Supreme Court of the constitutionality of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and on the constitutionality of executive branch acceptance of rules and rates laid down by GATT.

The question of constitutionality certainly should be resolved before any action is taken on this legislation in the United States Senate.

THE FICTION OF "RECIPROCAL TRADE"

H. R. 1 would extend a trade program that is not "reciprocal," never has been reciprocal, and never was intended to be reciprocal. No reciprocity has ever been achieved, either through the bilateral trade-agreements program of 1934 to 1947, or the multilateral program since 1947 under GATT. There is no reciprocity in GATT and none is intended.

Testimony was presented to the Senate Finance Committee during hearings on H. R. 1 that the following countries have recently increased tariff rates:

Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ecuador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, Uruguay, and West Germany.

The United States has trade agreements with Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Ceylon, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Haiti, India, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Union of South Africa, Guatemala, United Kingdom, and Uruguay, and all of them except Guatemala are covered by trade agreements made through GATT.

In contrast to tariff increases made by these nations the United States has decreased tariff rates 68 percent since 1937, and more than 55 percent of our imported commodities enter free from any duties at all.

This fact was confirmed by the Committee for Economic Development in November of last year. In a United States tariff policy statement the committee said:

"Only a part of our imports are subject to tariffs or import restrictions.

"Of the total annual imports of approximately $10.8 billion in 1951, some $6 billion consisted of products which enter free of duty or quota restrictions.

"The rest—some $4.8 billion annually—were subject to tariff duty or import quotas.

"This $4.8 billion included some $2.5 billion of finished or semifinished manufactures, $1.8 billion of them agricultural products, and $500 million of metals and minerals. Of this $4.8 billion of imports, however, only about $3 billion were subject to import quotas or to tariffs sufficiently high to have an appreciable effect on the volume of imports. This $3 billion consisted for the most part of agricultural products and finished manufactures."

Tariffs in nearly every trading nation of the world are higher than those in the United States. Examples of foreign tariff rates include:

Cotton manufactures: United Kingdom, 15 to 30 percent; Germany, up to 30 percent; Italy, 15 to 25 percent; Indonesia, 18 to 30 percent; Canada, 15 to 27½ percent.

Synthetic textiles: France, 20 to 35 percent; Italy, 25 percent; Norway, 22 percent; Belgium, 24 percent; and India, 50 percent.

Grains: France, 15 to 30 percent; Germany, 15 to 20 percent; Italy, 25 to 30 percent; Sweden, 10 to 15 percent.

Machinery: Britain, 10 to 25 percent, when it can be imported at all, and which, as will be presently shown, is rarely permitted to be imported and is subject to other types of restrictive barriers; France, up to 30 percent; Italy, 5 to 40 percent; and Japan, 15 to 30 percent.

Automobiles: India, 63 percent; United Kingdom, 33⅓ percent; Japan, 30 to 40 percent; France, 15 to 30 percent.

In addition to tariffs most of the trading countries impose restrictions and controls by which they limit or ban the import of United States goods into their markets.

THE FOREIGN BARRIERS TO AMERICAN TRADE

These barriers include manipulated currencies and currency shutoffs, import licenses, quotas and cartels, empire preference curbs, and exchange permits.

The United Kingdom, principal beneficiary of Amercan aid, and a major beneficiary of United States trade concessions, bars many American-made products from its markets entirely and imposes rigid restrictions on all others except a few raw materials and foodstuffs.

The British rule in general is that no American manufactures, such as machinery, may be imported into England if such products are being made at all in the United Kingdom. Import licenses are denied for all such imports except "token" shipments on a very few commodities.

Britain grants preferential tariff rates mainly free, to products of the British Commonwealth shipped or consigned directly to the United Kingdom, but these preferential rates in no case apply to products of the United States. American products pay the highest rate or are banned entirely.

Import duties are payable in British currency, and the rate of exchange for the conversion of foreign values is the current selling rate in the United Kingdom. By devaluating the pound, as it has done in the past, Britain can automatically raise its barriers to United States trade.

As of February 14, 1953, the Department of Commerce advised; with respect to British trade barriers and restrictions:

1. Licensing and exchange controls are maintained on about half of dollar imports, while over 80 percent of trade with European countries is free from any restriction. Quotas are set for some key dollar products.

2. Licenses covering dollar products are usually granted only for goods considered essential to the domestic (i. e., British) economy, and which are not alternately obtainable from domestic or soft currency sources.

3. The British Government announced in late June 1954 that it would give more favorable consideration from then on to applications for licenses to import dollar machinery provided the machinery in question would reduce cost, and provided no nondollar alternatives were available.

In other words, if Britain could get machinery from any other country than the United States, import licenses would be denied for the importation of machinery from this dollar country.

Britain has sold millions of dollars worth of machinery to the United States for use in Government projects in America, paid for by the American taxpayers. Similar American products are barred from England.

"Britain industrial output index reaches highest point on record," the United States

Department of Commerce reported on January 3, 1955. "Unemployment amounted to only 1 percent of the labor force," it adds.

England has achieved this record not through reciprocal trade but through protection, high tariffs, curbs on imports of American products, manipulation of exchanges, and gift dollars and contracts from the United States paid for by American taxpayers.

H. R. 1 would further benefit the United Kingdom by reducing tariffs on her products at further cost to American taxpayers, workingmen, and investors.

As a gesture toward the United States, possibly in its bid for reduced tariffs here and extension of the trade-agreements program, Great Britain did, some months ago, agree to admit 650 American-made automobiles "on trial," the imports subject, of course, to British duties and taxes, bringing the price of an American Chevrolet to approximately $6,000.

This was obviously a propaganda gesture. Britain, during 1954, exported 25,889 new cars valued at $34,147,665 to the United States, and used cars and parts totaling another $2.5 million in value. The tariff rate on automobiles imported into the United States from Britain is 10 percent. The British rate, excluding taxes and other charges, on cars imported from the United States is 33⅓ percent. On cars imported from British Commonwealth countries it is 22½ percent.

British leaders, such as R. A. Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer, have been ardent proponents of reduced tariff barriers for the United States, while raising prohibitive trade barriers against American products reaching the British Isles.

The British are not alone. Of the 33 foreign nations in GATT, 26 impose barriers on imports from the United States by requiring import licenses to be obtained by prospective importers of American goods. As the Department of Commerce puts it:

"These regulations (import licenses and exchange permits) apply primarily to goods of United States origin and to other goods payable in United States dollars."

GATT members employing these barriers against United States trade after 22 years of concessions by the United States are—

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Ceylon, Chila, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Government of Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, and Uruguay.

Exchange permits also are required in many of these countries, either as separate documents or combined with the import license.

Countries not members of GATT which require import licenses or exchange permits, or both, on imports from the United States, after 22 years of trade concessions made to them under the trade agreements program which H. R. 1 would extend, are—

Anglo-Egyptian Sudan; Aden, Bahrein, Qatar, and Trucial Oman on the Arabian Peninsula; Argentina, the Belgian Congo, Bolivia, British Colonies, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, French overseas territories, East Germany, Hashemite Jordan, Hong Kong, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Korea, Laos, Lebanon, Federation of Malaya, Mexico Morocco (French zone) and Morocco (Spanish zone), Netherlands West Indies, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Portugese colonies, Rumania, Singapore, Spain, Spanish colonies, Surinam, Switzerland, Syria, Formosa, Thailand, U. S. S. R., and Viet Nam.

Countries which have neither import licenses nor exchange permits, or in which such restrictive devices and controls apply only to some commodities, are Saudi Arabia, commodities); Cuba (excepting wheat, flour, Arabian peninsula, Canada (except for a few commodities; Cuba (excepting wheat, flour, rice, tires and tubes, red and pink beans, potatoes, condensed milk and butter); El Salvador, French Somaliland, Greece (excepting luxury items); Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Panama (excepting commodities under quotas); Tangier, Peru, the Philippines, Sweden (except automobiles, coal, and certain agricultural products); Venezuela (except approximately 25 tariff or quota items), and Yugoslavia, which licenses firms to carry on its import business instead.

Thus it is obvious that most of the trading nations of the world, whether or not they are members of GATT, have erected barriers against products of the United States, and have erected them since the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which H. R. 1 would continue, came into operation.

While America has reduced tariffs to low and ineffectual levels, other nations have imposed devices with which they can and do shut out American products entirely.

Their program appears: Free trade for the United States; protection for the rest of the world, excepting such remote and impoverished areas as Yemen, French Somaliland, and Tangier.

The Trade Agreements Act, by the record, has not expanded America's export markets. The markets have, in fact, been reduced during the 22 years the act has been on our statute books.

The Trade Agreements Act has not achieved concessions to balance the increasing restrictions and bans placed by foreign nations.

The Trade Agreements Act is in no way reciprocal.

It is an act to increase imports of foreign products from low wage, low living standard nations, not one of which pays wages one-third as high as those in the United States, and some of which pay wages one-ninth of ours.

H. R. 1 will extend the Trade Agreements Act, and for that reason, it, too, is a bill to increase imports at the expense of the American workingman, investor, and taxpayer.

GATT, which H. R. 1 would continue regardless of whether it ever comes before the Congress, is not reciprocal. It is discriminatory against the United States and any other country which may achieve a favorable balance of payments in its foreign trade.

GATT imposes high-sounding rules to apply to prospering nations; nullifies them with respect to any and all nations which presently are not enjoying equal prosperity.

GATT proposes under article XI that no restrictions other "than duties, taxes, or other charges, whether made effective through quotas, import or export licenses or other measures, shall be instituted or maintained by any contracting party on the importation of any product of the territory."

Article XII, however, grants exceptions to this rule to any GATT member which wishes to "safeguard its external financial position and balance of payments." Such countries may "restrict the quantity or value of merchandise permitted to be imported."

As the State Department puts it: "Notwithstanding the general rule against the use of import restrictions in article XI, this article permits a contracting party to impose import restrictions to safeguard its external financial position and balance of payments; that is, to forestall the imminent threat of a serious decline in its monetary reserves, or, if the country has very low reserves, to achieve a reasonable rate of increase in its reserves."

Article XIV and article XX contain other exceptions.

In other words, GATT imposes rules on the United States and what few other GATT members may enjoy a favorable balance of payments, but lifts them on any members who can, through manipulation of exchanges or otherwise, claim an unfavorable balance of payments, or even profess a threat to a decline in their monetary reserves.

Such countries may also continue, or apply, discriminatory restrictions when they affect only "a small part of a country's trade and the benefits derived by the country substantially outweigh any injury to another country"; when they are to assist a country "where economy has been disrupted by war"; when they are applied by countries having a common quota in the International Monetary Fund; when they are equivalent to restrictions authorized by the "scarce currency" provisions of the fund agreement; and when they are applied "under specific preferential arrangements existing in the United Kingdom."

Every member of GATT except the United States and possibly Canada thus have an "out" to continue restrictions, controls, and preferential arrangements, and as listed earlier in this report most of the GATT members are applying them.

The United States, enjoying a high standard of living and maintaining high production levels, is the victim of GATT's rules, and will continue to be the victim until our economy is reduced to a "scant currency" and adverse payments balance basis, so long as the Trade Agreements Act remain in force.

H. R. 1 in extending the Trade Agreements Act for 3 more years will extend the life of GATT for 3 more years. Rejection of H. R. 1 will mean the death of GATT, and the end of this international control over the Nation's economy and international restrictions against America's export trade.

Rejection of H. R. 1 by the Congress will remove control over our foreign commerce, duties, and tariffs from an international aggregation of 33 foreign nations and the United States which meets in foreign lands, and in which the foreign nations have rigged the rules to our disadvantage.

Rejection of H. R. 1 will restore the regulation of tariffs and the foreign commerce to the Congress, as provided by the Constitution, article I, section 8.

Rejection of H. R. 1 will liberate the Nation from GATT and restore our national economic independence.

WHO H. R. 1 WILL BENEFIT

H. R. 1 will help the foreign producer and work injury on the American producer here at home.

The foreign producer, as Willaim McKinley told the 50th Congress, "has no right or claim to equality with our own. He is not amenable to our laws. He performs no civil duties—he is subject to no demands for military service. He is exempt from State, county, and municipal obligations. He contributes nothing to the support, the progress and the glory of the Nation."

GATT grants the foreign producer not equality, but superiority over his American competitor.

H. R. 1 will enable GATT to continue that discrimination, and will continue the subservience of our National Government to an international authority sitting in Geneva, in which no American producer has a voice, and over which the Congress has no vestige of control.

For the above reasons; for the reason that my home State of Nevada and the States of California, Utah, and Idaho have passed resolutions opposing H. R. 1, and for the reasons advanced by the many industry and labor organizations, spokesmen, and leaders who have testified before the Senate Finance Committee or have written or telegraphed me in opposition to H. R. 1, I oppose H. R. 1 and any extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

I do so with the full conviction that the continuation of the act by H. R. 1 is adverse to the interests of the United States, its industries, and its people.

ONE-WORLD WAGE AND LIVING STANDARD FREE-TRADERS GOAL

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the International Trade Organization, the Organization for Cooperation, and so forth, can lead only to a one-world wage and a one-world living standard, with 160 million Americans sharing their savings and earnings with the other 3¼ billion other persons of the globe.

That is what we are headed for if we continue to support every free-trade and one-world scheme to share our wealth, our resources, and our markets with the rest of the world. Our own living standards will be reduced to the world average, if 160 million Americans continue to pour their wealth and resources into the pot with 3¼ million other people. Anyone who tries to think that through will see the result.

I again say that the principle of reciprocal trade as enunciated, first, by George Washington, then by Lincoln, and later by McKinley, was on a basis of equality. It can be no other way. It presupposes equal living standards such as the 48 States hoped to and did bring about through free trade among themselves. It was necessary in that case because of the one-nation organization.

But to adopt that principle and say that we intend to bring up the living standards of more than 3 billion other people with the resources of 160 million Americans, is simply the echo of a mental aberration which lasted two decades, and is still continuing to a certain extent.

CHOICE IS BETWEEN PRESERVING OUR STANDARDS OR LOWERING THEM TO WORLD LEVEL

Of course, everyone would like to see the living standards of the whole world raised; but as things stand today, we must make our choice. We must make up our minds whether we intend to maintain our own standard of living while we assist foreign nations to raise theirs through a flexible duty or tariff, as we have come to call it, operated under the Constitution of the United States, through the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, which can lower tariffs or duties as the Nation's chief competitive nation on each product raises its living standards; or whether we are going to throw everything into the same pot and mix it up at one time. That is what we must make up our minds about now.

What did President McKinley say on this particular point? He said, and I quote:

> Free trade in the United States is founded upon a community of equalities and reciprocities. It is like the unrestrained freedom and reciprocal relations and obligations of a family. Here we are one country, one language, one allegiance, one standard of citizenship, one flag, one Constitution, one Nation, one destiny.
>
> It is otherwise with foreign nations, each a separate organism, a distinct and independent political society, organized for its own, to protect its own, and work out its own destiny.
>
> We deny to those foreign nations free trade with us upon equal terms with our own producers. The foreign producer has no right or claim to equality with our own. He is not amenable to our laws. There are resulting upon him none of the obligations of citizenship. He pays no taxes. He performs no civil duties—he is subject to no demands for military service. He is exempt from State, county, and municipal obligations. He contributes nothing to the support, the progress, and glory of the Nation.
>
> Why should he enjoy unrestrained equal privileges and profits in our markets with our producers, our labor, and our taxpayers?

AMERICAN FLAG SHOULD ALWAYS FLY ABOVE ALL OTHERS

That is what we are and what we have today, Mr. President; I hope it will continue to be so.

Mr. President, Congress passed an act that the American flag should fly above all other flags. A century ago, or two generations ago, we would have been considered crazy to have thought it necessary for Congress to pass an act that the American flag should fly above all other flags. But we are proving every day in the Senate that anything can happen in this country.

ADOPTION OF CONFERENCE REPORT MEANS FURTHER DIVISION OF WEALTH AND MARKETS

In closing, I would only say that with the adoption of the conference report this afternoon, we will have made the decision to divide the wealth of our own country, the United States, with that of the world, through the most-favored-nation clause and through the GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—and multilateral trade treaties, which have never been submitted to the Senate for approval, and never will be, unless Congress comes to its senses and reverses its course.

It is my firm opinion that while the adoption of the conference report and the signing of the act by the President will extend the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, nevertheless, long before that time Congress will again take up the question, because the people of the Nation are awakening. They are beginning to understand that they can no longer depend upon a subservient Congress to carry out their will.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 O'CLOCK TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have asked unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

STATUS OF VISA APPLICATIONS UNDER THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee on refugees, escapees, and expellees, I am again presenting the figures from the Department of State statistical report dated June 10, 1955, showing the most recent figures of the status of visa applications under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Public Law 203, 83d Congress.

On June 3, when I made my report, I was delighted to tell the Senate that 1,267 visas had been issued between the period May 20 to May 27. The figures I am going to give now cover the period May 27 to June 10. During that period a total of 2,040 visas have been issued. This is at the rate of 1,020 per week. From this figure it must be inferred that either the assurances are not coming in fast enough or else the State Department is not processing these applications at the same rate of speed as during the preceding period. The report date June 10, 1955, shows the distribution of the 33,959 visas issued as follows:

	Total issued
Italy	10,737
Greece	5,647
Netherlands	568
Germany	2,809
Austria	2,792
Far East	841
Others	65

I realize that it is always of interest to know how many of these 33,959 persons have actually taken advantage of the privilege of coming to the United States, and I am told that as of June 10, 1955, 22,478 persons have actually been admitted to the United States.

The law provides for the admission of 214,000. That law has only another year and a half left to run. So far, only 22,478 persons have actually been admitted.

Taking up the matter of orphans, under the provisions of Public Law 203, 4,000 orphans may be admitted. As of June 10, 1,124 orphan visas have been issued and 760 orphans have actually found homes with their adoptive parents in the United States.

It is quite obvious from the report that unless there is a marked change in getting persons to come into the United States, even though visas have been issued, sooner or later a request will be made for an extension of the act, because at the present rate the 214,000 will not come in before the act expires.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the textile workers of the South will long remember Geneva, Switzerland, June 8, 1955, as infamous, as we all remember Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

June 8, 1955, Mr. President, is the day the great Eisenhower giveaway administration sold the American textile industry and its thousands of workers down the river, and gave the Japanese textile

industrialists a stranglehold on the American cotton textile market.

By signing the Japanese Trade Agreement, the one-world enthusiasts of the State Department, at the direction of the President, paved the way for the destruction of the entire American textile industry. But, especially, they paved the road to destroy the textile industry in the South.

Once again, Mr. President, the Republican high command has ridden herd over the South, and has stabbed the textile workers in the back. In previous history, the Republicans imposed high tariffs to prevent the South from building up any trade or developing any industry. Today, now that we have industry, the administration is imposing low tariffs designed to destroy the southern textile jobs and industries which we have worked so hard to build up over the past 50 years.

And for whom, and for what? It is not to help anyone at home. New England, the other principal textile area of this Nation, is hurt by the Japanese agreement almost as much as the South.

Mr. President, it is for a foreign government, a government which was at war with us only 12 years ago. There are southern workers in southern textile industries who fought the very nation to whom we have been sold down the river by the Eisenhower State Department.

Think of it, Mr. President. There will be southern textile workers who fought for this country in World War II who will now lose their jobs because the Eisenhower administration has agreed to let the Japanese flood our American market with their cheap textile products.

The men who were once behind the guns may soon be in front of the unemployment compensation windows.

The Japanese agreement, which was signed on June 8, came in the waning hours of the life of the old Reciprocal Trade Act—one which Congress last year reluctantly extended for 1 year.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate at this time the fact that when the bill was before the Senate, my colleague at that time, the late Senator Maybank, and I both raised the question in regard to the proposed 50-percent reduction in the tariff on textiles at that particular conference in Geneva. We tried to get the reduction cut to one-third of that amount—16⅔—but lost on a rollcall vote. Thirty-four Senators voted for the amendment. I am glad to say that the Senator now presiding over the Senate [Mr. HOLLAND] voted with us on that amendment.

The President's State Department, when it signed the Japanese agreement last week, 3 days before the law expired, knew well the intent of Congress. By our action on this very floor, Mr. President, we let it be known that we wanted no authority to be given to any departmental bureaucrats to reduce our tariffs any more than 15 percent over a 3-year period.

But in the late hours of a hurried foreign conference to beat the gun and congressional intent, Eisenhower's tariff experts agreed to a 50-percent reduction in one fell swoop.

Mr. President, under the law used by the Eisenhower administration to reach the Japanese agreement, the President of the United States was authorized to direct the State Department to negotiate such treaties.

Mr. John Foster Dulles is President Eisenhower's Secretary of State. He told his State Department staff at Geneva what to sign and what not to sign. The President knew what was going on. He naively told Congress a few short weeks ago that he had no intention of taking any action to hurt any American industry, and then he blandly directed the signing of the Japanese giveaway agreement.

Mr. President and Senators, it is obvious who is to blame for this Japanese Treaty—a treaty which was entered into without any vote by the Senate, but which has been criticized so much on the floor. It is obvious who is to blame for this sellout of the American textile industry. It is Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, who directed the entire Geneva fiasco.

This Geneva Conference—this Japanese agreement, or reciprocal trade agreement, or what have you—has granted the Japanese textile industry an additional 1½ cent a yard preference over the American industry on the American market. It affects over 80 percent of everything manufactured by the American textile industry, nearly 90 percent of everything manufactured by the southern textile workers, and nearly 100 percent of everything manufactured by the textile workers of my State, South Carolina.

Mr. President, during the past few days, while this bill (H. R. 1) for renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements legislation has been under consideration by the conference committee, the announcement of the Japanese trade agreement has created a major crisis in the operations and programs of the textile industry of the United States. I repeat, Mr. President, that while Congress was deliberating on H. R. 1, and while efforts were being made to strengthen the new bill with certain vitally needed safeguards for the protection of important American industries which are particularly vulnerable to coolie-wage foreign competition, even at that time, the Geneva negotiations were in progress. At that time, no one outside the State Department had any way of knowing what the Geneva decisions would be.

This is one of the basic reasons why I shall oppose H. R. 1 and all proposed legislation like it. I think the time has come for Congress to insist on exercising its authority and what I think to be its obligation—that is, Mr. President, to renew its constitutional responsibility of voting its approval or disapproval of proposed foreign trade and economic agreements.

While the Geneva negotiations were in progress, Mr. President, we of the Congress—especially those of us who represent regions where textile manufacturing is the mainstay of the local economic and social structure—did have two important assurances: We knew that thousands of men and women and the business and civic leadership of our regions demanded equitable treatment for the textile industry, in order to prevent further losses of markets, further losses of income, and further losses of mill employment. We also knew that from the White House itself had come positive assurance that no American industry would be placed in jeopardy as a result of the trade-agreement negotiations.

Despite the will of the countless American people, despite the wishes of many Members of this Congress, and in spite of the pledge publicly made by the White House, the worst happened at Geneva, Mr. President. In secret proceedings, to which the White House delegates were a party, the Geneva Conference decreed tariff reductions which strike a crippling blow at the textile industry and threaten the job security of 1,250,000 textile workers. The worst, Mr. President—the impossible—has happened.

In making public the Geneva agreement, the State Department stated that moderate textile tariff concessions were granted on some carefully selected items. The fact is, Mr. President, that those carefully selected items cover a great majority of the textile industry's output; and the severity of the tariff cuts is anything but moderate. Carefully selected they were, indeed—by the White House freetrading administration. Mr. President, I am not surprised. It seems that our State Department looks after the welfare of everyone but the people of the United States.

Here is only one example of what was done: Tariff reductions of 48 percent were imposed on the entire range of fabrics made from yarns, in numbers from thirties to fifties. That range of fabrics includes printcloths—the basic, bread-and-butter production of most textile mills in my State of South Carolina. In fact, Mr. President, 60 percent of the Nation's production of printcloth is manufactured in South Carolina. Mr. President, I repeat that 60 percent of the Nation's production of printcloth is manufactured in South Carolina. The range also includes many kinds of broadcloths, twills—such as are used for military uniforms—poplins, oxfords, and so on—types of cloth from which are drawn the fabric material that clothes a good three-quarters of all the people in the United States.

The Geneva tariff reductions on these standard staple goods are so drastic, Mr. President, as to be actually greater than the average net profit margin of South Carolina mills producing those fabrics.

Let me point out again, Mr. President, that it will be found that in 1950 the textile industry was, on the average, making a profit of 5 percent, after taxes. But in 1954, the danger point had been reached, for the industry was then reduced to an average profit of 1 percent, after taxes. So we can readily see what the program now coming on will mean to the United States textile industry.

I am told that in terms of actual prices, the duty reductions on these basic cloth constructions amount to from three-quarters of a cent to 1½ cents a yard. This fact raises an impossible

problem in an industry in which only one-eighth of a cent a yard in price generally makes the difference between sales and no business, between orders and idle mills, between profits and losses.

Keep in mind, Mr. President, that these devastating tariff reductions were imposed for the direct benefit of the textile industry of Japan. This was the intention, and was so stated publicly. The unthinkable thing about it is that the very products we are talking about—the great basic fabrics which represent by far the largest volume of manufacturing operations in the textile industry, those in South Carolina included—are the same types which Japan is now shipping in increasing amounts to the United States.

As we consider putting this measure to a vote, Mr. President, let all of us be sure of what we are doing. What has happened to the textile industry, which can very well lead to consequences disastrous beyond calculation, is a very painful and ugly example of what we are being asked to sanction in the future—without recourse or control—if this measure is enacted.

I know that some will say there would be a possible recourse if the textile industry were suddenly to crash into a depression. That recourse, it is argued, is the escape clause and peril-point provision of the law. This provision may give relief in the long run. But what will happen in the intervening months during the escape-clause proceedings? What will happen, Mr. President, to the thousands and thousands of textile workers who will be unemployed? What will happen to our shutdown textile mills?

Let me emphasize here, Mr. President, that there are 127,250 textile employees in South Carolina, working in 320 plants. These employees are 68 percent of all the industrial employees in South Carolina. Their salaries are 71 percent of the total annual industrial wages paid in South Carolina.

Even if relief were sought, it would take 9 months at least for a finding, and another 2 months for action, should the President condescend to act. He may not wish to act, and he is not bound to do so. Also, how long after such possible relief action—should the President decide to take it—would it take the American market to drain off the flood of foreign products? How long would it take to restore normalcy in our textile workers' homes and in our textile plants? Longer, I am afraid, Mr. President, than it took the State Department to negotiate this economic nightmare, and certainly longer than it took them to sign it.

It is ridiculous to think that the administration has created a Frankenstein trade agreement that will take longer to save American workers and industry from destruction than it does to destroy them.

I am well aware, Mr. President, that there are those in this Chamber who will try, and have tried, to minimize the textile industry's alarm over the direction in which this Government's trade policy is drifting. We have heard on this floor the criticisms, and we have heard the question asked, more than once, why does the textile industry become so excited about a comparatively small amount of foreign imports when it enjoys a larger volume of exports and thus realizes a net export balance?

It is important to nail that one down right now, Mr. President, not only so far as the textile industry is concerned, but also insofar as the same situation may exist for countless other American industries. On the one hand, the amount of imports in a given period of time is no indication whatsoever of how much more there may be behind those imports. A case in point is the textile-import picture. The public press reported only yesterday, speaking of cloth coming to the United States from Japan, that "actual shipments so far, plus new bookings on hand, already are larger than the postwar high of 49 million yards shipped to the United States in all of 1954."

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, reports made officially by the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry as to orders placed with Japanese textile manufacturers by United States importers indicate a rate of shipment to this country during 1955 considerably heavier than the prewar peak of 125 million yards in 1937. At that time it was Japanese imports which touched off the deepest depression the American textile industry has ever known. At that time the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, recognized the danger and, after a long-drawn-out survey by the Tariff Commission, he recommended an increase in customs duties on Japanese textile imports, which President Roosevelt put into effect. How different the picture is today with the so-called business administration in the saddle.

On the export side of the picture—that is, the sales of American-made textiles overseas—it is telling only a half-truth to point at the 600,000,000 yards of goods shipped abroad by American mills in 1954. The whole truth is that thousands of American jobs have been lost because American textile exports have declined seriously—by a full 1 billion yards since 1947, during the lifetime of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. That is why I am alarmed. By abusing and exploiting the machinery of GATT, by taking advantage of every concession, every exemption, and every loophole, most foreign competitor countries are capturing the overseas markets of the United States textile industry. That is why the textile workers of the South and New England are alarmed.

And now, thanks to the sellout at Geneva, these foreign countries stand ready to take over the home markets here in the United States. I should think anyone in this body should be alarmed, Mr. President.

This is not reciprocity; this is a giveaway of American markets, of American earnings, of American jobs. We have heard a good deal, Mr. President, about foreign trade being a two-way street. Let me say that true reciprocity in order to work justly and healthily must also be a two-way street, not a one-way road whereby the United States does all the giving and our friends overseas do all the taking. Yet that is what is asked of us, in the way GATT and State Department policy have been functioning under the reciprocal trade program. I, for one, refuse to vote in favor of any bill, no matter how well it has been improved, if it prolongs this kind of outrageous injustice for industries, like the textile industry, which have pioneered the growth of America, and my State of South Carolina.

Incidentally, I wonder, Mr. President, how many of us have had the opportunity to give detailed consideration to what the State Department's so-called experts decided to do at Geneva. I wonder if any of us can possibly understand the implications with respect to the entire economy of this Nation—to say nothing of the impending injury to the textile and cotton economies—or whether we have had time to realize the potential significance of the Geneva agreement. It seems to me each one of us ought to take a close look at the concessions granted to Japan; and we ought to take a good look, also, at the so-called concessions granted by Japan, before we act on this bill. I say this even though the damage has been done, and may be beyond repair, and may lie at this point outside the effects of the legislation now before us. But certainly, before we vote, we ought to make sure we do not repeat a bad mistake and compound the error.

Indeed, Mr. President, my conviction is that it is a wrongful abdication of our duty as Members of this Congress to permit our responsibilities in matters of trade and tariff to slip out of our control—out of the control which the Constitution itself gave to the Congress. I wish to urge, sir, that from this time forward any trade agreement, tariff concession, or similar grant or acceptance of economic aid in any form, negotiated between the United States and another nation or nations, be made subject to approval of the Senate before effectuated.

While I have spoken at some length about the textile industry, since I am very familiar with it, I am certain there are other industries which have been similarly stunned by the action at Geneva. I am certain there are other industries which are struggling against unequal odds owing to unsound grants of trade concessions at previous conferences of GATT. These are American industries, geared to American costs, American wages, American living standards, yet because of the raw materials they utilize, the universal and worldwide nature of their machinery and manufacturing operations, they find themselves in direct competition with foreign industries employing cheap-wage workers. Many of these industries—and again textile manufacturing is an example—can no longer be classed as high-tariff protected industries. Like textiles, they have undergone a series of tariff reductions during the more than two decades of reciprocity. They are quickly reaching the point, or may already be there right now, where tariffs are no longer adequate to provide safeguards against loss of home markets.

If these industries are to be preserved, if they are to keep in operation and continue providing jobs for American men and women, it seems to me the Members of this Congress should be devoting careful consideration to means other than tariff safeguards in order to prevent their disappearance. Our mission as public servants is to legislate for the prosperity, the welfare, and the happiness of the American people, not for a foreign country, and not for the surrender of jobs and security.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am going to vote against the conference report, and I ask the Senate to join me in rejecting it. Then let us start afresh and write a new bill which will include a firm stipulation that the Senate shall have the final and supreme authority to approve or reject any future trade and economic pacts with foreign countries.

In this way, Mr. President, we will be carrying out our constitutional duty to prevent any future Geneva-type agreements that would destroy American jobs and American industries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article published in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of June 11, 1955.

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

IKE BLASTED ON JAP TRADE AGREEMENTS

WASHINGTON, June 10.—Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON in all-out blast against the new Japanese trade agreements today accused the Eisenhower administration of having sold the southern textile industry down the river in typical Republican fashion.

President Eisenhower in directing the State Department to negotiate the new trade agreements has paved the way for the destruction of the southern textile industry and, at the same time, will carry favor with New England. The State Department's report on the agreements is a deliberate effort to deceive the southern industry and especially the textile worker. It is a boldfaced attempt to cover up the sellout.

The agreement gives the Japanese textile industry an additional 1½ cents per yard advantage over the American industry and affects more than 80 percent of the southern industry's production. Yet the State Department refers deceitfully to the moderate reductions of rates on some carefully selected cotton textile items. Certainly they are carefully selected. They are carefully selected by Sherman Adams and others of the free-trading White House ring as a sop to Republican big-business contributors who own plants and other interests overseas.

The President obviously has given no consideration to the fact that this Japanese trade agreement could shortly result in widespread unemployment in the southern textile industry.

An analysis of the concessions made to Japan reveals the President's complete lack of knowledge and understanding of his own utterances. When the reciprocal trade legislation (H. R. 1) was before the Congress, he assured the Republican leaders of the House in writing that he had no intentions of taking any action which would cause harm to any American industry.

Knowing full well that his generals and lieutenants in the White House and the State Department were dedicated to a giveaway of the American textile industry to the Japanese, I voted against the entire program. This is only the first step in a cleverly conceived sellout and I shall oppose the conference report when it is presented to the Senate next week just as vigorously as I opposed the bill originally.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the news release of the Department of State of June 9, 1955, and I should like to read from it, as follows:

At Geneva, Switzerland, on June 8, 1955, Assistant Secretary of State Samuel C. Waugh, under authorization of the President, signed an agreement containing the terms for the participation of Japan in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The agreement embodies the results of tariff negotiations involving Japan and 17 of the contracting parties to the general agreement, including the United States. The conclusion of the tariff negotiations, which began February 21, 1955, at Geneva, completes preparations for Japan's full participation in the general agreement and the prospect is that Japan will become a contracting party next September.

Note that, Mr. President. It will become a contracting party next September. It was necessary to adopt the agreement now, because if it were not done now the law would run out. I continue to read from the State Department news release:

This marks the completion of a project undertaken last year when the 1-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act was voted by the Congress and is a notable achievement for the foreign economic program of the United States.

As a result of the negotiations, the United States obtained very substantial benefits to its trade.

I should like to have someone point out where we gained anything. We have been giving all the way through.

In addition, Japanese participation in the general agreement will contribute to United States interests in a variety of other ways. Expansion of Japan's foreign trade, which participation in the Geneva agreement will promote, is essential if Japan is to have a sound, self-sustaining economy capable of providing adequate living standards for the Japanese people. By offering Japan expanded trade opportunities, participation in the general agreement also will give the Japanese people a concrete basis for continuing their alinement with the free world, thus lessening the danger of enforced Japanese economic dependence on Communist-dominated areas of the mainland of Asia.

I continue to read from another portion of the State Department's press release:

All United States duty reductions combined covered imports valued in 1954 at $81 million, while duty bindings or duty-free bindings were granted on a trade of $98 million. Among the concessions granted by the United States were moderate reductions of rates on some carefully selected cotton textile items, 2 bindings and 1 moderate reduction on tuna products, moderate reductions on certain kinds of earthenware and china, simple microscopes, some toys, and some chemicals, includng monosodium glutamate and various essential oils. All of the foregoing concessions were initially negotiated with Japan. United States concessions also included items covering a trade of about $3 million initially negotiated with third countries in connection with the triangular negotiations mentioned above.

Concessions granted by the United States to Japan and other countries did not cover all of the items which were listed in public notices issued last November and February and on which public hearings were held.

I hold in my hand a pamphlet entitled "Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. Minority Report. January 1954." It is a very excellent pamphlet, and I recommend that Senators read it. Even though Senators may vote to adopt the conference report today, it would still be educational for them to read the pamphlet, in order to find out just what we will face in the future as a result of the position we are taking today.

I also hold in my hand a pamphlet issued by the State Department. It is entitled "General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Analysis of Protocol—Including Schedules—for Accession of Japan. Analysis of Negotiations of Certain Tariff Concessions." In it I find pointed out some of the things which have been done. It appears that one of the industries which has been dealt with probably more severely than any other is the textile industry. Having so much of the textile industry in my own State, I invite the attention of the Presiding Officer, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] to the fact that his State will be in the same position my State will be in with regard to the tariff situation and the reduction that has been made by GATT. I hope it will not be as bad as I anticipate, but, as I see it, it constitutes almost a death stroke to the textile industry and would hurt the Senator's State and my State, Mr. President.

CIVIL RIGHTS IN OUR DEMOCRACY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a news story from the New York Times of May 29, 1955, reporting on the marked progress being made toward elimination of racial discrimination in the West. This news item reporting on a survey undertaken in 13 Far Western States is most reassuring because it reflects the marked decline in racial bias in our Nation and the growing realization that racial discrimination is incompatible with our democratic principles and with our aspirations for a wholesome, healthy American society.

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

MARKED DECLINE IN RACIAL BIAS IN FAR WEST REVEALED BY SURVEY

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, May 28.—While controversy seethes about desegregation in public schools below the Mason-Dixon line, unspectacular but marked progress is being made toward elimination of racial discrimination in the West.

This was indicated this week in a New York Times survey of interracial relations in 13 Far Western States.

In few sections of the West can it be said that all the principal minority groups—Negroes, Indians, and people of oriental and Spanish lineage—enjoy full equality with other people in public activities.

But in a few of the States and many localities the situation comes remarkably close to full equality. And there are widespread indications of steady improvement.

Among the 13 States, 8 legislatures in their current sessions have enacted measures aimed at reducing discrimination.

Washington strengthened its fair employment practices law and eliminated racial questions on drivers' license applications.

California outlawed discriminatory automobile insurance terms. This week, for the first time in many attempts, an FEPC bill won approval by the State assembly, although its enactment is considered unlikely.

Arizona passed an FEPC law covering public works only.

Wyoming repealed an old, unused statute that permitted Negro segregation in some public schools.

New Mexico and Montana both enacted measures ordering racial equality in places of public accommodation (hotels, restaurants, taverns, theaters, etc.), although they carried no enforcement machinery. Colorado strengthened its 4-year-old FEPC law.

North Dakota repealed a law against interracial marriage.

On the negative side, bills guaranteeing equality in places of public accommodation failed in Nevada and Arizona and measures to repeal bans on interracial marriage failed in Idaho and Colorado.

The survey found that:

Racial discrimination generally is worse in hinterland areas and small towns than in more developed districts.

In progressive areas first-class establishments, such as hotels and restaurants tend to take the lead in racial tolerance while the second-rate institutions cling to prejudicial treatment. In discriminatory areas the situation is the reverse.

Discrimination does not always go hand in hand with large minority populations. (In Nevada, where there are less than 10,000 Negroes, discrimination is much worse than in California, where there are more than 500,000.)

The West does not bear out the saying "You can't legislate tolerance." A State's statutory expressions on discrimination are not necessarily an indicator of actual conditions. But where efforts are made to enforce such laws, discrimination has lessened. And some of the most conspicuous progress against discrimination has been made in States where there has been strongest legislative pressure.

The 13 States contain about one-eighth of the Nation's population. The area has some 20 million people. In it are about 600,000 of the Nation's 15 million Negroes (as of the 1950 census), about half its Indians (some 200,000 of them) and about 180,000 people of Chinese and Japanese lineage. A large portion of the Nation's approximately 3 million "Spanish-speaking people" (of Spanish and Mexican lineage) are in this region.

The minority group population is distributed unevenly among the States. California has about 500,000 Negroes, while North Dakota has less than 1,000. Arizona has 70,000 Indians, Colorado less than 2,000.

Since World War II, people of Japanese and Chinese lineage, who in the west coast States used to be the targets of the most systematic discrimination, have moved into a status close to first-class citizenship.

The most regular victims of discrimination are Negroes. But it is also applied, occasionally with greater emphasis to Indians and Spanish-speaking people. The latter are habitually referred to in some districts deprecatingly as Mexicans, even though some are not even Mexican-Americans but are of Spanish descent.

Virtually the last vestiges of overt, sanctioned segregation in public schools in the region have been eliminated in the last few years.

In places of public accommodation, the situation ranges from general acceptance of nonwhites in Washington, with only occasional prejudice in small towns, to a degree of southern-style Jim Crowism in southern Arizona, where no Negroes allowed signs are displayed in restaurants.

Here is a State-by-State summary of salient features of the interracial situation:

WASHINGTON

The FEPC law, enacted in 1947, is administered by a five-member commission. It investigates discrimination complaints and can seek court injunctions. In practice, it has worked mainly by conciliation. It receives about one complaint a week and has never gone to court with a case. This year the commission was given power to reinstate workers discharged for racial reasons and to collect their back pay.

The 1953 public accommodations law provides for civil action by aggrieved parties and criminal action by prosecuting attorneys. One action of each type has been brought, resulting respectively in a $500 fine and a $50 fine.

OREGON

A 1951 FEPC act, administered by a special division of the State department of labor, has been applied generally through conciliation.

An equality-in-public-establishments law was adopted in 1953.

The influx of Negro shipyard workers in Portland, Oreg., in World War II led to some friction, but it has dwindled to almost the vanishing point.

Several years ago some Portland parents protested against sending their children to school with Negroes. School officials took a firm stand—including optional assignment of Negro teachers to all-white schools—and the complaining stopped.

CALIFORNIA

California has had a law prohibiting discrimination in public establishments since 1905, a civil service nondiscrimination law since 1945, and a public works FEPC law for several years. Up to this year no general FEPC bill got anywhere.

The public accommodations law provides civil penalties of $100 or more. It has been invoked many times with results.

The California attorney general, in connection with a controversial school blackface minstrel show last year, issued an opinion denouncing "any and all entertainments which for any reason reflect adversely on a citizen because of race, creed, or color."

ARIZONA

Arizona's new limited FEPC law makes it a misdemeanor for any State or local governmental subdivision or agency, or contractor to them, to discriminate in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

In contrast to the "little Dixie" atmosphere in some southern sections of the State, first-class hotels in central Arizona have accommodated nationally prominent Negro personalities. The State has a Negro legislator. But in Phoenix there is segregation in most of the leading movie theaters.

NEVADA

According to Franklyn Williams, regional director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, "Nevada is a misplaced Mississippi—a Negro can't even lose his money at the gambling spots." To rectify this situation, a group of Negroes, including Joe Louis, the former boxer, this week opened a multimillion-dollar casino hotel in Las Vegas, welcoming the patronage of all races.

Nevada has no antidiscrimination laws. The 5,000 Indians among its 200,000 inhabitants are subject to little if any public discrimination.

UTAH

About 70 percent of Utah's 700,000 inhabitants (5,000 of them are Negroes) are Mormons. According to Mormon doctrine, rooted in slavery days, Negroes are "black because of the curse put on Cain," and must do menial work and will never go to heaven. Many Mormons of the new generation are embarrassed by this bigotry, considering it in manifest conflict with Christian tenets of their faith. But little has been done about it legally.

Utah has no civil rights law or antidiscrimination law, except an old, inoperative statute forbidding hotels to discriminate against nonwhites. Both Marian Anderson, the singer, and Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat of Manhattan, have had trouble getting first-class hotel accommodations in Salt Lake City.

But there has been a general informal decrease in prejudice in Utah in recent years. Spanish-speaking people are no longer considered nonwhite in many communities. Negroes and Indians are increasingly numerous in Federal jobs. And Negro spokesmen report an easing in trade union membership barriers.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico has a dual Anglo-Spanish culture.

Spanish is a second legal language. In public life there are about as many people of one strain as the other, including the State's congressional delegation.

New Mexico adopted an FEPC law in 1949 and a public-accommodation law this year. Both lack enforcement provisions.

Discrimination against Negroes is so prevalent that, according to a correspondent, "it is as difficult to get a Negro a meal in Albuquerque, of 100,000 population, as it is in Ruidoso, a small mountain resort." In predominantly Anglo-Saxon southeastern New Mexico, near the Texas border, even Spanish-speaking white people and Indians from other parts of New Mexico are subject to considerable discrimination. Generally, however, the reception accorded Spanish-speaking people has improved greatly over pre-World War II days.

IDAHO

Idaho, with only 1,000 Negroes among its 590,000 population (1950 census) has no antidiscrimination laws. Most hotels and some restaurants refuse Negro patronage.

COLORADO

Colorado has an antidiscrimination law, adopted in 1895 and strengthened in 1935, providing civil penalties of $50 to $500. Actions must be instituted through district attorneys and their cooperation varies greatly from county to county. Discrimination in hotels and restaurants is most pronounced in certain towns of southern Colorado with large Spanish-speaking populations. Negroes and other nonwhites appear to be incidental victims. In Denver the situation is radically different. There Negroes are accepted to the point of being employed in good jobs in a wide variety of commercial enterprises.

Colorado's FEPC law, adopted in 1951, established a commission under the State industrial commission with power to issue cease-and-desist orders against employment discrimination by State agencies and subdivisions. It has conciliation authority in relation to private employers.

The 1955 amendments separated the discrimination commission from the industrial commission, broadened the definition of State agencies and applied the law to private contractors on public jobs. The law has never carried penalties and is administered mainly through conciliation.

WYOMING

Wyoming has no antidiscrimination laws except in education. Hotels, restaurants, and bars discourage Negro patronage. But, where a few years ago Negroes were admitted only to the balconies of smaller movie houses, theater segregation now has generally stopped.

MONTANA

In Montana, with its new penaltyless antidiscrimination law, hotels and restaurants

are still cool to Negro patronage. But traveling Negro athletic teams are now accepted at a leading hotel in Helena, the capital, whereas a few years ago they found accommodations hard to get.

NORTH DAKOTA

The North Dakota constitution calls for equality for all people. But there are no implementaing laws. A law against interracial marriage was repealed this year.

The patronage of both Negroes and Indians is generally discouraged by first-class hotels and restaurants. But the movement of some Indians to work in urban enterprises is tending to break down prejudice against them.

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota has no antidiscrimination laws, but Negroes and Indians are received in hotels, restaurants, and taverns generally without discrimination.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to add, Mr. President, to the encouraging news reported by the New York Times survey the information that my own State of Minnesota in this past session of the legislature adopted a bill to establish fair employment practices in our State. This is added evidence that the true spirit of America is a spirit of human equality.

These developments are a refreshing breath of fresh air in these days of controversy over the implementation of equal rights for all our citizens. The principle of human equality is the cornerstone of political democracy. Just so long as we tolerate conditions of second-class citizenship we weaken and jeopardize the fulfillment of the objectives and promise of a democratic society.

It is reassuring to see the steady progress which is being made in the guaranteeing of civil rights to all persons regardless of race, color, or creed. The force of events in the world and the spirit of liberal democracy at home places increased emphasis upon the urgency of eliminating all forms of discrimination, bigotry, and intolerance. The Supreme Court in its decisions declaring segregation in public schools unconstitutional and calling for integration has fortified the cause of civil rights in a most vital area.

In my judgment, there has been too much emotional talk by a small group of people who have been dissatisfied with the Supreme Court decision. The task of responsible American citizenship is to set about conscientiously and constructively to solve our Nation's social problems within the framework of our laws and our Constitution.

The fulfillment of the ideals and objectives of our Constitution requires dedication, perseverance, and courage. The test of statesmanship is the subordination of selfish political advantage for the national good. There is, to be sure, a problem involved in the elimination of segregation in our public schools. The Supreme Court has recognized the proportions of this problem and has laid down a course of action that is moderate but mandatory, reasonable but firmly declared. Let us together as Americans recognize that problem by understanding it and constructively acting to meet it. We must get on with the job and demonstrate effective, certain, and continuing progress.

The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land. The Supreme Court, under our Constitution, is the final authority in the interpreting and application of constitutional law. The Court has declared that segregation in the public schools is a violation of the supreme law of the land. The responsibility is, therefore, upon all law-abiding citizens and on all levels of government to conform to the Constitution. It is the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government to first seek observance of the law and, if need be, enforce the law. I am confident this will be done. Neither the President, the Congress, any State or subdivision of government, nor any citizen is above the Constitution.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

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

NONMILITARY DEFENSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to suggest that under the rules of war games we are all war casualties. I do not do so facetiously. This is a most grave matter. We all know that today Washington has been evacuated by the Government; some 15,000 key officials and employees have left to take up safe posts outside the Capital City because of evacuation tests being conducted throughout the Nation. In fact, according to the plans, a theoretical H-bomb was due to fall on the Capital at 3:25 p. m. today.

Mr. President, that was 2 hours and 20 minutes ago. Yet, here we sit and the business of Congress continues as usual. I submit that this is characteristic of the attitude the Congress has taken to the entire problem of nonmilitary defense.

We in the Senate fondly refer to ourselves as the greatest deliberative body in the world, but I suggest to my colleagues that it is possible to deliberate for too long on some matters. We should not have to wait for the radioactive fireball to impress itself upon us before we become aware of its possibilities. This calm inaction in the face of possible annihilation might be admirable if it were not so foolhardy.

Here is what a writer in the New York Times of Monday had to say about the remarkable calm we display before the terrors of the hydrogen age:

> The National Capital is a model of the muddle in civil-defense planning. As a city without home rule, Washington reflects the general indifference of Congress to civil defense. * * * Congressional interest has been aroused somewhat since the report last February on hydrogen bomb fallout. But civil-defense officials are not sanguine about the chances of getting before Congress adjourns all the legislation and funds they feel they need. On civil defense, Congress seems to act as if it had as much immunity from atomic destruction as from traffic tickets.

I should like to point out that article I, section 8 of the Constitution provides that "the Congress shall have power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Yet, in the matter of nonmilitary defense, the Congress has abdicated its responsibility at the outset. In setting up the Federal Civil Defense Administration in 1950, it declared as its policy and intent "that this responsibility for civil defense shall be vested primarily in the several States and their political subdivisions." Such an approach to planning for the dread eventuality of thermonuclear warfare exhibits what I have already referred to here on a prior occasion as a preuranium mentality. It thinks of civil defense in the World War II terms of the air-raid warden and the practice blackout.

I may state here that I think that the present Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration has been doing a most commendable job, but he is laboring in large part against the obstacle we placed in his way by setting up civil defense with the primary responsibility for it left to the States and local governments.

Furthermore, I wish to point out that the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee which has been holding hearings on civil defense in recent months has been doing a most admirable service in alerting us to the shortcomings of overall planning for nonmilitary defense. This sort of planning for survival from thermonuclear attack goes far beyond the authority of the present civil-defense setup and presents problems we have not even yet begun to solve. The contribution the Armed Services Subcommittee has already made is most significant in this regard, and I commend to the Senate's attention the interim report the committee has already submitted.

But I suggest that the problems of nonmilitary defense against thermonuclear attack require the continuing and constant attention of a full congressional committee. To point out how little attention civil defense has received from the Congress, I need only mention that when the present Administrator of the FCDA, the Honorable Val Peterson, appeared before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee in February he remarked that it was the first time a Civil Defense Administrator had been called upon to testify before a congressional committee on anything but appropriations since September 1951.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to permit the acting minority leader, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. BYRD] to have a short colloquy, which I do not expect will take more than 3 minutes, and then to permit action on the conference report, with the understanding that the Senator from Minnesota will not lose the floor, and that these remarks will appear following the conclusion of his speech?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I always want to cooperate with the majority leader in the expediting of the business of the Senate. I shall yield the floor with that understanding.

(At this point Mr. HUMPHREY yielded to Mr. CARLSON, who spoke on the subject of the conference report on the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. Mr. CARLSON's remarks and the colloquy

in connection therewith appear following Mr. HUMPHREY's speech.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, civil defense, that provides only emergency services for survival in the actual event of hydrogen attack, is not the whole of planning for nonmilitary defense to meet the new conditions of warfare. Other aspects of nonmilitary defense include planning for reduction of target vulnerability through dispersion and through protective construction; provision for the continuity of industrial production and also for the continuity and stability of our economic and financial systems; and finally, provision for the continuity of government on the Federal, State, and local level. Only in this last matter have we begun to take some of the steps necessary to insure that the Nation will somehow be able to survive all-out thermonuclear attack. It is readily seen that these are tasks that transcend what is customarily thought of as civil defense. They are problems that require the coordination of a number of departments of the Government and overall planning beyond that authorized in the establishment of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. For this purpose, the President has recently set up a Civil Defense Coordinating Board. With the Administrator of the FCDA as its head and representatives from each of the executive departments and agencies as members, the Board will bring to the civil-defense activities of these various agencies the kind of coordination that has long been needed.

But there is no corresponding unit in the Congress to concern itself with the kind of overall planning and coordination that nonmilitary defense requires.

I feel quite strongly that if we are to have an effective nonmilitary civil-defense plan, there must be an appropriate agency or committee of Congress. It is for that reason that the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and I have submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 to establish a Joint Committee on Civil Defense. Such a committee would enable the House and Senate to make a continuing study of what is being done and needs to be done to insure survival of our Nation in the event of an all-out attack with hydrogen weapons. It could consider questions and hold hearings on matters which are presently in dispute, such as the new problem of radioactive fall-out and how this relates to dispersion as a means of reducing the vulnerability of our industries and urban populations. There is disagreement on these matters, and the constantly changing nature of modern warfare daily creates other problems which require continuing study—such as what changes will be needed in our nonmilitary defense planning with the advent of the intercontinental ballistics missile. Can anyone honestly say that the Congress is giving proper consideration to these problems?

The seriousness of the inadequacy of our preparations to withstand nuclear attack if it should ever come has been pointed up and documented for us this past week by an excellent series of articles in the New York Times. The first of these articles describes the radar defenses we are constructing in the Far North to warn of attacking aircraft and so give us that little extra time that may mean whether or not we will have time to evacuate our cities. This article is not primarily concerned with nonmilitary defense, but I do mention it as giving an unusual picture of the lonely vigil that some of our servicemen must keep in these frozen outposts. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the end of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the early warning line we are presently constructing along the northernmost reaches of Canada and far out to sea will be in large part wasted unless we begin to improve upon the present state of nonmilitary defense preparedness. At this point I would like to ask that the second article in this series which appeared in the New York Times on Thursday, June 9, 1955, be printed at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. The article points out that "this country's immunity from attack has been erased irrevocably by intercontinental bombers and nuclear weapons." It suggests that Americans have had to make the psychological transition from virtual isolation and immunity from attack to the threat of thermonuclear war without ever having experienced modern warfare on our home soil, and that this is the reason for our slowness to appreciate the real proportions of danger.

I should like to suggest, however, that there is another possible explanation for what we usually refer to as the apathy of the people to civil defense measures. I do not think that the American people are unaware of the devastation that could be caused by thermonuclear war. I do think, however, that they have not been given either enough information or the leadership necessary to convince them effective measures can be taken to lessen the effects of nuclear attack. The subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee states this quite forcefully in its interim report, when it says:

> The subcommittee finds that there is a feeling among State and local officials that there is a lack of Federal leadership in the vital matter of education on the horrors of an H-bomb attack and the necessity for preparing to meet such a disaster. Despite the efforts of FCDA, the Atomic Energy Commission, and others, there remains a widespread apathy and also lack of information regarding the civil-defense program. Many civil-defense officials share a feeling of frustration because of the lack of public support.
>
> The subcommittee recommends that the President assume, as an addition to the heavy burdens of office, the personal responsibility for providing the leadership which will cause the people to support a proper civil-defense effort. It suggests that the President consider the possibility of setting aside 1 week in the near future to be known as Civil Defense Week. The President might then give the people the facts regarding the effects of a thermonuclear attack on this country and then state in plain terms what the Federal Government intends to do about meeting this eventuality. Other executive officials could thereafter discuss their plans and responsibilities in the civil-defense program. The subcommittee feels that, if the people are explained the facts, they will demand and receive a civil-defense program that will issue survival.

I should like to support the subcommittee in its recommendation that the President provide the leadership the civil-defense effort needs to impress its importance on the people. I must say that I have never agreed with the administration in its reluctance to give the American people the facts on which they can base an understanding of what needs to be done for their own self-protection and for the Nation's survival. I have great confidence in the American people to make the right decisions when they are given all the facts. Yet we had to wait until last February to learn of the nature of fallout, which was known to the Government as a consequence of the March 1, 1954, test in the Pacific, and was surely no secret to the Soviet. Let the people know what can be done and what needs to be done, and I am sure what we now call apathy will soon give way to wholehearted cooperation in the civil-defense program. I ask the President to assume this role of leadership and give the people the facts to insure survival.

Mr. President, since I prepared this address, this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald carried a column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop entitled " 'Security' Versus Democracy." I have read the column, and I desire to say on the Senate floor that if the report of Mr. Joseph Alsop and Mr. Stewart Alsop is true, we now have what borders upon the most rigid form of undemocratic censorship that any people has ever experienced. The Alsops, in their article, bring to our attention that many important facts relating to our security, as well as many important facts relating to the strength of the Soviet Union, are being kept away from the American people. The column calls to our attention remarks by the former Secretary of the National Security Council, Mr. Robert Cutler, in his recent address before the Associated Harvard Clubs. I should like to read a line or two from the article, because I think it goes directly to the question of why there is such apathy in this country relating to the very matter of our survival, in terms of civilian-defense preparation. The column by the Alsops reads in part:

> Until very recently, the American people's right to know the basic facts of their national situation was never questioned for an instant. The people's right to know was properly regarded as the mainspring of our democracy.
>
> Now, however, no one seems to doubt the American Government's right to bamboozle people by the concealing of the life-and-death facts. The Eisenhower administration is actively seeking to install a peacetime censorship in America. The censorship has as yet aroused very little opposition. And there was no word of protest, or even comment, when the thinking behind that censorship was unblushingly confessed a few weeks ago.
>
> The confession was made by the former Secretary of the National Security Council, Robert Cutler, in a speech to the Associated

Harvard Clubs. The Cutler views on the measure of truth that ought to be told the people have been specially commended to the White House staff by the President himself. This incredible speech, then, can be taken as accurately reflecting the official White House line.

In a morass of somewhat self-satisfied verbiage, Cutler makes two central points. First, he declares that the people should be told no fact included in any document classified confidential or above, and should be especially kept from knowing any facts about thermonuclear or other weapons; the status of our own defense effort; intelligence from the rest of the world which, of course, includes the status of the enemy defense effort and enemy intentions; and the reasons for our national-security policies and character of our current diplomacy.

In short, all facts of real significance—

And the quotation marks apparently indicate the words are taken from Mr. Cutler's speech—

"all the vast paraphernalia that goes into executive decision-making"—are to be kept from the American people. This is because of Cutler's second point. "Theirs is not to reason why," he in effect says of the American people. According to Cutler, national decision should be made, not by the people, but by the President alone. At best, the Nation is to have a sort of pale privilege of postaudit on the President's decisions. "The people," Cutler generously says, "may always call him to an accounting, for his acts and omissions to act.

If you read his speech, you will wonder why he did not also capitalize the words "him" and "his." He has need to believe that the President possesses divine attributes; for none but a president-deity could accommodate the Cutler system and the American system.

Mr. President, I shall not read all of this article, because I understand the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has brought to the attention of the Senate all the facts set forth in the article.

There were two other articles by the same columnists which I recall indicated that reprisals are being taken against public officials who give out information to the American people; and reprisals even against reporters themselves.

Mr. President, I do not know the validity of the charges, but they are serious charges, made by responsible men. I think it is about time the Congress of the United States interested itself in this alleged censorship, which seems to deny to the American people facts as to their national security. As one Senator, I rise to protest this kind of secrecy. There is too much of it in Government.

I shall ask one of the pages to go to the reading room and bring me a copy of today's New York Times. I understand, from the New York Times, that only today the Soviet Union is bringing out into the open certain engineering designs and drawings of the atom bomb, which have been denied to the American people.

Only a short time ago a Japanese doctor came into the United States, talked to private doctors of this country, and gave them information which was classified so that our own private doctors could not get it from the American Government.

Mr. President, my point is that we cannot have the kind of public support and alertness which are needed in these critical hours if the American people are to be treated as if they are incapable of hearing the sordid truth and the naked facts. The American people always respond when the facts are made available to them. They have in the past, and will continue to do so in the future.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I certainly have never believed that information should be withheld from the public merely for restrictive purposes, or for covering up errors, regardless of which administration might be in power. But I have been a little concerned about the Senator's statement that, according to the New York Times of this morning, there has been publication in a Soviet newspaper of a diagram of an atomic weapon.

The Senator from Minnesota is not suggesting, is he, that diagrams of our secret devices and atomic weapons be published in the United States merely because a Soviet publication contains some kind of facsimile? I can think of nothing more helpful to the enemy than to have actual secret information published. The fact that there may have been an unjustified "leak" or publication of some details of an airplane in a Japanese trade publication does not, it seems to me, warrant the publication of information entirely different from that to which I think Mr. Alsop may have been referring.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was not suggesting that any matters of the most secret nature be given the lay public. But I am saying that, time after time, information which supposedly has been carefully guarded, and which has been kept from the American people, has been published by private sources, in which case the American Government then has said, "Well, we were planning to publish it, but we had not gotten around to doing it."

I refer to the publication of the details of nuclear fallout. Those details were published in an American journal. I also refer to the publication in the fall of 1953 of details regarding an atomic explosion in Russia, before our Government had admitted that the Soviets had had another atomic explosion.

Mr. President, I am not an expert on these matters; but among the press and the editors of important journals of public opinion in the United States there is growing concern because it has become increasingly difficult for them to receive information which is of key importance to an alert public citizenry. I am of the opinion that if the United States press is called upon to respect certain information because it is of a vital and most important security nature, our press will do so. The press did that during World War II; and I think the American press would do so in connection with the present administration, in particular, because it has a most sympathetic press.

But I suggest, Mr. President, that it will do no good to force reporters and columnists to rely upon subterranean channels, so to speak, in obtaining information which should be available to the general public.

As I pointed out a moment ago, one of the reasons why we have citizen apathy in the whole area of civil defense, is that it has become increasingly difficult to bring the proper information to the American public.

Mr. President, let me say that if I have overstated the case, I shall make due apology to my colleagues. But I believe that when there appear in the press, statements that a kind of administrative censorship is being exercised, that matter should be of deep concern to Democrats and Republicans alike, as American citizens, forgetting our partisanship. In the previous administration there was this problem, and protests were made on the floor of the Senate. I suggest that the time to protest is before this practice becomes an established procedure. Once we make it clear that we wish to have items which are really secret kept secret, but items which are not secret made public, there will be a healthier public opinion in the Nation. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that that is our design and our objective.

Mr. President, the nature of the nuclear fall-out problem was dealt with in the third of this series of articles in the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that the two articles which appeared in the New York Times on June 10th be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, even in the short time since these articles appeared, new information has come forth that suggests that the fall-out problem may be a more difficult one to cope with than we had thought. The first discouraging note was struck by Dr. Willard F. Libby, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, who indicated that the thermonuclear bomb can be made with the cheapest atomic explosives, and virtually unlimited in size, and also indicated that the lethal or damaging doses of radioactive fall-out may persist for a long time.

Mr. President, I wish to note that in my comments regarding the New York Times, I was referring to its issue for Tuesday, June 14, and to a front-page article by Harry Schwartz, a very respected and learned reporter, and one of the best experts on the Soviet Union. The headline on the first page is:

Soviet Gives Nuclear Bomb Facts to Its People.

And the diagrams are published, along with descriptive material as to the nature of the bombs and how they work, as well as the pertinent facts regarding their destructive power.

Mr. President, I am not arguing that we should follow suit; but I rise to protest vigorously against a censorship which violates all the pious statements about free speech and free press which have been enunciated time after time by high officials in high places.

Dr. Libby's remarks were seconded by an article written by Dr. Ralph Lapp, and

appearing in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Dr. Lapp warns that many of our present plans for civil defense might be outmoded by the new estimates of persistence of radioactive fallout. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject, appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald for June 13, be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the press for getting this information to the American people. It is information which should constantly be brought to their attention, through official channels, in every conceivable manner.

Entirely new problems are raised by these developments. I do not know the answers to them. What I wish to emphasize here is that the Congress needs a Joint Committee on Civil Defense to study just such problems as this one. We are not presently set up to consider what action needs to be taken to cope with the constantly changing situation. The lack of awareness of the Congress of the imperative nature of these problems is indicated in the figures of appropriations for civil defense cited in the New York Times article. I read from the article:

> Between the fiscal year of 1951 and the current fiscal year of 1955 the Federal Civil Defense Administration asked Congress to appropriate $1,748,950,000 for five phases of its work. Congress, however, approved $247,741,000 for the 5 years.

As the Times article says, "Civil defense was treated as an area in which economies could be made easily." I do not think this would be the attitude of the Congress, Mr. President, if we had a joint committee whose duty it was to concern itself with these problems, and if it understood just what was the nature of the threat of thermonuclear warfare.

I think this attitude may now be changing, as the vulnerability of the United States to nuclear attack becomes increasingly evident. As the next article in the Times series says, "The major planning assumption of Civil Defense officials is that the Soviet Union can strike any target in the United States." If that is not the case at this very moment, our civil defense planners are correct in assuming that it soon will be, and we must plan on this assumption. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the article which appeared in the Times on Saturday, June 11, printed in the RECORD at the conclusions of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, here again, in this article, it has been emphasized that the present way in which civil defense is set up is preventing preparedness against nuclear attack to move ahead as it should. In April, the Governors of New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut joined with the mayor of New York City in urging that the Federal Government assume primary responsibility for nonmilitary defense planning. Both the nature of the problem and its expense are beyond the capabilities of individual State and local governments, or even of a number of States joined in compact.

The nationwide condition resulting from this state of unpreparedness is disclosed in the fifth article in the Times series. It contains a survey of civil defense preparedness throughout the country; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 6.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is also an accompanying article on the extent of civil defense preparedness in Britain, and I ask that it also be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as it provides a comparison of the way in which a country which has had much experience in these matters is proceeding in its own efforts.

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

(See exhibit 7.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that one interesting feature of the British civil defense organization for which we have no counterpart in this country is the "mobile defense column." Forty-eight of these mobile defense columns are being raised to deal with any emergency civil defense situation. Each column contains 600 men, specially trained for civil and home defense service, and they serve as a link between the civil defense forces and the regular Armed Forces. So far as I have been able to learn, no real effort has been made to plan the part that our Armed Forces or National Guard units would play in the emergency created by nuclear attack. They would clearly be called upon, and undoubtedly martial law would be in effect in the devastated areas, which might well be the entire country. But I do not believe the Armed Forces or the National Guard have received special training or any specific assignment that would prepare them to cope with such an emergency. It would seem that this should be a primary part of National Guard training and planning, but so far nothing has been done along these lines, as the responsibility rests outside the authority of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the Defense Department is reluctant to take up a mission which is beyond the area of the Armed Forces' usual duties. Here is a situation which the Congress should look into and correct. The subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee has indicated its concern about this situation, and I trust that the Senate Armed Services Committee will look into the role that our Armed Forces should be playing in our civil defense preparedness.

The final two articles in the series on the state of our civil defense preparedness appeared in the New York Times on Monday, and I ask to have them printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 8.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. These articles are concerned with the extent of preparedness to survive nuclear war in New York City and Washington, D. C. It is not an encouraging picture. Recruitment and training of volunteer civil-defense workers is especially unsatisfactory; one New York official termed it "our weakest spot." There is also confusion over the different theories of staying in the city and seeking shelter or evacuating the city. The magnitude of the new weapons perhaps makes evacuation the only possibility, but the former approach to the problem holds over in some matters—such as the use of highways during attack—and causes confusion. It should be interesting and instructive to observe with what success the evacuations of our cities are carried out today. But most evacuations are more theoretical than real, and the question will still remain in large part unanswered of how successfully our entire urban populations could be evacuated in the event of actual attack.

Mr. President, I always hesitate to talk about the possibility of attack. It is a terrible thought. Pray God that it will never happen, but I believe we are grossly derelict in our responsibility under the Constitution to maintain and provide for the common defense unless the Congress spends more time, money, talent, and planning upon civil defense. Surely we ought to be thinking in terms of the great strength of this Nation, which is its people, and its industrial and agricultural areas.

We have had too much conflicting evidence to make us happy. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has called to the attention of the Senate some very strange contradictions in the Department of Defense over our airpower. I understand that the Senate Appropriations Committee will bring to this floor a recommendation for a substantially larger sum of money to strengthen the American Air Force. In the name of economy we have played with the defense and security of this country, and we have done so without a clearcut statement of the facts.

I personally commend the Senator from Missouri for his vigilance, his dedication, and his patriotic devotion to the cause of security and the welfare of this Republic. Had it not been for the Senator from Missouri and others who worked with him, much that has been done in the Pentagon Building in an effort to gloss over the realities of the threat which exists to our Republic would never have been brought to light. I repeat that when a government exercises censorship, it not only denies the people information, but it soon becomes the victim of its own nefarious practice.

There is only one way to guard the security of this Nation and the ramparts of this Republic, and that is by having the American people know the truth, understand the truth, and face up to the truth, and then have public officials respond to the facts and the truth. That is why I speak out today, as our Government is engaged in a civil-defense exercise. The first principle of civil defense is truth, the courage to state it, and the willingness to afford leadership to the American people as they hear the truth.

A great deal more could be said on this subject. But the articles I have placed in the RECORD give a very thorough picture of the degree of our nonmilitary defense preparedness and just how much still needs to be done. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues, and I commend the New York Times for publishing them.

In conclusion, I wish to stress the points I have made in my remarks which I feel require consideration and early action. First, there is the need to reconsider the whole question of where the responsibility for nonmilitary defense lies. I well recognize that it is necessary to enlist the support and participation of State and local governments if our civil defense measures are to be effective. But I wish to make my stand with the mayors and governors, and with the present administrator of the FCDA himself, in their contention that the primary responsibility for nonmilitary defense must be that of the Federal Government.

Secondly, I urge that the Congress take early action on my proposal that a Joint Committee on Civil Defense be established so that nonmilitary defense will begin to receive the continuing and constant attention of the Congress which it so urgently requires.

Third, I hope that President Eisenhower will begin to give leadership to the Nation in our civil defense effort. I respectfully urge him to speak out in clear, vigorous terms to the American people, telling them just what needs to be done and encouraging them to take an active part in the measures which must be taken if we are to insure national survival from the devastating effects of thermonuclear attack.

This requires that the American people be told the facts as to our strength, the facts as to our vulnerability, the facts as to the buildup in the strength of the enemy, and the facts as to our state of preparedness. This requires that there be the closest responsible cooperation between the media of public communication, the Congress, and the executive branch of the Government.

There are too many executive hearings, too many executive sessions, too many off-the-record conferences, and there is too much censorship. The time is at hand to call a halt, or at least to reverse the pattern.

This leads me to my final point, that the administration must give the people all the facts, so that they can understand the nature of the problems which confront us. There should be no secrets from the people except those that involve the utmost security considerations. Putting a nice gloss on unpleasant facts is not the right way in a democracy. I feel quite confident that so long as the American people are supplied with all the facts there will be no hysteria or panic, but they will then be ready to take part in the nonmilitary defense program, a program which has been too long neglected.

EXHIBIT 1

LONE RADAR SENTRIES GUARD UNITED STATES IN ARCTIC VIGIL—EXPENDABLES ON THE ALERT FOR WARNING IF ENEMY STRIKES

(By Anthony Leviero)

ST. LAWRENCE ISLAND, BERING SEA, JUNE 1.—Continental and civil defense begins in a frozen ridge, with a kid from Missouri hunched over a radarscope. He is the sentry of the atomic age.

If you look at a polar projection of the world, you realize that he is considerably west of Honolulu, but only 10 minutes from Soviet soil. Ten minutes for a Soviet type 39 bomber, or 10 minutes for our B-47.

This Air Force GI and his buddies in his secret and desolate outpost somewhere on this big island in the Bering Sea describe themselves philosophically as "expendable." They are not combat troops. But they are far out in the No Man's Land of the "cold war." They are airmen but have no aircraft. They are equipped with nothing but small arms and radar. Anyway you look at it, they are out on a limb.

But these men fight the battle of time. These unsung heroes, if diplomacy and reason fail, will give the folks back home a few hours' warning that atomic war is on the way. The fate of such places as New York, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, Seattle, Ottawa, Pittsburgh, anybody's home town, might be decided by the alertness of these men.

The men here belong to the X Aircraft Control and Warning Squadron. It is one of several hidden in the cloud-shrouded ramparts of North America along the Bering Sea and Strait and the other coastal areas of Alaska.

On the emblems of one outfit are emblazoned the words, "Vigilantia Electronica." This tells their story in a nutshell.

From their radomes, crammed with electronic equipment, they could flash in a few seconds a "red" alert to Continental Air Defense Command Headquarters in Colorado Springs. A red alert means an invasion by enemy aircraft.

From Cape Prince of Wales on Alaska's Seward Peninsula to Kivak on the Soviet Chukchi Peninsula is only 60 miles. From Gambell on the western tip of this island to Naukan, also on the Siberian Peninsula, is 50 miles.

From Gambell on clear nights Americans can see the rotating air beacons on busy Soviet bases. At distances of only 50 and 60 miles, Soviet aircraft raise "blips" on United States radarscopes. American aircraft do the same on the Soviet side.

Between the mainlands of the two continents there is only ice. But on the charts are the coinciding international boundary and datelines cleaving between Big Diomede Island (Russian) and Litle Diomede (American). There is only 3 miles of ice between these islands.

NO BORDER INCIDENTS

It is assumed that Russia has in the Chukchi Peninsula a counterpart of Alaska—an outermost bastion dotted with airbases and troop installations. Vast numbers of American aircraft and thousands of tons of arms and equipment were sent there by way of Nome and other Alaskan bases during World War II.

Despite the proximity of the Soviet and American territories, there have been no serious and untoward incidents such as those in the other frontiers with the Communist world—no United States planes shot down for allegedly violating Communist territory, no incursions of Soviet aircraft.

Up here the masters of the Kremlin cannot use satellites to create incidents. Here it would be Russians against Americans. If anything started between them, it would be for keeps.

Nevertheless, swift jet interceptors "scramble" every day in Alaska and its outposts. The thin golden line scanning around Squadron X's radarscope picks up the blip of an unidentified plane and a warning flashes into the control center of one of the two air divisions that guard Alaska and fly "top cover for America."

On the inclined floor of a former bowling alley, two airmen wearing tennis shoes and trailing long wires from earphones move around on a huge map of Alaska.

They set up lettered and number blocks—"raid stands"—showing the location and course of every single aircraft except bush planes in the air over and around the Alaska territory. Here the direction of the unidentified plane is seen in relation to the terrain and the key targets.

The commander flicks a switch and utters one word: "Scramble." Within 2 minutes F-89D Northrop Scorpions are streaking into the sky to look things over.

It may be only another commercial plane coming over the Great Circle route from the Orient. Every lane from that direction is checked and doublechecked. Or it may be a friendly plane that has gone off course.

Or some day it could be part of a fleet of 500 or more bombers, familiar to American airmen by incessant study of Soviet identification charts. Then the "red" alert would flash into Colorado Springs and several other key places in the United States and Canada.

That is how it would be if the United States were attacked, as military leaders envision it. There would be a massive attack from several directions by hundreds of bombers striking simultaneously at United States airbases and heading for many of the major industrial cities with atomic and hydrogen bombs.

They would meet a rough time along the way. They would have to run several gantlets of air defenses. Interceptors would battle them at every opportunity. Guided missiles would be poured at them wherever they came into range.

SOME WOULD GET THROUGH

Some of these bombers are expected to get through to bring death and destruction to United States cities. Even President Eisenhower has said that there is no such thing as absolute defense.

And once the attackers got through, the home front would be at war. The great problems of civil defense instantly would become real.

The United States would be fortunate, however, if Squadron X flashed the warning. That would mean that a great industrial target such as Detroit might get as much as 5 hours and some minutes of warning.

But military leaders in Washington and Alaska do not underestimate the enemy. If he decided to strike, he would strive for surprise. He would try to go undetected as long as possible.

The foe might come over the top of the world, bypassing strong Alaska at least in the initial stages. He might try to sneak by Point Barrow and Barter Island in the Arctic Ocean and slash down through central Canada.

If he succeeded in this, he might go undiscovered until the radomes of the mid-Canada radar line, or McGill Fence, picked him up. That would mean that Detroit and many other American cities would get only 2½ or 3 hours' warning.

VAST AREA STILL UNGUARDED

The greatest gap in continental defense is no secret. It is the vast expanse of wild terrain across the top of North America, from the eastern boundary of Alaska to Greenland. The task of filling the gap with the distant early warning (D. E. W.) line has just been started. It will not be completed for 2 years.

The eastern approaches to the continent now are screened by Air Force bases on Greenland as well as by picket ships at sea and radar airplanes that extend the defense line as far east as the Azores and along the Nation's coasts in a continual patrol.

Continental defense is a serious business in this vast and complex territory. There

the airplane is the common transportation. There are other, smaller gaps in the defenses, in the interior as well as along the coasts. Work goes on constantly to plug them.

New aircraft control and warning squadrons are being established in remote places. Some now in operation cannot be reached by automobile, ship, or railroad. They are supplied the year around by C-47 aircraft. Sometimes the weather is so bad that the supplies must be dropped by parachute.

The Army is building Nike guided-missile emplacements at key places. Fleets of military and commercial aircraft under an agreement with Canada are rushing equipment northward for the DEW line.

Later this month, as the ice breaks up, 32 ships of the so-called Mona Lisa Operation will be making amphibious landings of tons of supplies along beaches with tricky tides and rough surf and cluttered with jagged volcanic rock and ice floes.

CARGO PLANES NEEDED

For Squadron X a ship gets through only once a year with the bulk of its supplies. It must rely on cargo planes for other needs. Some heavy equipment for the DEW line also will be brought in by ships.

Here continental defense is almost everybody's business, too. Alaska is somewhat like a theater of war, calm but alert.

The chain of service extends from keen-eyed Eskimos, hunting guides, housewives, missionaries, and other types of volunteers up to the joint Army, Navy, and Air Force units. These are under Lt. Gen. Joseph Atkinson, the theater commander. He is an Air Force officer.

Radar is not perfect in its coverage. There is not enough of it to go around in a vast territory. Hence, about 1,000 volunteers blanket Alaska with the 200 posts of the "Sadie Hawkins" network of the Ground Observer Corps.

The Air Force is proud of civilian volunteers for their around-the-clock sightings of strange or unidentified aircraft. Such information reaches the air defense control centers by radio in minutes.

Recently the Reverend Vincent Joy up at Glenallen interrupted his Sunday school class. He rushed to his telephone and soon was "calling Sadie Hawkins" to report an unfamiliar aircraft overhead.

Between the remote radar sites and watchful volunteers in every village no unidentified plane bigger than a bush aircraft goes unreported.

TWO AIR DIVISIONS

Military leaders believe they could cope with any attack by Russia against Alaska itself. This bastion for Alaskan and continental defense is being run, however, like some other American military establishments, on a calculated risk basis. The commanders could use more of almost everything. But they do not complain.

Under the Alaska theater commander is the Air Command, headed by Maj. Gen. George R. Acheson. This consists of two air divisions. The Tenth is based at Elmendorf Air Force Base, under Col. Dolf E. Muehleisen. The Eleventh is based at Ladd Air Force Base, under Brig. Gen. T. Alan Bennett.

These divisions are capable of all-weather operations, although there is one squadron of day fighter-bombers, saberjets. The number of wings and squadrons in each division is a military secret. It can be said that they are under strength.

The United States Army in Alaska under Maj. Gen. James F. Collins has less than a division here. Two regimental combat teams are within Alaska. A third is at Fort Lewis, Wash.

The Navy Alaskan Sea Frontier has operating bases on Kodiak Island on the south coast and at Adak in the Aleutian chain. From there is carried on patrol and reconnaissance missions in the Bering Sea.

These are the sinews of strength in the Alaska Territory. General Acheson expects his forces to give a good account of themselves when and if the wrong kind of "blips" turn up in the radome on a distant mountain top.

EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES VULNERABLE TO BOMB THREAT—NATION GIRDS FORCES, ENTERS THE AGE OF CONSTANT ALERT THOUGH COLD WAR EASES—CIVIL DEFENSE BLURRED—MANY PROBLEMS UNSETTLED—STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND KEY TO STRIKING POWER

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—The liberation of Austria, talk of disarmament, and negotiations for a top-level Big Four conference have sweetened the atmosphere of the cold war. Nevertheless, civil defense will continue to be a great national problem.

Regardless of the ultimate fruits of peace efforts, this country's immunity from attack has been erased irrevocably by intercontinental bombers and nuclear weapons.

President Eisenhower has called attention to the revolution in military concepts in this atomic age and the burdens it has imposed on the Nation. For the American people the most striking consequence of the revolution is that the country has become vulnerable to attack by a foreign power for the first time since the British burned the Capitol and the White House in the War of 1812.

REQUISITES FOR SURVIVAL

Hence, the age of constant alert is at hand. In his backyard the citizen views with reassurance mixed with uneasiness the deadly Nike guided missile, thrust spearlike at the sky. Jet interceptors crack the sound barriers as they scramble from a nearby base to investigate unidentified aircraft.

National leaders counsel that survival depends on resoluteness, economic stability, and strong military power. The citizen himself may be serving as a civil defense volunteer.

The menace is formidable. The destructiveness of the thermonuclear, or hydrogen bomb, has made the power of the model-T atomic bomb seem puny. Yet, Americans have had to make the psychological transition from virtual isolation to the thermonuclear threat without experiencing modern warfare on their home soil. Consequently, both the public and Congress have been slow to appreciate the real proportions of danger.

A do-something feeling was roused after last February 15, when the Atomic Energy Commission disclosed that the hydrogen bomb tested March 1, 1954, had spread a lethal fallout over a 7,000-square-mile area in the Pacific.

A surprise attack of that scope on land would have wiped out every exposed person in an area about the size of New Jersey. Val Peterson, Federal Civil Defense Administrator, has said that a single attack on that scale probably would require the evacuation of 92 of the larger cities. It could result in the immediate destruction of 50 percent of the country's industry, he added.

U. N. ACTION SOUGHT

Some officials and scientists have warned that drastic civil-defense measures are necessary if millions are not to die in such an attack. Others have argued that defensive measures will ameliorate, but not prevent, the holocaust and have pleaded for real disarmament and moral action by the United Nations.

President Eisenhower has said a thermonuclear war is inconceivable, and he is persistently exploring approaches to a stable peace. Since the Soviet Union has also tested a hydrogen bomb, it is assumed its leaders are aware that the bomb contains the seeds of destruction for Western civilization.

Under present circumstances, neither the United States nor any other free nation can accept the assumption that the Kremlin would not use the dread weapon.

As an insurance measure the United States has been amassing military and atomic power that is poised for instant action. The most vital element of this power is the Strategic Air Command, with its girdle of bases around the world. By all indications, this force has deterred Russian plans for conquest.

Public realization of the awful power of the thermonuclear bomb has stirred doubt and confusion as to the adequacy of defensive measures for the homeland. Is defense against atomic and hydrogen bombs feasible or should the effort be abandoned as futile? Is the Federal Civil Defense Administration efficient or is it floundering under well-intentioned but imprecise policies? Has Congress faced up to its responsibility or has it been looking the other way?

Should the citizen rely for survival on a shelter or an evacuation, or should be prepare to resort to both? Has the administration overemphasized security at the expense of informing the public about the things it must know for survival?

NATIONWIDE TEST DUE

Future articles will report on current thinking and action on these problems. The citizen may reach conclusions of his own from Operation Alert 1955 on June 15, 16, and 17, when Federal and local civil-defense organizations stage a nationwide test. It will be based on a hypothetical nuclear attack on 50 of 92 critical target cities.

Meanwhile, a survey of the problem is far from comforting except in the assumed ability of the Strategic Air Command to strike at the Soviet Union in case of war.

The purely military aspects of defense, embodied in the Continental Air Defense Command, have not advanced as far as the SAC. But they are being pressed vigorously. It is civil defense, the realm of the civilian, that is afflicted both by official and private inertia and marked by serious deficiencies both in planning and accomplishment.

The military aspects of the problem size up as follows:

The doctrine that offense is the best defense still is sound on the battlefield. But as a result of the revolution in military concepts President Eisenhower has said it is now necessary to assign as high a priority to defensive as to offensive measures.

This necessity has compelled a revision of strategic doctrine, with the emphasis on air power and the subordination of surface forces; heavy tax burdens and an uneasy way of life for the people.

Gone is the traditional policy of concentrating most of the national effort on mobilizing a large, well-equipped expeditionary force. When that was possible in the pre-atomic age, comparatively small and cheap domestic defensive measures were adequate.

Under the new concept the greatest military power of the United States is still offensive in nature but is massed in the Strategic Air Command. This force, with headquarters in Omaha, has become a byword of strength and security. It's fleet of atomic bombers maintain a world round-the-clock alert. In a matter of hours after an alarm has been given, the bombers can swarm over their objectives.

A COMPLEX SYSTEM

The purely defensive measures are newer and still developing. They are embodied in the vast, complex continental air defense system in which the United States and Canada are harmonious partners.

Continental defense radiates outward and inward from the Arctic Circle, employing ground, sea, and air elements that sweep in a great arc from the ice cap to the Hawaiian

Islands in the Pacific and to the Azores in the Atlantic.

An air alert from a lonely radar sentry post in the Arctic would flash simultaneously through the Canadian air defense system, to the SAC, and the United States Continental Air Defense Command (CONAD) in Colorado Springs, Colo.

Vast offensive and defensive forces could be sent into action in a matter of minutes. Jet interceptor squadrons would go up to identify the intruders and attack instantly if they were hostile. Squadrons of the SAC would be dispatched to strike the enemy's home bases.

Radar stations would plot the course of the aerial invasion. In the gaps not covered by radar, some of the 400,000 volunteers of the Ground Observer Corps, manning 13,000 stations, would help. Soon, on the east coast, the first of more than a score of Texas Tower radar units would be operating. At the sea approaches, warships under the control of CONAD would engage the invaders.

Army Nikes and antiaircraft batteries would engage planes that penetrated to big cities and industrial centers. With the first warning, Civil Defense organizations would take steps to help the populace.

For overall missions of retaliation and defense, both the SAC and CONAD come under control of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The continental force is headed by Lt. Gen. Earle E. Partridge. Under him is a joint staff drawn from the Army, Navy, and Air Force, Canadian Air Defense Command, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Office of Defense Mobilization, Civil Aeronautics Authority, and the Ground Observer Corps.

TWELVE AIR DIVISIONS

The main unit is the Air Defense Command, with 12 air divisions. Each has one or more wings normally equipped with about 75 jet interceptors. There is one noninterceptor division, the Eighth Airborne Early Warning and Control, that operates on the east and west coasts. Also under the CONAD are the Army Antiaircraft Command and the Naval Forces Continental Air Defense. General Partridge has a joint staff with high-ranking officers from the three services.

These three major commands are integral parts of the Air Force, Army and Navy, respectively. But for tactical and command purposes they are divided among the three main subdivisions of the Continental Air Defense Command—the Joint Eastern Air Defense Force, Stewart Air Force Base, N. Y., the Joint Central Air Defense Force, Grandview, Mo., and the Joint Western Air Defense Force, Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif.

The joint staff concept, including representatives of civilian agencies, is carried down to the civilian level. Thus, each division of the Air Defense Command comes under the control of a Joint Air Defense Division staff, where the operations of interceptor, antiaircraft and naval units are coordinated. Here local operations of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and other agencies are tied in, too.

While the resources of the Continental Air Defense Command are impressive, serious gaps in the system still exist. It is generally believed that if the Soviet Union made a large, determined attack, a sizable number of bombers would get through to key United States targets.

BIGGEST DEFICIENCY

The greatest single deficiency is in the early warning system. The Civil Defense Administrator said he would expect to get 4 to 6 hours' warning of an attack over the polar region. But military quarters say an enemy force may get through without betraying its presence until 3 hours before it is over United States targets.

Reliance for early warning is being placed chiefly on 3 radar lines, but it will be about 2 years before the northernmost of these is completed. The Pinetree Line, disposed in depth on both sides of the Canadian border and built jointly by the United States and Canada, is fully operational.

The Mid-Canada Line (McGill Fence), built entirely by Canada and disposed generally along the 55th and 56th parallels, is operating in some sections, but is not complete.

The Distant Early Warning (D. E. W.) Line was started this spring on a "crash" basis. It is being built by the United States, by permission of Canada, within the Arctic Circle on the most northerly practicable land masses along the 68th and 70th parallels. This line would cover the desolate, far northern Canadian territories through which an enemy might fly undetected until he reached the Mid-Canada Line.

The western region is covered by United States installations in Alaska, including a radar station on Barter Island just north of the 70th parallel. But the central sector is generally wide open. Into this region, under agreement with Canada, the United States Air Force this spring has been bringing construction equipment.

Caterpillar trains moved inland as deep as 700 miles with the light bulldozers to begin laying foundations for radar stations. Later, shipborne equipment will be moved in for this line which, because of the forbidding terrain and climate, will be largely automatic.

HOPE TO SAVE 3 HOURS

It is only about an hour and a half flying time from Chicago to the 60th parallel, which cuts through Hudson Bay. By extending the early warning system into the Arctic with the D. E. W. Line it is hoped to save at least 3 hours.

The cost of defensive measures in the preatomic age was negligible compared with the hundreds of millions being poured into projects of this kind. The aim is to erect practicable defenses for 3 million square miles of territory, including 10,000 miles of borders and an aerial fence 11 or 12 miles high.

The Defense Department has not disclosed the cost of radar fences. The Pinetree Line alone is reported to have cost $250 million, of which the United States paid two-thirds and Canada the rest. The D. E. W. Line is expected to cost at least as much.

Nike guided missile enplacements are being built as rapidly as possible around more than 15 major American cities for close-in defense. This program alone is costing more than $1 billion. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, told Congress last week that another $160,500,000 was needed.

The cost of these defensive measures has been steadily rising. According to the Defense Department, an estimated total of $1,900,000,000 was spent for continental air defense items in the 1954 fiscal year. This year the figure has risen to $2,400,000,000. For 1956 it is estimated at $3,300,000,000.

This does not tell the whole story, however. Items such as ammunition and jet-interceptor fighters, which may be used for offensive as well as defensive missions, are not listed in the budgets for continental air defense.

There are the salient features of the continental air defense situation as Washington studies evidence that the Soviet Union has begun substantial production of intercontinental bombers, jet medium bombers, and all-weather fighters. Such forces may seriously challenge the Strategic Air Command's ability to penetrate into Russia.

EXHIBIT 3

THERMONUCLEAR BOMB BLAST JOLTED UNITED STATES CIVIL DEFENSE LEADERS, BUT PROGRAM STILL LAGS—PETERSON SEES NEED FOR EVACUATION STUDY IN 100 COMMUNITIES

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—The disclosure last February of the immense power of the thermonuclear bomb has jolted some of the inertia out of official and public attitudes on civil defense planning.

There has been a quickening of interest as the vast proportions of civil defense needs daily become more apparent. The impact has been greatest on officials. They know the full implications and capabilities of the weapons.

But much of this knowledge is being withheld. Scientists say there can be no intelligent civil defense planning until the public gets more definite data on radioactive fallout.

Few have been the human problems of modern times that compare with those following the disclosure that the weapon commonly referred to as a hydrogen bomb, tested in the Pacific in March 1954, had spread a lethal fallout over an area as large as New Jersey.

The toughest aspect of the problem is that man's propensity for war and his technological ability to develop dread weapons appear to be running away from his moral and political capacities for achieving peace and brotherhood.

A SHOCK FROM PETERSON

Almost as staggering is the realization that millions accustomed to a highly developed urban life would be compelled by a hydrogen bomb attack to flee to the rural areas.

Planning has gone barely beyond the "think-about-it" stage. Millions would have to move out into rural or suburban areas. Great numbers would have to take refuge in conditions approximating the life of the aborigines.

For many there would be shelter in farmers' basements, barns, schools, churches, in every form of man-made or natural object that would afford shelter from radioactive fallout.

But Val Peterson, Federal Civil Defense Administrator, shocked a Senate subcommittee recently by making clear that for multitudes shelter would mean crouching under culverts or in simple trenches, without sanitary facilities, along the highways radiating out of the big cities.

He spoke also of laying concrete pipelines along the roads in which refugees could huddle. He made this sound well-nigh impossible, however, when he explained that such pipelines would cost $40 a person for about 25 million persons. He told the Senators bluntly this was a matter of "stark survival."

Those who felt reasonably sure of being outside the immediate target area could build comparatively inexpensive concrete shelters. Those caught in the open and still alive could dig a hole or trench to protect themselves from the first severe dose of fallout.

MORE FUNDS FOR ZOO

No part of the $1 billion for pipelines is at hand, nor have any trenches been dug. In fact, the whole civil defense situation might be placed in perspective by citing a bit of evidence placed recently before the Civil Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

This showed that the United States Capital, with more than a million residents and the seat of National Government in its metropolitan area, had received from Congress $115,000 for civil defense in the fiscal year 1955, as compared with $660,000 for the zoo.

The Senators quickly assured the Capital's children that they favored support of the zoo. They expressed concern also for the civil-defense situation. The record of Congress, however, has been one of meat-ax slashing of every appropriation request from the Federal Civil Defense Administration since 1951.

This example of the Capital and the zoo characterizes in more or less degree the various aspects of the Federal civil defense operation.

The subcommittee headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, called upon President Eisenhower to "assume personal responsibility" for an adequate civil defense. Its report cited deficiencies in planning for evacuation, feeding, and medical treatment of refugees and contended that the Federal Government was shifting too much of the responsibility to the States and cities.

Between the fiscal year 1951 and the current fiscal year of 1955, the Federal Civil Defense Administration asked Congress to appropriate $1,748,950,000 for five phases of its work. Congress, however, approved $247,741,000 for the 5 years.

For the 1956 fiscal year beginning July 1 the agency asked for $59,300,000. The House of Representatives has approved $53,400,000. The Senate has not yet acted.

The agency requested a total of $403 million for the fiscal year of 1951, but Congress approved only $33,581,000. For operations it asked $8,300,000, as against $3,581,000 approved; for Federal contributions to States, $21,291,700, as against $25 million approved, and $25 million for use in a revolving procurement fund, as against $5 million approved. In addition, it asked without success that year for $98,348,300 for emergency supplies and equipment and $250 million for protective facilities.

The agency generally began toning down its request. In contrast to the 1951 figures, for example, it asked for a total of $85,750,000 for work in the fiscal year of 1955. Congress approved $49,325,000. For operations in 1955 it requested $11 million to the $10,025,000 approved; for Federal contributions, $14,750,000 to $13,300,000, and for stockpiling emergency supplies and equipment $60 million to $26 million.

SOME REQUESTS DROPPED

For the coming fiscal year of 1956, it asked $11,600,000 for operations, $12,400,000 for Federal contributions and $35,300,000 for stockpiling emergency supplies.

Since the $5 million approved for the procurement revolving fund for 1951, nothing further was approved for that activity. And, after requesting funds for protective facilities, such as shelters, for 3 years, to no avail, the agency omitted all such requests after the fiscal year of 1953. It then also stopped asking for revolving-fund money.

For the fiscal year of 1952, the agency asked for a total of $535 million and Congress approved $75,310,000. For 1953, it asked for $600 million and got $43 million. For 1954, it requested $125,200,000 and got $46,525,000.

For the fiscal year 1956 the Civil Defense Administration has made two requests. It asked $59,300,000 and the House Appropriations Committee approved $53 million. Then when the fallout problem was realized, the President sent up a supplementary request for $12 million. Of this $10 million would be used to survey the evacuation problem for about 100 critical target cities. The rest would be for scientific research of the fallout problem. The House committee threw out the $12 million item. Now the Senate is being asked to restore both requests fully.

The tendency in recent years at the Capitol and in some public quarters has been to regard the Federal Civil Defense program as a boondoggle. Until the historic fallout report, Congress did not consider the thermonuclear threat as a clear and present danger. Civil defense was treated as an area in which economies could be made easily.

Also in this period there was a tendency to criticize its administrators, Mr. Peterson included, as to their leadership qualities and technical ability.

Some administrators were still, small and unpopular voices crying in the political wilderness. Mr. Peterson has preached his cause all over the Nation, within the security limits permitted by the Atomic Energy Commission.

On the other hand, the Federal Civil Defense setup has been used to some extent as a patronage vineyard. Jobs have been given to political workers and to make employment for defeated candidates, sometimes without regard to their planning, administrative or operating abilities.

A DIFFERENCE ON PREMISES

Thus volunteers have not always been inspired by the quality of leadership they have received from Civil Defense officials on the public payroll. As a result, some have lost interest in serving. Some observers concerned with the problem raise the question why more use is not made of retired Army and other service officers at the Federal level of Civil Defense.

Such officers are in virtually every branch of the Government, including the White House, where their organizing experience abilities are put to full use. The problems that would arise during and after an atomic attack would be much like those that many retired officers coped with in a theater of operations.

Now, the real proportions of the problem are becoming understood. Members of Congress as well as governors and mayors, have disputed the defense agency's fundamental position that it lays out general policies and carries out operations peculiar to the Federal Government, but that the primary responsibility rests with the local governments.

"The present law places responsibility for Civil Defense primarily on the States and localities," said Mr. Peterson in a recent interview. "A tremendous responsibility has got to be on them. That is where people live and where they work, and on what each person does depends the success of Civil Defense."

Mr. Peterson said some had argued that since a thermonuclear attack was a military attack, Civil Defense should be mainly a national responsibility. His reply is that it is a joint responsibility of Federal, State, and municipal governments.

Then, others contend that only the Army would be able to cope with a thermonuclear disaster. They say that the responsibility should be transferred to the Defense Department. Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, has said that he certainly would not reach for this responsibility.

Not much thought has been given to the role of the military. Mr. Peterson acknowledged, however, that "unquestionably there would be martial law in an attacked area." He also believed that the governors would have National Guard units, as well as some Reserve and Regular Army organizations, available to help after an attack. This would mean that a large portion of the Nation's mobilization day force would be tied down by police and relief measures.

The fact remains that the United States has 50 different civil defense organizations—one for each State and the District of Columbia and the Federal agency, to say nothing of the organizations in the Territories. There are no regional groupings that could exercise command in atomic disasters that would spread over one or more State boundaries.

A city on the border of a State—and Washington is a small entity between Maryland and Virginia—might have to rely for succor on the willingness of a governor of the adjoining State to employ resources he is husbanding for his own people. Therefore, unless new civil defense command channels are established for war on the homefront, they will have to be improvised under martial law when the first bombs drop.

INDUSTRY'S PROBLEM UNSOLVED

The fate of civilian populations remains the first priority problem. The other relating to dispersion of industry, meanwhile, has gone virtually unheeded. Recognizing that the economic life of the Nation depends on the industrial complexes, now highly concentrated, the Government in July, 1952, began offering tax amortization incentives for plant dispersal. As of February 15, only 637 projects amounting to $4,700,000,000 for plant and equipment had met the dispersion criteria.

Mr. Peterson has referred to this as "rather slight." Arthur S. Flemming, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, acknowledged before the Kefauver subcommittee that the key criterion for tax amortization had been made obsolete by the hydrogen fallout report. He referred to the requirement that plants would have to move outside a 10-mile radius of congested urban areas.

Ever since Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, disclosed in February that the thermonuclear bomb had spread a lethal fallout over 7,000 square miles, two aspects of his report have created controversy. First was the security policy that withheld the vital data from the public for nearly a year. Second was the duration of radioactivity over so great an area.

Both questions remain confused in the public mind. Some scientists and Members of Congress have criticized the delay bitterly on the ground that knowledge affecting the safety of 165 million far outweighed the security considerations.

Moreover, scientists contend that any scientists, including Russians, could deduce the power and nature of the weapon from data published here and in Japan.

Mr. Strauss told a congressional subcommittee earlier this year that the report had been delayed nearly 3 months for fear that it would adversely affect certain international situations.

Japanese physicists have published exhaustive analyses of the radioactive effects on the crew of the *Fortunate Dragon*, a fishing boat that suffered a heavy radioactive fallout about 100 miles from the explosion.

REPORTS DATA ANTICIPATED

The essential data in the Strauss report had been anticipated by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, an American atomic physicist, in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. He said he had used extant data. Recently he testified before the Kefauver subcommittee that the weapon was not a hydrogen bomb but of another type and even more powerful.

Mr. Peterson has repeated the fact that radioactivity decays readily. He is on record as saying it is possible to move around an attacked area after 4 or 5 days. Dr. Willard F. Libby, an Atomic Energy Commission member, also gave this impression to the Civil Defense Subcommittee.

Senator KEFAUVER had observed, "As I understood Dr. Libby's testimony, and others, it would take at least 3 days before the lethal effect of the fallout would diminish sufficiently so you would be able to move around."

Mr. Peterson replied: "No; I believe it is more correct to say, Mr. Chairman, that depending upon the dosage, it might be a matter of hours to days and probably not over 4 or 5 days—but a matter of hours."

Atomic physicists in the Capital are indignant over statements like this. They say it gives the impression that evacuated persons could return to their homes in a fallout area and resume more or less normal life in 4 or 5 days.

They say that while decay of fallout is comparatively rapid, its persistency makes it hazardous for as much as a year. The impact area itself may become untenable forever, the scientists believe.

The factor still undefined for the public is the persistence of fallout. Mr. Strauss reported that the rate of radiation for the first 36 hours was 2,000 Roentgen at 110 miles from the point of explosion. A Roentgen is a measure of comparison with X-ray strength.

Before the Kefauver committee, Dr. Libby expressed a fallout law as follows: "A fallout that occurred at the end of 1 hour after the bomb had been detonated would, at 7 hours, be one-tenth as strong, and after 2 days would be one-hundredth as strong, and after 2 weeks would be one-thousandth as strong."

EXAMPLES OF DURATION

Dr. Lapp has translated this formula into layman's terms to show that:

From the 5th hour after an explosion on a Monday to the following midnight the fallout referred to by Mr. Strauss would amount to 1,600 roentgens.

From midnight of Monday to midnight of Tuesday, an additional 500 roentgens.

From midnight of Tuesday to midnight of Sunday, an additional 800 roentgens.

From the end of the first week to the end of the first month, an additional 720 roentgens.

From the end of the first month to the end of the first year, an additional 840 roentgens.

Radioactive poisoning is cumulative, so that the condition of a person remaining in a contaminated area would worsen day by day. Thus, if an explosion occurred on January 1, and if a person waited until after the first month to reenter a fallout area, and assuming that through ignorance or other causes he did not take safety precautions, he would absorb 840 roentgens by the end of the year.

The generally accepted standard is that 450 roentgens absorbed within a day or so will kill half the persons exposed to them, and seriously sicken the others. Mr. Strauss said a dose of about 25 roentgens over a brief period would produce temporary blood changes. A dose of about 100 roentgens may produce nausea and other symptoms of radiation sickness.

A LIMIT ON EXPOSURE

In conducting atomic tests at the Nevada proving grounds, the AEC does not permit persons in the area to receive more than 3.9 roentgens in a year. Laboratory workers are allowed a maximum exposure of three-tenths of a roentgen a week.

Thus scientists question how anyone but a protected worker could enter a contaminated area, and then only for brief periods. Both the Atomic Energy Commission and Mr. Peterson advise washing down houses and turning over the earth to cover radioactive material. Scientists explain that if a citizen were able to decontaminate an area 50 feet in diameter, he would be reducing the radiation dose by only 50 percent.

The surrounding area still would be radiating poison. If a few acres of woods were nearby the task would be beyond the ability of the individual. And this problem of eliminating contamination from the immediate home environment does not consider contaminated food and water supplies.

While this issue is left clouded by the pertinent officials, the citizen seeking to decide between flight or building a shelter has no basic guidelines.

Mr. Peterson is seeking, meanwhile, to rouse more public and official interest in what he calls the preattack phase of civil defense. He explains that the postattack phase is well conceived. Hundreds of thousands have volunteered for auxiliary police, fire, rescue, welfare, communications, and medical services.

PREATTACK PLAN STRESSED

The Civil Defense Administration has accumulated $131 million of a proposed $411 million reserve of medical supplies that would be needed to back up the States in handling 5 million casualties for 3 weeks.

Mr. Peterson explained that the American Medical Association had told him this number of casualties was all that the Nation's medical resources could care for. And this is only by using chiropractors, veterinarians, and everybody else with a smattering of medical knowledge.

Until the fallout report, the preattack phase had received little consideration. Mr. Peterson said this was the most critical phase because this was where countless lives might be saved.

Most important, he said, is to evacuate cities, and, second, for people on the edge of cities to build themselves basement or backyard shelters. Such shelters, with sanitary facilities and air conditioning, as recommended by Mr. Peterson, probably would cost $2,000 and up.

Mr. Peterson has arrived at a rough formula by which the individual would decide whether to hide in a shelter or flee. He expresses it this way:

A thermonuclear bomb with the power of 20 million tons of dynamite, if it struck Manhattan, would cause complete destruction in a radius of 5 miles, and diminishing degrees of damage to a radius of 20 miles. By complete destruction is meant "buildings fractionalized, pulverized, vaporized, and a crater 1 mile or 2 miles wide and 175 to 200 feet deep" in which you could bury 14 Pentagon buildings.

Persons living 15 miles, perhaps even 11 miles, from an anticipated aiming point, might build a backyard or basement shelter. If they survived they might be able to come out in 4 or 5 days. But persons living closer should evacuate.

Mr. Peterson has said that tests by cities point to the feasibility of evacuating millions. These have been tests conducted without a real threat and therefore with a minimum of anxiety and disorder.

FUND FOR STUDY DEMANDED

Evacuation is now the policy relied upon as the chief means of safety for millions. But this is only a beginning. What is to be done with millions once they reach the countryside?

Those whose cities have been actually attacked must be sheltered and fed indefinitely. Even plans for this are nonexistent except perhaps for a few cities. The populations of cities not attacked would return to their homes until the next alert.

Mr. Peterson is adamant in saying that he cannot make a start and will not ask a penny to build shelters until Congress furnishes the $12 million for the evacuation and fallout studies. He said it was necessary to determine for 100 cities just how many could be sheltered in factories, basements, stores, churches, schools, and culverts, 15 to 50 miles from their home towns.

When this much is known, the defense agency would decide on how many roadside shelters would be needed for the rest of the refugees.

For such metropolitan areas as New York and Boston, where one city impinges on the boundary of others, the problem is even more complex.

It is Mr. Peterson's philosophy that there is no place for fatalism in the face of the threat of the thermonuclear weapon. His position is that measures may be taken that can save countless lives. It is evident, however, that there is a great void between the neighborhood volunteer with a rescue mission and national planning for preattack measures affecting whole cities.

FALLOUT OF BOMB A DEFENSE FACTOR—SHOWER OF RADIOACTIVE DUST AFTER THE EXPLOSION MAKES WIDE AREA UNSAFE—EXPERTS SPLIT ON TESTS—AEC SCIENTISTS DISCOUNT GENETIC DANGERS BUT OTHERS HAVE DOUBTS

(By Robert K. Plumb)

Radioactive fallout is a shower of dust after a thermonuclear explosion.

The ugly mushrooming cloud that has become the trademark of atomic explosion is made up of dust. The particles are spread by the winds after an explosion. They settle down over wide areas where the winds move them. Or they are carried down in rain or snow.

The official report of the Atomic Energy Commission published February 15 described fallout following the tests of what was probably the first fusion weapon on March 1, 1954, in the Pacific proving grounds. White calcium oxide fell like snow as far as 160 miles downwind from the blast site, the Commission said. An area of 7,000 square miles was made unsafe for human habitation.

The Commission referred to the Pacific explosion as a thermonuclear detonation. Ordinarily, this might be taken to mean that a hydrogen fusion device had been set off. Some other fusion device might actually have been exploded, however.

The hazard of fallout in civil defense has been appreciated slowly in the 3 months since the Commission's report. Only a suggestion of the exact problem, however, has been made public thus far.

Fallout peril depends upon how much radioactive dust is created in the moments following the explosion. In an air burst, dangerous fallout dust is made up of fragments of the casing of the bomb and its vaporized mechanical components plus the end products of the fission and fusion reactions. A wide range of chemical elements is involved.

Also, some stray dust particles floating in the air may become irradiated to a high degree. But the total amount of air burst dust is relatively small.

The fallout hazard is much greater with an explosion near or at the surface. Tons of earth and rock and other terrestrial objects destroyed by the explosion are sucked up into the great mushroom. Intense radiation transforms these particles into hot radiation emitters.

DUST SPEEDED BY WINDS

The great force of the explosion (the Pacific test was one generating the force of millions of tons of TNT, according to the Commission) blows the radioactive dust very high.

It boils up to 80,000 feet or more, to heights that are not well explored. The dust speeds with the winds aloft. Their speed and direction determine the ultimate size and shape, and the direction from the blast site, of the elongated cigar-shaped pattern within which radiation was found to be lethal in the Pacific tests.

According to the Commission's report, air-burst fragments are mostly lightweight. They may travel far, perhaps around the world, in a week or two. The light fragments take a long time to come down.

Irradiated particles always lose their strength with time. So particles that travel a long distance over a long time are considered relatively harmless.

This is not true of the heavier surface explosion particles. They fall soon, while they are still very hot. In the Pacific test, island coral was burned to unslacked lime and irradiated. Blown into the air, it absorbed water.

Eight hours after the explosion, a white radioactive snow of hot calcium oxide and water particles began. It fell as far as 160 miles downwind. Particles formed a deadly white mantle where they rested. The size of these heavy fallout particles varied between one-fiftieth and one-thousandth of an inch in diameter. Not all fallout particles can be seen, but hot ones always can be detected by radiation detectors.

RADIATION BURNS BODY

The term "radiation" describes a variety of ways in which energy is transmitted through space. Light is radiation. So is heat.

Four radiations associated with thermonuclear explosions (in addition to heat and

light) are alpha beta and gamma rays and streams of neutrons. (Alphas are speeding helium cores, betas are high-energy electrons, gammas are high-energy X-rays. Neutrons are chargeless particles that can act like subatomic rifle bullets.)

All these radiations can change living and inanimate organisms. The mechanisms are not clear. The effect is somewhat like a burn, sometimes a burn of vital tissues deep within the body.

Radiation is not often if ever immediately fatal. But it can damage the body so that the victims weaken and die gradually. Radiation damages the machinery of cells, the smallest units of living materials. No cure for radiation overexposure is known. Some cells are more sensitive to radiation than are others. Some cancerous cells, for instance, are killed by radiation while surrounding normal cells are not damaged.

Damage to a living body by radiation depends upon the type of the radiation, the intensity of the radiation, the time it impinges upon a radiation victim, how close he is to the source.

Radiation is measured in curies, by comparing it with the strength of radium, or by comparing it with X-ray strength, in which case the measure is roentgens. Curies were named for Pierre and Marie Curie, discoverers in 1902 of radium. Roentgens for Wilhelm Konrad von Roentgen, German physicist who discovered X-rays in 1895.

LARGE DOSES USUALLY FATAL

According to the Atomic Energy Commission, exposure to 25 roentgens over the entire body for a short time produces temporary changes in the blood. A similar 100-roentgen exposure produces symptoms of radiation sickness. An exposure of 450 roentgens is fatal to about half those who receive it. Larger doses are more often fatal. Very large doses are invariably fatal.

The body can recover between exposures. The Atomic Energy Commission and other authorities have set three-tenths of 1 roentgen as the maximum exposure to which a normal person can be subjected week after week without harm.

In some weeks higher exposures are allowed if the yearly exposure does not exceed 15 roentgens. Small doses are believed free of immediate hazard. Medium doses can be withstood. Large doses are usually fatal.

At the instant of a thermonuclear detonation, very high levels of radiation are created. However, according to Federal estimates, these flashes of gamma radiation and strong streams of neutrons do not extend much farther than the area ravaged by blast and heat waves from the explosion.

Fallout, beginning sometime after the explosion, extends the radiation danger way out from the blast site.

According to the February report of the AEC, during the first 36 hours after the 1954 detonation, the following levels of radiation were measured:

Ten miles downwind from ground zero, 5,000 r.

100 miles downwind from ground zero, 2,300 r (at one point).

110 miles downwind from ground zero, 2,000 r.

125 miles downwind from ground zero, 1,000 r.

160 miles downwind from ground zero, 500 r.

190 miles downwind from ground zero, 300 r.

220 miles downwind from ground zero, survival after 48 hours exposure without protection likely.

PATTERN ROUGHLY PREDICTABLE

These figures present only an approximation of the distribution of fall-out radioactivity, the Commission said. There were some very much hotter spots and some places of relative freedom from radiation. The exact pattern of fallout can be predicted only roughly, it was said. Accuracy depends on knowledge of the dust formed and on knowledge of future weather movements.

Some Civil Defense authorities have suggested that a fall-out area might be relatively safe after as short a period as a few days.

No precise description of what happened in the test of the big device in the Pacific has come from the Atomic Energy Commission. However, in the current issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, a physicist and former executive of the Atomic Energy Commission, calculates from the reported 110-mile-downwind measurement of the AEC that radiation there would remain as high as 840 r (if it was 2,000 r after 36 hours) on the surface within 1 year.

No other estimates of the duration of fallout radiation as a hazard to life, which appear to be based upon sound analysis of the Pacific results, are available. Fallout from smaller detonations would pose a smaller problem.

Efforts to wash off radioactive fallout, to shield persons, food, and water from it, and to take other protective measures, would reduce the hazard from the high radiation levels measured in the Pacific proving grounds' 1954 test.

Radiation hazards at explosion time have been regarded as low. Heat and shock waves would kill any person close enough to be subjected to prompt radiation. This appears to be borne out to some extent by recent reports from Hiroshima, where the atomic bomb was dropped. There was little fallout. Effects on survivors of the blast that could be traced to immediate radioactivity have not yet appeared.

Fallout radiation poses another problem completely different from that of contact with hot dust during the first few hours, weeks, or even months after an explosion. Contact would make a victim sick or it could kill him. The second main problem is in the possible long-range effects of fallout radiation upon the human race.

Radiation is one of the agents that cause changes called mutations in the germ plasm, the sperm and ovary borne material that transmits characteristics from generation to generation. Some geneticists fear that each instance of spread of fallout will damage germ plasm and deteriorate the inheritance of as yet unborn generations.

Regarding this possibility, the Atomic Energy Commission has reported:

"At our present stage of genetic knowledge there is a rather wide range of admissible opinion on this subject. In general the total amount of radiation received by residents of the United States from all nuclear detonations to date, including the Russian and British tests and all of our own tests in the United States and the Pacific has been about one-tenth of one roentgen. This is only about one one-hundredth of the average radiation exposure inevitably received from natural causes by a person during his or her reproductive lifetime. It is about the same as the exposure received from one chest X-ray."

The commission said that it was continuing to support elaborate testing to detect possible genetic dangers. Meanwhile, however, commission authorities "believe that the small amount of additional exposure of the general population of the United States from our weapons-testing program will not seriously affect the genetic constitution of human beings * * *."

This opinion is not shared by all scientists outside the Commission. At the time of the last annual Washington meeting of the American Physical Society in April, for instance, a special symposium on "Nuclear Radiation Hazards and Their Political Implications" was held by the Federation of American Scientists. Grave doubts and worries about Commission policies were expressed.

In the May 27 issue of Science, bulletin of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a report was made on this meeting by Dr. M. Stanley Livingston, professor of physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He said great difficulty had been met in finding scientists willing to talk in public about the problem.

"This experience illustrates," Dr. Livingston reported, "one of the politicial dilemmas in which we find ourselves * * *. Those who know won't speak and those who don't know cannot speak without authority."

Security regulations, fear of controversial issues and administrative restrictions on speaking by employees were cited by Dr. Livingston as the reasons that a scientific-political program was difficult to arrange.

At the session, Dr. Bentley Glass, geneticist and professor of biology at the Johns Hopkins University, emphasized that the mutations caused by high-energy radiations were deleterious and that there was no recovery.

"The present 'permissible' dose of 0.3 r/week or 15 r/year, if delivered to the entire population, might multiply the present mutation rates by at least 4.5 and maybe as much as 150 times," Dr. Glass said. "Who, knowing the predominant harmfulness of mutation, can dismiss such a possibility lightly?"

The Atomic Energy Commission is continuing studies on the effects of radiation on living organisms.

Also, studies are continuing on the actual appearance of radiation that has been detected in laboratories from cost to coast following domestic and Pacific nuclear-weapon tests.

In the May 13 issue of Science, Dr. Merril Eisenbud and Dr. John H. Harley reported on the total radioactive dust from all detonations between 1951 and January 1, 1955, that had fallen on the United States. They found it to be low compared with the radioactivity normally present in the earth's crust.

The average value of the accumulated fallout is 61 millicuries (equivalent to sixty-one thousandths of a gram of radium) for each square mile of surface, they said. The radioactivity contributed at the surface by the naturally occurring radium 226 varies from 100 to 1,000 mullicuries in each square mile, they noted.

EXHIBIT 4

DANGERS OF FALLOUT CITED—U-BOMB IS SAID TO RENDER ATOM DEFENSES OBSOLETE

(By Warren Unna)

An article by nuclear physicist Ralph E. Lapp in the June Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists published today details of how science's latest weapon, the U-bomb, is capable of driving people into underground shelters for up to 9 months, outmoding such superdefense protections as Nike and polluting food with a vicious fallout particle which produces bone cancer.

Lapp's remarks provide a ghoulish expansion of cut-and-dried statistics released by Atomic Energy Commissioner Willard Frank Libby 10 days ago in an almost unnoticed speech before a University of Chicago alumni group.

Libby, with extremely obscure wording, confirmed what scientists around the world had long sniffed out: the "device" used by the United States in its March 1954 Bikini test was no A-bomb such as was dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945; no H-bomb such as was tested at Eniwetok atoll in 1952. It was a U-bomb triggered by fissionable uranium 235, fanned up by a fusionable hydrogen ingredient and finally split asunder by an enormous fissioning of ordinary uranium 238.

Libby detailed how the Bikini U-bomb explosion sucked up fine radioactive particles

into its stratospheric mushroom and then spewed them out again in fine fallout dust over a 7,000-square mile ellipse in the South Pacific. He said the fallout area could have been "larger or smaller by a considerable factor." Without further ado, Libby began describing just how large was "larger."

According to Libby, a single 10-megaton bomb, one equal to the explosive power of 10 million tons of TNT, could shower 1,100 pounds of fallout dust over a 100,000-square mile area. At such a rate, 30 carefully placed bombs could blanket the entire United States.

Libby went on to say the average radioactive "dosage" from such a fallout pattern would be 67 roentgens after the first day, and 6.7 roentgens after the first week. Lapp says over a considerable period a person could stand an "emergency" exposure rate of 1 roentgen per day, 20 times that now permitted AEC employees working in bomb tests. A quick dosage of 400 roentgens is generally accepted as being lethal.

But Libby didn't make the news as bad as he might have. For one thing, Civil Defense Administrator Val Peterson has spoken in terms of 20-, 40-, and 60-megaton bombs. Some scientists say ships could bear bombs to these shores with a 100-megaton capacity—packing a wallop equal to 200 billion pounds of TNT in 1 explosion. (By contrast, the Hiroshima bomb was equal to a mere 40 million pounds of TNT.)

Libby also did not say that if the fallout from a 10-megaton bomb were confined to the 7,000-square-mile Bikini ellipse, rather than to the 100,000-square-mile area he mentioned, the concentrated radioactive dosage would be more than 14 times greater.

In other words, if the Bikini U-bomb were of 10-megaton size, the fallout at the end of the first day would average some 950 roentgens over a 7,000-square-mile area—more than twice the lethal 1-day dose.

Even at the end of the first week, the dosage would average 95 roentgens. This is a little less than one-fourth of the lethal dose but just about the amount, according to Libby, which can cause "deaths and mutations in later generations" through the radioactivity's effect on the human reproductive organs.

BONE CANCER PERIL SEEN

Libby's speech mentioned that radiostrontium 1 of 90 fallout fission particles, acts like calcium and can cause bone cancer. He said the natural radiostrontium in the United States was increased 15 times last year, the year of the Bikini U-bomb test. But he also said it would have to take a large-scale atomic war, with 1,000 times as much fallout, before the radiostrontium would really start doing its damage.

Libby's remarks, however, are confined to Strontium 90, an isotope which emits dangerous beta rays over a 28-year period. Lapp, in his article in the Bulletin, points out that a more potent "bad actor," Strontium 89, puts out 180 times more radioactivity during its comparatively brief 56-day life.

Dr. John C. Bugher, Chief of the AEC's Division of Biology and Medicine, told a recent Senate committee investigating civil defense that fallout dust could be shaken off crops. Nobody asked him about the radiostrontium that seeped into the ground, was absorbed by plant roots, and eaten by milk-producing cows. And Bugher didn't volunteer the information.

Until Libby's talk to the Chicago alumni, AEC's comments on fallout had been pretty well limited to the much-publicized news release by AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss last February 15. In it, he officially conceded the existence of fallout and described the pattern it took at the Bikini test. He also said that during a 36-hour period following the burst, the fallout would have been lethal for all persons standing exposed to it 140 miles away, for half of those standing 160 miles away, and for 5 to 10 percent of those standing 190 miles away.

Strauss did not discuss persistence—how long and to what degree fallout radioactivity can deny humanity a normal above-ground existence. This is the unknown which scientists, some Senators, and civil-defense officials say must quickly be made known if this Nation's civil defense is to be effective.

The information that is given, they contend, seems to have a fixation on fallout from bomb tests and never spells out what to expect from the real thing.

Libby has since testified that fallout radioactivity becomes one-tenth as intense 7 hours after the burst, one-hundredth after the first 2 days, one-thousandth after the first 2 weeks, and one ten-thousandth after the first 3 months.

EVIDENCES OF U-BOMB

In April Strauss answered a Youth Wants To Know question on the existence of the U-bomb by declaring: "I have seen some pieces by columnists using that expression, but so far as I am aware there is no such weapon."

A week ago, 3 days after Libby's Chicago talk, Strauss told the American Medical Association convention in Atlantic City 95 percent of all the atomic information dealing with biology and medicine had now been declassified. He added the rest would not remain under wraps very much longer.

How do scientists read into Libby's remarks the fact that a U-bomb exists?

Primarily because the Libby speech said 10 megatons of "fission" energy could be produced in a nuclear explosion. H-bombs produce "fusion"—the combining of atoms, not "fission"—which is when they split.

The scientists then combined a little mathematics with a little economics.

To get the 1,100 pounds of fission fallout from the 10-megaton bomb Libby described, scientists say the bomb would have to contain either an enormous amount of rare uranium 235 or plutonium—the fission producers—or just natural uranium which was somehow made to fission. Since the first two are supposed to cost around $10,000 a pound to produce, each one-ton bomb would set the national budget back by $20 million. This price is prohibitive, even for so wealthy a nation as the United States.

The natural uranium ingredient is cheap, however—about $25 a pound. The AEC has masses of it, piled up as "waste" in obtaining uranium 235.

Scientists have deduced that a middle core of hydrogen must exist in the bomb to produce the fast neutrons which fission the outer jacket of natural uranium.

TWO DEDUCTIONS

The nongovernmental experts, including Lapp and Prof. J. Rotblat, of England, say their mathematical and economic deductions merely confirm the evidence of fission particles found on the *Fortunate Dragon*. This is the Japanese fishing vessel which was accidentally hit by a fallout downwind following the Bikini explosion.

The information presented by Libby and Lapp makes two things coldly real:

1. Bomb stockpiles in themselves are no longer necessary. Using Libby's own figures, thirty 10-megaton U-bombs could blanket the entire continental United States with radioactive fallout, and, of course, cause enormous blast, burn, and localized radiation in the immediate areas hit.

2. International inspection, as first proposed in the Acheson-Lilienthal-Baruch plan, no longer provides foolproof knowledge of a nation's nuclear buildup. With natural uranium as the basic ingredients, only a minimum amount of the costly uranium 235 and plutonium need be produced and could be easily hidden. There will be no need for many huge power sources, such as at Hanford, Wash., no need for enormous gaseous-diffusion plants, such as that at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES

A countermove to these cold realities, next to peace, would appear to be workable civil-defense protection.

Libby spoke of staying in shelter while waiting for the outdoors to cool from its fallout radiation. Evacuation might be possible in shielded cars or by helicopter.

He also threw in another suggestion: Perhaps a medicine might be invented to counteract the radioactivity—quench it before the fallout starts burning through the skin and provoking tumors in the bones.

Such an invention might mean man had come full circle. He would have devised a weapon to help neutralize the weapon he originally created.

EXHIBIT 5

UNITED STATES FOUND UNPREPARED TO MEET HYDROGEN-BOMB ATTACK—CIVIL DEFENSE FORCES UPSET BY APATHY IN FACE OF PERIL—STATES FAR BEHIND ON NEW KEY POLICY OF EVACUATION

(By Damon Stetson)

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., June 3.—The major planning assumption of civil-defense officials here is that the Soviet Union can strike any target in the United States.

In this hydrogen-bomb era such an attack could mean death, suffering, and devastating destruction. Moreover, the Nation has learned of a concomitant nuclear threat—residual radioactivity or fallout.

The possibility of atomic warfare poses one of the Nation's most serious challenges. The Federal Civil Defense Administration, with headquarters here, is struggling to meet it.

Plans for meeting all kinds of civil-defense problems have been made on paper. Great quantities of advisory and technical information on civil defense have been issued.

Many persons have been trained for special civil-defense duties. The agency has helped States and cities purchase supplies and equipment needed for civil-defense programs. A nationwide air-raid warning system is in operation.

VOLUNTEERS ILL TRAINED

Despite these and many other accomplishments, Federal civil-defense authorities are confronted with public apathy about planning for civil defense. They say State and local governments do not seem to get the support, financial and moral, that they need for essential civil-defense preparations.

Volunteer civil-defense officials, they say, often have not had the time or developed the drive to carry through aggressive local planning. Federal officials feel that volunteer workers too often are not well-enough trained to meet possible emergencies but they think civil defense is too big a job for the military.

Evacuation planning—key to civil defense in the thermonuclear age—is in its infancy. In brief, according to FCDA officials, the Nation is not prepared for a hydrogen-bomb attack.

Under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, the Civil Defense Administration is charged with preparing national plans and programs for civil defense, delegating civil-defense responsibilities to other Federal departments and agences, disseminating warnings of impending enemy attacks, distributing civil-defense information and a variety of other duties.

Actually, however, the primary responsibility is vested in the States and cities.

Some governors and mayors, including Gov. Averell Harriman of New York, Robert B. Meyner of New Jersey, Abraham A. Ribicoff of Connecticut, and Mayor Robert Wagner of New York City, have questioned recently whether State and local authorities

are able any longer to assume this burden in the face of thermonuclear weapons. They have suggested that the primary responsibility should belong to the Federal Government.

PETERSON PREACHES NEED

Civil Defense is headed by a genial and energetic Nebraskan, Val Peterson. He receives an annual salary of $17,500 and seems to enjoy his peripatetic life—divided between the offices here and in Washington, with frequent speechmaking trips.

Nevertheless, Mr. Peterson has to be something of an ever persevering civil defense missionary in view of the stark realities of atomic warfare and general public apathy.

"As long as there are weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them—as long as we need a military defense—we need civil defense," he preaches.

The hydrogen bomb and fallout have forced a new course in planning. There is no longer adequate shelter in target areas. Consequently, evacuation of target cities has become basic civil-defense policy.

Yet Mr. Peterson acknowledges that the Nation is not even close to being properly prepared to face an attack. The Civil Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services recently concluded that if a thermonuclear attack were to occur, possibly millions of lives would be lost unnecessarily because of the inability to evacuate cities and to house and feed refugees.

STAFF VOLUNTEERS TIME

Such assessments of preparedness perhaps help to explain why the 437 persons on the staff here are going about their tasks so soberly. They know how bad it could be. Many of them are voluntarily working extended hours and on weekends.

An additional 268 civil-defense workers, including 16 liaison officials in Washington, make up the remainder of the FCDA staff at seven regional offices and in the field.

Civil-defense headquarters was originally in Washington. The agency was forced to give up its rented apartment building there last year. Mr. Peterson had hoped to move to near-by Olney, Md., but President Eisenhower wanted some existing Federal building used. The closest adequate Government facilities were at Battle Creek.

Consequently, last September the agency moved into the Percy L. Jones General Hospital here. This had been taken over by the Army in World War II. The huge edifice, towering incongruously above Battle Creek's tree-lined streets, has 1 million square feet of space. The Civil Defense Administration is occupying only about a quarter of it.

The move to Battle Creek also complied with a directive of the Office of Defense Mobilization that the civil-defense agency be located 30 or more miles outside Washington. The move, therefore, set an example in dispersion.

But the transfer brought problems, too. A large percentage of the agency's employees decided not to make the move. Of 467 employed in Washington, only 235 came here. Liaison work with other branches of the Government became more complicated. Officials now have to spend more time traveling.

THREE MAJOR SERVICES

By this spring, however, most top civil-defense officials were saying that the location of the agency here was working out satisfactorily. They also noted that Battle Creek was more centrally located for visits from State and local civil-defense officials.

Mr. Peterson has indicated that he intends to make at the end of the year a new appraisal of the advantages and disadvantages of the Battle Creek location. But he told the Senate subcommittee in March that up to that time the "balance sheet would be rather on the side of the disruptive factors rather than on those that have been conducive to increased efficiency in our work."

The subcommittee, in its report last month, expressed concern whether the agency could perform its mission properly while located here.

In the fiscal year 1955 the agency received an appropriation of $49,325,000. For the fiscal year 1956 it asked for $59,300,000, compared with $34 billion for the Department of Defense. A supplemental request for $12 million also has been made for surveys, plans, and research to assist the 92 critical target cities in developing evacuation plans.

Organizationally, the agency has a planning staff that has developed and is continually revising the national Civil Defense plan.

Then there are three major services: Education, charged with informing the public; technical advisory, furnishing technical guidance to State and local officials and specialists, and operations control, providing emergency command advice and direction in attack.

OPERATIONS ROOM SET UP

One of the agency's important responsibilities is to warn of an impending attack. It has assigned an attack warning officer at the headquarters of each of the Air Force's 12 air divisions across the country. It is the responsibility of the commanding general of each division to set a warning condition when an attack threatens.

The FCDA air warning officer then would flash the word to key points where State civil defense officials would pick it up and relay the warning to local units. The entire process, agency officials say, would take only minutes.

The warning officer also would transmit word of the impending attack to a huge operations room here. This room which would be the key information center in an attack, has a huge map of the United States across its rear wall and one of North America at the front.

An entire side wall is covered with black status boards where data on evacuation, damage, dead, and injured in the various regions would be recorded. Special telephone hookups, printers and teletypes would feed information in and out of this room from all over the Nation.

In an actual emergency, the agency would report to the President what had been destroyed and what human and economic resources remained.

It would claim, in behalf of the civilian population, those resources essential to survival. It would arrange for logistic support of stricken cities and provide advice to States and cities preparing for further attacks.

RESPONSIBILITIES DELEGATED

Last summer President Eisenhower approved the delegation by the Civil Defense Administration of certain specified responsibilities of civil defense to departments of the Federal Government.

For instance, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is responsible for planning, guidance and action concerning biological and chemical warfare against humans; the effects of radiological fallout, protection of foods and drugs against contamination, and civil defense in the schools.

The Secretary of Agriculture is responsible for combating biological and chemical warfare against crops, preventing and controlling enemy-caused fires in rural areas, and maintaining adequate food supplies for attacked or support areas.

The Secretary of Commerce is responsible for designation, use, coordination, and emergency clearance and restoration of highway and street systems, and emergency traffic control. All told, some 26 such delegations of responsibility have been made to 6 departments of Government.

Agency officials report that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is well advanced in its plans to cope with its delegated civil-defense responsibilities. Most of the other departments, they say, are in the early planning stages and need appropriations for research and action.

The Senate subcommittee noted that if a Federal agency failed to perform its delegated civil-defense responsibility, the only recourse of the Civil Defense Administrator was to the President.

In view of the slow progress, the subcommittee recommended a more workable system of executive direction to use effectively the extensive resources of the Federal Government.

BULLETIN ON EVACUATION

Probably the greatest civil-defense problem of the moment is evacuation.

"A target city (and there are 92 of them in the United States) that is not ready to evacuate is not ready to survive," according to Mr. Peterson. "There must be a plan. And it must be tested and practiced. The reaction to a bombing attack—whether it be panic or order—depends on the competence of the local and the neighborhood leadership."

The agency has been talking for nearly 2 years about the importance of evacuation but the disclosures regarding a possible hydrogen-bomb and fallout have made solution of the problem urgent. Last September the agency issued an advisory bulletin discussing the necessary planning and responsibilities for evacuation of cities.

This bulletin said it was the responsibility of the Civil Defense Administration to develop national plans and programs for the guidance of evacuation planning by the States and to assist in the integration of State evacuation plans with national and regional civil-defense planning.

Although the FCDA long has emphasized the urgency of evacuation preparations, the agency did not set up an evacuation office as such until mid-March of this year, after the fallout announcement.

This office is charged with assembling and analyzing information on evacuation problems. The results will be supplied to the States and local governments to help them work out evacuation plans. In addition, the special $12 million appropriation has been requested to assist States and cities in evacuation planning.

PROGRAM VERY LIMITED

This evacuation office, despite the urgency of its work, is critically short staffed, in the opinion of one official. Key information on evacuation planning, he said, "is just beginning to get to civil-defense people" [in the cities].

The Senate subcommittee said in its report that the program of evacuation was very limited. It stated that it was alarmed to learn from testimony that cities lacked adequate plans for evacuating citizens.

The concept of evacuation, agency officials point out, is unfamiliar to United States residents. Thorough planning, they say, is one of the greatest problems the Nation ever has faced.

Despite the magnitude of evacuating and then housing and feeding those evacuated, the lack of even temporary evacuation plans in many cities is disturbing those concerned with civil defense.

An agency official who has had a major responsibility in this field was asked why evacuation preparations were so inadequate. He replied that there was no part of the agency that had not been activated regarding evacuation. But he added:

"We don't give orders to the States."

Another high agency official commented, "If a city decides not to evacuate, there's nothing we can do about it."

These are typical of the answers given here to questions about what is actually being done regarding evacuation and other civil-defense problems.

CONFUSION OVER SIGNALS

The present status of air-raid warning signals represents another area of confusion. A new system of signals was announced by the defense agency on March 7—alert and take cover. The announcement said the signal would go into effect immediately.

Many city civil defense directors, however, were not ready for the new signals because their evacuation plans were incomplete or nonexistent.

They protested and were told to put the signals into effect when sound evacuation plans were ready. That has left a muddled situation. Moreover, a check at agency headquarters disclosed that the agency had no report on which cities have put the new signals into effect and which ones haven't.

Much remains to be done also, according to agency officials, in civil defense coordination with Canada. An agreement for cooperation between the two countries was reached in 1951 with the idea of coordinating Civil Defense as if there was no border.

Agreements have been reached regarding the transportation of narcotic medications across the border during emergencies and for the relaxation of immigration and customs regulations.

Evacuation of cities near the border, however, would pose special problems in United States-Canada cooperation, but the agency apparently has few specific plans for such an eventuality.

A joint United States-Canada Civil Defense Committee meets only once a year. Eight joint groups have been working on mutual problems. But there are few concrete results to report.

There is some feeling among high agency officials here that it needs more authority. One executive in the agency suggested that this could be achieved if it could spend matching funds for the administration of local civil defense activities and as a consequence exert greater supervision over local activities.

PROBLEM OF VOLUNTEERS

The problem of civil defense volunteers also is serious. Although most cities have large numbers on their lists, many are not adequately trained, particularly on such matters as fallout.

The feeling here is that there are not enough volunteers, but the agency believes the cities are not prepared to handle and train those who offer their services.

The National Guard in each State is under control of the governor. Therefore, agency officials say, it will be available for emergency use as the governor sees fit. But it is felt that the Guard in any State would not be big enough for a major air raid emergency. It probably would assist the civil authorities.

Another problem is medical planning for total war. The Senate subcommittee found that the Nation was medically unprepared. Yet the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said that its civil-defense responsibility did not include mass medical care. The subcommittee urged immediate steps to give some appropriate Federal agency this responsibility.

Key civil defense officials here readily acknowledge weaknesses. But they feel that they have made genuine progress in educating and preparing 165 million residents for this atomic age.

Dean Pohlenz, Deputy Assistant Director of Planning for the Agency, puts it this way:

"We're not as effective as we ought to be, but we're a lot more effective than we're given credit for being."

EXHIBIT 6

MAJOR CITIES LAG IN PLANNING DEFENSE AGAINST BOMB ATTACKS—SURVEY FINDS SOME TOTALLY UNREADY, PUBLIC APATHETIC

(By Bernard Stengren)

Although some Civil Defense progress has been made, Americans are not prepared for enemy attack.

Bostonians would have almost no chance of survival.

Norfolk's progress has been slow but positive.

Pittsburgh is almost totally unprepared.

Cleveland would be a sitting duck.

Ottawa is almost totally unprepared.

Detroit's plans are completed but not made public yet.

Chicago would lie helpless.

Fort Worth is woefully unprepared.

Los Angeles would be a horrible shambles.

Seattle is not ready.

New York Times correspondents in these cities found citizens apathetic—with exceptions—and concrete preparations rare.

The average citizen either does not believe the danger is great, or feels that if anything can be done the task is someone else's. The correspondents' reports emphasize the conclusions of a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Last month that body found that the United States is presently unprepared to deal with a disaster resulting from a thermonuclear attack * * *.

A CHANGE OF POLICY

A major cause of unpreparedness is the change in concept from duck and cover to run for the hills enunciated by President Eisenhower 18 months ago.

He said the dangers of new weapons (later disclosed as the radioactive fallout from hydrogen bombs) and the improved early warning system had made evacuation preferable to seeking shelter.

Federal and local civil defense officials agree. Many of the later, however, complain that too little information on how to cope with hydrogen-bomb effects has been given them.

So strategic evacuation now is the theme. This means getting out of cities at the first warning, befort bombers arrive. But among the cities surveyed, only in Seattle have residents practiced evacuation.

Elsewhere such plans are on paper, if they have reached that stage. Should the attack come today, the best that residents could do would be to scramble for the few available shelters.

Only 2 of the 10, however—Pittsburgh and Ottawa—have no civil defense budget, no civil defense director, few volunteers and almost no preparation or equipment.

What have other cities done?

In general they have hired full-time directors of civil defense. Three cities have retired military men, two have police officials and in three cities civilians head the program.

They have allotted current annual budgets ranging from $22,866 to $597,000 for salaries, services and other expenses.

They have trained, to a greater or lesser extent, the volunteers who have signed up. These are far fewer than officials say are needed.

They have held few full-scale drills, but test air-raid sirens at regular intervals.

They have established, with few exceptions, good relations with other city departments and with adjacent and statewide civil defense organizations.

Even where evacuation plans have been made, much remains to be done. For example:

While shelter will probably not be abandoned entirely because of the possibility of sneak attack, it is now the less desirable alternative. Yet school children and others are still being trained in shelter. They would not know what to do if evacuation were ordered.

Definite assignments of specific persons or groups to specific evacuation routes have not been made.

Provision for long-term feeding, housing and schooling of refugees has not been made.

Similarly, provision for medical care, sanitation, health, and other problems of temporary settlements of displaced populations has not been made.

Here is the picture in the 10 cities:

Boston: The 2,600,000 persons who live within the Boston metropolitan area extending 15 miles from the State House would have almost no chance of survival if a nuclear weapon dropped today.

This is the almost unanimous opinion of the men most closely concerned with the public safety. It is concurred in by civic leaders. The blame is placed on the complexities of nuclear weapons and their consequences, rather than on human factors.

A principal problem, according to Joseph L. Malone, director of civil defense for Boston, is in working out the details of shifting from shelter to the evacuation concept.

The city has a population of 810,000. In working hours, this is increased by nearly 500,000. There are approximately 90,000 civil-defense workers, most of them volunteers. Youth groups are not included.

As to shelters, Boston could handle between 300,000 and 400,000 persons under the old plan. Signs pointing to the shelters will remain.

PROBLEMS ARE CREATED

There appear to be enough sirens, strategically placed. But the Federal decision to evacuate whole populations has created problems. For instance, the city is working on special plans for evacuating schoolchildren.

Printed evacuation information has been distributed to homes, business, and industrial concerns. It includes a map showing 15 thoroughfares designated escape routes to the suburbs.

There is apparent agreement in thinking between the State and city planners. Signs have been posted barring certain roads in an attack. It is agreed, however, that these will come down.

Now escape routes will be marked even more clearly.

Despite a general impression of apathy toward civil defense, officials express amazement at what the public seems to know about what to do in emergency.

None of the suburban or outlying communities is geared to handle refugees. The same applies to cordinating areawide dispersal.

MAYOR FIXES BUDGET

Turnouts of volunteers for classes have been poor. But the turnouts have been remarkably good for the twice-a-year drill, officials say. No workers are uniformed. The organization is largely a skeleton one, pending revision of plans to shift from shelter to evacuation.

Mayor John B. Hynes has recommended a budget of $75,000 for civil defense this year. This has been about the same for the last 5 years.

Mr. Malone and his deputy, Francis C. Cleary, are full-time employees. They have a staff of a dozen clerks and maintenance persons. Mr. Malone reports to Mayor Hines.

Relations with the police and fire departments have been harmonious. Under the law, the Civil Defense Director is supreme in an emergency.

The relation of city to State civil defense also has been cooperative. Both groups meet frequently to work on evacuation plans.

Radiation-detection equipment is handled by the State. The city public works department maintains emergency equipment.

Norfolk: Civil-defense progress has been slow but positive. Because of the geographical and transportation circumstances peculiar to the Norfolk area, planning has been geared to coordination of intercommunity efforts.

The Norfolk-Portsmouth complex is the home of one of the world's largest concentrations of naval facilities. The area is one of the most critical targets on the east coast.

Also included in the area complex is the Army's Transportation Corps Training Command at Fort Eustis and its subordinate op-

erational command at Fort Story, north of here.

Dominated by this vast network of military concentration is a civilian population of 800,000 in an area from Virginia Beach to Suffolk, some 40 miles inland, and from the North Carolina border to a line north of the Newport News sector.

Norfolk's population is estimated at 296,500. For evacuation, much of the traffic will be by rail and water. Princess Anne County and Portsmouth will use principally rail and highways.

STRESS PUT ON FLIGHT

Evacuation of the entire tidewater area is the keynote of passive defense planning. There is little hope for adequate bomb shelters because of a high-water level underground—even cellars are nearly impossible in most of the area.

Calvin H. Dalby, Norfolk director of public safety, is civil defense coordinator.

"We are prepared for an air raid," he said recently. "There are many things yet to do, but our major problem is final coordination of all plans in the tidewater area."

Three major highways leading east from Norfolk through Princess Anne County are reserved for civil defense. These and roads leading north and northwest from Portsmouth are posted as such.

Concise and detailed instructions have not been given to the public in final form. And as yet no firm plans have been formulated for schoolchildren or hospital patients.

"The nature of our geographical situation demands exact planning and mature and realistic instructions," Mr. Dalby said.

VOLUNTEERS ENROLLED

To prepare for this task, the Norfolk civil defense organization has enrolled 2,732 volunteers. These workers are divided for planning and operation into committees—transportation, wardens, welfare, first aid, and communications.

Four trained radioactivity teams have been formed. Sixteen more are to be developed.

Mr. Dalby is operating with a current budget of $22,866. The Norfolk City Council will provide funds for subsequent needs through additional appropriations.

The civil defense command will be held jointly by Mr. Dalby and the city manager. All orders, in an attack, would come from them to the police, fire and other city departments.

Lack of coordination between State and local officials has been one of the most pressing problems.

Thus far the only practice alerts have been ordered by regional or national authority. Mr. Dalby feels that they have shown increasing public awareness and cooperation.

Paul J. Canady, director of public welfare, reports that medical supplies are being assembled at strategic warehouses.

Through coordination with inland communities, officials are confident that evacuee populations can be accommodated.

Pittsburgh: This industrial capital, a prime target in atomic warfare, is almost totally unprepared for an enemy air raid. The state of civil defense at best can be described as a muddle.

Mayor David L. Lawrence and local civic leaders blame the failure of Federal and Commonwealth officials to agree on what should be done in an air attack and set a local policy.

Pittsburgh's situation may be unusual in that there are separate civil defense organizations for this city of 700,000 and the 129 other municipalities in Allegheny County with a total population of 900,000. Liaison between the municipalities and the Allegheny County coordinating organization is loose and ineffective.

Despite radio broadcasts, television announcements and newspaper publicity, public knowledge of what to do in a raid is not considered adequate, at least for adults. Much of this is attributed to public apathy and indifference.

There are two plans for an emergency. One, partial evacuation, is only in the study stage. Total mass evacuation within hours is considered impossible because of the topography of the city and its traffic bottlenecks.

NO SIGNS ON ROADS

Duck and shelter is the current plan. School children are far more advanced in knowledge of seeking shelter than their elders. There are signs in public and private buildings pointing to shelters that could handle less than 10 percent of the population.

There are no signs on roads to bar traffic in attack. Suburban and outlying communities are unprepared to handle refugees. Thought has been given, but no plans developed, for any areawide dispersal.

How many individuals are enrolled in civil defense work is not known, even by Mrs. Gertrude Levin, the only full-time administrator, on loan from the city. Her office acts as the coordinating unit for city and county activities.

No one is in command of civil defense forces. Ross Loeffler, an official of United States Steel Corp., resigned 18 months ago. He had served as director in World War II.

The city has no budget for civil defense. But 10 automatic sirens, costing $100,000, and 11 high-power fire pumpers, costing $200,000, were purchased, using half city money and the balance in Federal matching funds.

There have been a few local air raid drills in the last 2 years. Most drills, however, have been statewide. Only one has come as a surprise. In the city air raid sirens are tested each Monday morning.

Civil defense personnel have been inclined to regard recent drills as fairly successful.

No physical equipment exists for decontamination, determining radioactivity, or feeding masses of refugees. Existing transit facilities, such as buses, streetcars, and private automobiles would have to provide transportation for evacuation.

Cleveland: The city of Cleveland would be a sitting duck today for an enemy plane carrying a hydrogen bomb, despite accelerated civil defense activities.

This opinion is shared by the city's civil defense director, the police and fire departments, newspapers, and civic groups.

One hydrogen bomb dropped in the downtown area would kill 250,000 men, women, and children, according to civil defense officials. This warning has been publicized widely, but public apathy remains.

Local public officials contend that the public has been lulled into a false sense of security by optimistic statements of Washington diplomats.

Although severely handicapped by a shortage of volunteer workers, local civil defense leaders have made considerable progress in the last 2 years.

In 1954 almost $100,000 in communications equipment was purchased on a share basis with the State and Federal governments. The county has more than $500,000 in medical equipment stockpiled.

TRANSIT FACILITIES MOBILIZED

A complete air raid warning system consists of 110 sirens that are tested weekly.

Trucking companies, Cleveland Transit System buses, taxicabs, and other vehicles have been mobilized to evacuate the city.

Under the direction of the disaster relief committee of the Academy of Medicine, 32 auxiliary hospitals and 96 report centers for mobile-aid teams have been designated in schools and public buildings.

The civil defense director is drafting a plan for mass evacuation. One million copies of the plan, with maps and instructions on what to do, where to go, and what roads to take will be distributed. All major roads that would be used for evacuation are well marked.

But approximately 80 percent of the public has a limited knowledge of what to do in attack. Infrequent test alerts have been successful, according to most observers.

Defense security drills are held in most schools at least once a month. All school children from kindergarten to the 12th grade have received metal identification cards.

BOY SCOUTS ENROLLED

Cleveland has a population of slightly more than 900,000 with an additional 600,000 suburban residents. There are approximately 80,000 volunteer civil defense workers; 203,000 has been the goal.

Included in the volunteers are 10,000 Boy Scouts, who must include first aid in their scout activities. Uniforms for 3,700 auxiliary police have been provided. Other volunteers do not wear uniforms.

The Cleveland civil defense budget is $119,000. It was $165,000 last year. Suburbs will contribute an additional $49,181 this year.

John J. Pokorny is civil defense director for the city. He is also coordinator of county activities.

He reports to Cleveland Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze. The mayor serves as chairman of an advisory committee consisting of 7 surburban mayors and 1 county commissioner.

The police and fire departments are cooperating closely with civil defense officials. State civil defense leaders counsel and advise Cleveland officials.

Ottawa: A sudden air attack on this capital city of Canada would find its population almost totally unprepared.

Civic unwillingness to bear the cost, with apathy and a spirit of helplessness in the face of atomic and hydrogen bombs seem to be responsible for the absence of a civil defense organization and program.

The city is governed in part by Mayor Charlotte Whitten and her board of control. A large part of it, however, including the best highways out of the city, is under the control of the federal district commission, a federal body.

Three years ago the city tried to set up an evacuation program with the suburbs. These outlying districts refused to contribute funds. The plan was dropped. No one has complained.

City officials blame the situation on public apathy and the feeling that there is no defense against modern weapons.

Others in the city administration say it is the duty of the Federal Government to describe exactly what course should be followed, and put up the money. They say, too, that the Federal Government and the Army are the only organizations able to do the job.

The Federal Government has established a Federal Civil Defense Administrator. A school for training of civil defense workers has been established at Arnprior.

Hundreds of civil defense workers from all parts of Canada have received training there. The Federal Administration points out that municipalities can recover from Federal funds 75 cents of every dollar spent on civil defense. They say that Ottawa officials are unwilling to set aside any money for civil defense.

EVACUATION PLAN FAVORED

Some 18,000 school children are led at a special signal every 2 months to the "safest part of the building." Thirty thousand civil servants have established a nucleus of an organization for civil defense.

But the public has no idea what to do in an air attack.

Most authorities agree that evacuation would be best in an emergency. The civil servants plan a test evacuation for about 10,000 of their members in June. The city does not plan to join the movement.

The population of Ottawa and its suburbs is about 250,000. There are no signs in or around the city to guide movement in an emergency, nor are there signs in buildings pointing to shelter areas.

One of the four members of the board of control has been designated civil defense administrator by the mayor. Miss Whitten has the power to declare an emergency and issue order through him to the police and fire departments.

No drills have been held by the city. There are no plans or facilities for feeding, decontaminating, or providing shelter in an air raid.

Detroit: Civil defense officials report operations plans completed for an air-raid emergency. But there seems to be general agreement among them and city officers, newspapers and civic groups that the public is not prepared for such a raid or informed on what to do.

Nearly everyone who discusses the problem mentions public apathy.

Evacuation plans have been prepared, but they have not been made public. They are in the hands of agencies concerned for final detail work. The program also has been turned over to the Michigan office of Civil Defense for integration into an overall State plan.

Detroit public schools have been conducting monthly air-raid drills in every school. But evacuation plans call for the department of street railways and car pools to move each school group to a predesignated location if there is time and the alert is during school hours.

FIFTY THOUSAND VOLUNTEERS SIGNED

With a population of 1,849,568, Detroit has 50,000 volunteer civil-defense workers, according to officials. Not included in those figures are 23,000 or more city employees or the employees of private, industrial, or commercial agencies, such as the American Red Cross, construction companies, public schools, and others that have assumed civil-defense duties and responsibilities. Explorer scouts participate, as a group, in medical and welfare services.

The only uniformed volunteers are emergency police reserves and auxiliary firefighters. Civil-defense officials say 26,000 to 27,000 participate in regular training, meetings, and drills. About 10 percent of the certified volunteers have been dropped for failure to participate.

Civil-defense officials say that response to continuing recruiting appeals fluctuates with the headlines.

Total expenditures for civil defense in Detroit from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1954, were $2,089,945.45. The proposed budget for 1955–56 is $352,900, up $6,300 from last year.

Maj. Gen. Clyde E. Dougherty is director of civil defense for both Detroit and Wayne County. He is employed part time and has a full-time assistant director and staff.

COOPERATION CALLED GOOD

As director he reports to the mayor and coordinates activities of all agencies comprising civil-defense forces, including the police and fire departments.

Civil-defense officials report good cooperation with city departments and with the Michigan office of civil defense.

Air-raid warning sirens are tested monthly to familiarize the public with alert signals. Also, limited test exercises, involving civil-defense services only, are held in connection with nationwide exercises of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Civil-defense officials call these tests successful.

Civil-Defense officials report feeding equipment available to feed 250,000 persons 3 meals a day for 3 days. Tree-spraying equipment of the department of parks and recreation and street flushing equipment of the department of public works would be available immediately for decontamination.

The city has 36 radiological survey meters. Ten more are scheduled for delivery.

Chicago: The continuing increase in the potential destructiveness of nuclear bombs has made obsolescent civil-defense plans for the Nation's second largest city, in the opinion of municipal and defense authorities.

Proceeding on the assumption that a potential enemy would strike with hydrogen bombs, the emphasis here is on speedy and large-scale evacuation. Advance warning is deemed essential.

But the conclusion is that in a surprise assault, the city would lie helpless. Officials here believe that, given a 4-hour warning, some 2,750,000 city dwellers could be evacuated in time for safety to points at least 30 miles from the city's center.

This would leave an estimated half-million essential persons, including the police, health, communications, and fire specialists behind to deal with physical damage.

A change in concept also has all but ruled out plans for shelters within the city. It is agreed generally that such shelters as are available—4 miles of subway underground—for example—would offer little protection in a bomb raid. But protection for schoolchildren continues to be based on atom-bomb assault.

Civil-defense authorities hope to make evacuation possible but not to command it. There is the question of cooperation by outlying communities that would have to receive the evacuees. This is an unknown factor.

WARDEN SET-UP DROPPED

Medical care, feeding, shelter, security, and other problems would be directed by designated authorities. It is believed that the backbone of the problem lies with the ability of the average person to tend to his own needs with assistance.

Chicago is operating with a skeleton staff of professional and volunteer workers in civil defense. The air-raid warden scheme, block by block and house by house, has been abandoned as unwieldy.

The new system is based on the so-called mile-square disaster volunteer system. A designated team operates within each unit of this system with the idea of soliciting additional assistance from qualified persons.

The 1955 civil-defense budget for Chicago is $597,000. This is financed by a municipal tax levy authorized by the State legislature in 1951.

Mayor Richard J. Daley is chairman of the city's defense force. Anthony J. Mullaney and Victor C. P. Dreiske are the operating codirectors.

The full-time operation is carried on from downtown offices by deputies to the codirectors. The direction is closely tied in with the fire and police departments.

There is no evidence of friction among these agencies. Coordination between city and State defense authorities is maintained through the State headquarters in Springfield.

Chicago's drills are confined to a test of 87 sirens at 10:30 a. m. each Tuesday. Twelve more will be installed soon.

The civil defense organization last November conducted a test mass-feeding mobilization in which a skeleton body of evacuees participated. It was described as a success.

The role of civil defense in postbombing periods in which decontamination and the like are involved is obscure. There is little actual equipment to deal with the effects of a hydrogen bomb attack.

Forth Worth: After almost 4 years of study and planning, the 350,000 persons in this city and the 100,000 more residing in Tarrant County are woefully unprepared for an air raid.

That estimate came from R. E. Dysart, full-time paid civil defense coordinator, a former chief of police. He held the same civil defense post during World War II.

Failure to be prepared was blamed by Mr. Dysart on public and official apathy. He discerns a lack of interest by Congress in civil defense appropriations, the failure of top citizens and top State and Federal officials to stress the need for preparedness, and the lack of radio, television, and newspaper activity that might alert the public.

Fort Worth is a vital spot. At the northwest limits are Carswell Air Force Base, home of the 7th and 11th Bomb Wings (heavy), global striking forces; the Convair Division of General Dynamics Corp., where B-36 bombers are being modified and maintained, B-58 supersonic prototypes are under construction, elements for the Boeing B-52 jet bomber are being manufactured and developmental work is underway in atomic-powered aircraft.

HEADQUARTERS INTEGRATED

Military personnel, including National Guard units, are coordinated with Fort Worth civil defense. It is understood, however, they may not be available in emergency, so that the community must depend on its pure civil defense set-up.

Mr. Dysart has a $28,000 annual operating budget, exclusive of equipment purchases. He has a well-integrated headquarters. This includes a district fire chief and a police captain assigned to full-time duty.

By city ordinance, the city manager, Frank Davis, is designated civil defense commander with full powers, which in an emergency he would designate to Mr. Dysart.

Fort Worth is working out a mass evacuation plan and does not contemplate the use of shelters. The population would be evacuated to points north, south and east of here, over a radius of 75 miles. Plans for such areas and feeding evacuees are developing.

Special plans are being made for evacuation of pupils by schools. Parents and teachers are in training for this project. Children would be moved at least 25 miles.

AUXILIARY POLICE AVAILABLE

Fort Worth's 2,200 city employees, including the welfare, fire, and police departments, are available and in training.

About 500 auxiliary police are available as volunteers. The same is true of about 1,000 volunteers firemen, most of whom serve the outlying communities. Mr. Dysart says at least 35,000 civil defense volunteers are needed.

Thirteen sirens have been set up as air-raid warning signals. They are tested Friday mornings. More sirens will be installed to cover dead sound spots. No radioactivity decontamination or detection equipment is available yet.

Regular air-raid drills are not held. A major test conducted last June was satisfactory, Mr. Dysart said, considering the personnel available. Citizens at large paid no attention to it.

Los Angeles: Los Angeles is in a state of flux on civil defense preparations. Most officials concede that their level is not better now than 25 percent. If there were an attack tomorrow, it would be a horrible shambles.

Los Angeles is the Nation's third-ranking metropolitan area. The city proper covers 450 square miles and has a population of 2 million. But Los Angeles County—roughly coinciding with the metropolitan area—is 5,000 miles squares. It has 5 million inhabitants.

State civil defense plans are tentative. California has an elaborate mobile emergency communications system. But solid, definite planning has not yet percolated to the local level.

A heated dispute has flared among authorities and nonauthorities over evacuation. Officials are completing an elaborate aerial survey of possibilities.

The local civil defense organization is reported to have ready an interim plan call-

ing for commuters, on signal, to go to their homes. The idea is that this would thin out the downtown area and start getting families assembled as more manageable evacuation units.

No firm arrangements have been made with outlying counties for caring for refugees. Three adjacent counties have estimated they could take 200,000 refugees each, but would not know what to do with them after 48 hours. A fourth county rejected a refugee-area role.

CELLARS ARE LACKING

Little thought is given to shelters, because this is a cellarless country, without much underground development, even downtown.

The appeal, response, and organization of volunteers has been almost academic. There are 50,000 volunteers, organized on a skeleton basis, and 30,000 city employees automatically would become members of civil defense.

The city would like a hard core of 200,000 volunteers, but lack of concrete plans and processing facilities has slowed recruiting.

There is a paid staff of 24, headed by Col. Richard F. Lynch, a retired soldier and full-time director. He reports to the mayor, as do the other city departments that would come under the mayor's direct control in emergency.

But interest has been evident in response to specific appeals. After a recent television forum on civil defense, there were 20,000 replies asking how citizens could help.

Officials are concerned, however, about keeping interest indefinitely in the absence of a concrete, long-range Federal-State program into which local volunteers can be coordinated.

Los Angeles is operating with a $166,000 civil-defense budget. An additional $65,000 has been asked.

Volunteers take part in regular training and test procedures. Five hundred radio hams do so weekly. The others train at least once a month.

City and county civil-defense officials have been at odds over whether a yellow or red alert should be the real cue for action. The sirens are blown so often on various kinds of tests, however, that it is doubtful that anyone would pay much attention.

Seattle: No interested official or civic group contends that this city, or any other possible target in this area, is ready today to deal with an enemy air attack.

Despite the attention given by newspapers, radio, and television, it also is apparent that there are large areas of apathy and confusion.

For example, even though evacuation plans have so progressed in Washington that a statewide evacuation drill was conducted last month, Seattle's public participation was called mediocre.

Residents were asked to drive, when the 3-minute blast of sirens signaled evacuation, to the nearest evacuation route with a 3-day supply of food. Highest estimates were that 1 family in 5 took part.

Signs designating shelters in public buildings and downtown business blocks are still in place.

But new signs along arterial highways indicate that in an evacuation warning the designated highways will be used for outbound traffic only. With 670,000 persons living within a 13-mile radius of an assumed ground zero in downtown Seattle, the getaway plan calls for 200,000 to 240,000 persons to be moved each hour. A minimum warning of 2 hours is expected.

VOLUNTEERS TRAINED

Plans call for organizing mass evacuations to distances of 15 miles or more. Schoolchildren would be taken directly from their classes.

Several hundred civil defense volunteers have received detailed training in rescue and similar work and in reception center operations.

If the physicians, nurses, amateur radio operators, utility workmen, and public employees assigned specific duties were included, the roster would run into the thousands. Some have received special training, including radiological monitoring, and attend drills regularly.

C. F. Greber, a retired rear admiral, is Seattle civil defense director. It is a full-time post. He reports to the mayor, and in an emergency would head the police, fire, and other departments.

Daniel E. Barbey, retired vice admiral, is Washington State civil defense director. He coordinates city and county planning. He would obtain emergency aid, if needed, from outside the State.

On the financial side, Seattle's civil defense budget has been cut from $72,000 to $28,000 by an economy-minded city council. The State budget also was slashed, though less drastically.

Seattle and other Washington communities have purchased, packaged, and distributed to previously designated first-aid stations large quantities of medical and first-aid supplies.

EXHIBIT 7

EXPERIENCE IN WAR GUIDES BRITAIN, BUT HOME DEFENSES ARE HAMPERED BY DELAYS ON DATA

(By Benjamin Welles)

LONDON, June 11.—Great Britain announced 3 months ago a "complete overhaul of our home defense plans" as a result of the development of the hydrogen bomb as a war weapon.

This overhaul is taking shape. Progress is slow, however, because United States information on the results of its nuclear tests is not arriving here quickly enough.

In the annual white paper on defense in February, which bore obvious signs of Winston Churchill's editing, the British people were warned bluntly that a hydrogen-bomb attack on the British Isles would lead to a "struggle for survival of the grimmest kind."

Apart from Germany, Britain has had more practice in "civil" defense than probably any other Western nation. Bombs and guided missiles rained down on the British Isles for 6 years. The nation learned by experience how to handle mass evacuation, port damage, food shortages, threats of epidemic, fire or disrupted gas and power supplies.

Now, under the inspiration that Sir Winston lent before his recent retirement, Britain is recasting the Civil Defense Act of 1948. It is preparing to lay extra communications lines throughout the realm, store extra food stocks and develop additional port facilities.

Most important, Britain is beginning to train men and women in emergency discipline, fire fighting, police and nursing work.

HOME SECRETARY RESPONSIBLE

Britain's civil defense is organized under the Home Secretary. He is normally responsible among other duties for the widely decentralized police and fire-fighting force throughout the United Kingdom.

The Home Secretary, at present Maj. Gwilym Lloyd George, is coordinating minister in the Cabinet for civil or "home" defense, as it is alternately called here.

One of his chief assistants is Maj. Gen. S. F. Irwin, Chairman of a Civil Defense Joint Planning Staff.

This includes representatives of the War Office, Air Ministry, Admiralty, the Ministries of Labor, Health, Transport and all other interested branches of Government.

Maj. Lloyd George's first assistant on Home Defense matters is Gen. Sir Sidney Kirkman, the Director General, who was a former quartermaster general of the British Army. General Kirkman, who has visited the United States with several senior advisers, has supervision over plans and over about 350,000 unpaid Civil Defense volunteers. Each now contributes about 5 or 6 hours of spare time weekly.

The British Isles are divided into 12 civil-defense regions, including Scotland. Each has a permanent, paid civil servant with a small staff of about a half dozen subordinates.

These officials coordinate all civil-defense plans and progress in their region with the local government authorities.

LOCAL AGENCIES REIMBURSED

There are about 180 local government authorities dealing with civil-defense preparations in Britain. The central government reimburses them for their work, some by 100 percent, others by 75 percent. This year about 70 million pounds ($196 million) is to be spent or civil defense.

Last April the Labor-controlled Coventry City Council refused to perform any statutory Civil Defense duties other than to provide for sewage and water supplies.

After due warning the central government quietly sent up three special commissioners to take over these duties. It authorized them to obligate funds and to have necessary work done. Eventually the bill will be sent to Coventry for payment. But this issue has not yet come to a head.

The Government gradually is building up a permanent volunteer civil-defense corps being trained in fire fighting, evacuation, emergency rescue and so forth. The corps, which the Government hopes to expand to 660,000, will become the nucleus for a far larger organization in an emergency.

MOBILE DEFENSE COLUMNS

The fire-fighting services in Britain, now run separately by local government authorities, will be centralized immediately in an emergency. There are now about 20,000 auxiliary firemen volunteers.

Auxiliary nursing personnel are also being gradually enlisted for an emergency.

The Churchill government decided to raise 48 "mobile defense columns" of 600 men each during the next 3 or 4 years. These columns, specially trained for home defense, will be the future links between the local civil defense forces and the organized armed forces.

The mobile defense corps will be under orders of the War Office. It will be composed of reservists, three-quarters from the army and one-quarter from the Royal Air Force.

Each year from now on about 10,000 army and RAF personnel will spend the last month of their obligatory 2-year service in special training depots. On completing their duty they will pass into reserve mobile defense battalions in areas near their homes. The reserve battalions will begin forming this autumn and are expected to be fully manned within a year.

Another 10,000 military reservists will get fire-fighting training each year and will join the centralized fire service in an emergency, thus permitting it to expand rapidly.

PUBLIC OPINION FLUCTUATES

Public participation in Britain's home defense fluctuates according to the international temperature, officials say. At the time of the Berlin airlift the volunteer rate soared. It soared again during the Korean tension. Now, with peace talks in the headlines, it has slumped.

British home defense officials evacuated 1,500,000 schoolchildren, their teachers, plus aged and infirm people from the big British cities in 3 days in the autumn of 1939. The move was carried out before the declaration of war and not a single accident was recorded.

In all, about 3,500,000 persons quit British cities during the fall and winter of 1939. In 1949 they began drifting back.

Evacuation is wise, officials think, if there is time, but in another war Britain might have only 3 or 4 minutes' warning.

The issue is complicated by the overriding question of radioactive fallout. This is the shadow hanging over all planning. The risk of fallout has clouded official thinking and the answers are yet far from clear, although earth shelters are recommended as affording considerable protection.

EXHIBIT 8

CITY LAGS ON CIVIL DEFENSE, WITH PLANS IN A-BOMB ERA—OBSOLETE SHELTER THEORY STILL IS THE BASIS OF MEASURES FOR A HYDROGEN ATTACK—EVACUATION STEPS ARE EXAMINED

(By Bernard Stengren)

Chinks in New York City's civil-defense armor are big enough to drop a hydrogen bomb through.

Civil-defense plans for this city of 8 million were set up to cope with atom bombs. Shelter would have saved all but those under or near the blast. The plans still exist on this basis.

Preattack evacuation had been dismissed as impractical by State and local authorities. Before the hydrogen bomb, they had insisted that the city was too big, and traffic problems too great, to chance a mass evacuation on short notice.

But shelters may be made deathtraps by the weapons of widespread destruction now available to a potential enemy for use against the Nation and the city. Getting out of target areas before bombs drop is now the byword for safety.

Apathy, confusion, and a vast public indifference have increased the dilemma. And, because the effects are so widespread, officials here say, the problem has become interstate and even national.

Shelter is still the rule, because there is no better one. And because the best diplomatic, military, and civil defense cannot guarantee complete immunity from sneak attack, shelters will be kept as alternatives.

So New Yorkers are between the frying pan of an obsolete plan and the fire of a theory of evacuation. This has been found feasible in theory, but needs practical plans that may take 6 months or more to complete.

Such plans must cover a myriad of details, as follows:

Getting out of the city on short notice—as any preholiday traveler can testify—is no mean feat. With an hour's notice, a recent study found, 1 million persons could be moved by rail, subway, and ferry to the city limits or beyond.

Another 1 million could get out by motor vehicles, buses, and trucks. And 2 or 3 million living from 10 to 12 miles from mid-Manhattan could walk to relative safety.

Who is to go first—school children, mothers with children, families? And who is to stay behind?

How can facilities for feeding, housing, and caring for millions of refugees in outlying areas be assured?

How will official evacuation orders be transmitted, and other problems of organization and practice evacuation be solved?

How can panic be avoided? A radio program several years ago, depicting a fictitious invasion from Mars, caused thousands to flee their homes in terror. A twist of the dial might have caused doubts about the program's authenticity.

ROLE OF UNITED STATES UNCERTAIN

These and other questions will be asked by those who must work out evacuation plans. But the planning staffs have not been hired.

A basic reason is the uncertain role of the Federal Government on evacuation plans. Mayor Wagner and the governors of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut held April 26 that the problem was national in character.

"Only the Federal Government," their statement said, "has the latest intelligence and technical information which is required for informed decisions governing these various steps, and only the Federal Government has the financial resources with which to bear the brunt of the heavy expense that will be involved."

President Eisenhower has asked $12 million for evacuation studies. The request is before Congress. An estimated $300,000 is needed for New York City to start such studies. The plans must be so coordinated that all 15 million persons in the metropolitan area will be provided for.

TEST SCHEDULED WEDNESDAY

Experts here feel that under these circumstances they must know what national assistance, financial and technical, will come before an intelligent approach can be made.

Next Wednesday, meanwhile, New York will be a target city in a nationwide civil defense test. If, instead of an exercise, a real enemy plane, with a real hydrogen bomb, were to attack mid-Manhattan, here is what would happen, under present plans:

The yellow (confidential) alert would come from the 26th Air Division (Defense) at Roslyn, Long Island, originating either there or at one of the other Air Force warning stations.

At this warning, Brig. Gen. Robert E. Condon, new Director of Civil Defense, and top members of his staff, would head for one of the five borough control centers already designated as headquarters and assume command.

Those of the 543,417 Civil Defense workers who have been trained would report to their posts. The alert would come through a chain of command from the heads of services to subordinates. They in turn would telephone individual workers.

At the raid signal (at least 1 hour's warning is expected) the city's 679 sirens would begin their wail, warbling for 3 minutes. Everyone would be ordered to take shelter. Subways have a capacity of 2,887,885 and 1,299 public shelters will hold 476,000. The rest would go into building halls and basements.

School children would be brought to the shelter areas of their buildings. They have become familiar with these in monthly drills.

If an atomic bomb 50 times the size of the Hiroshima weapon were dropped, there would be total destruction in an area 3.6 miles in diameter. Severe damage would be caused in the area from 3.6 to 7.4 miles in diameter. Moderate damage would occur from there to the 11-mile diameter line, and partial and light damage would extend as far as 14.6 miles.

This weapon has been dwarfed by hydrogen bombs 500 and more times more powerful than the Hiroshima one. The thermonuclear device tested at Eniwetok on March 1, 1954, was between 600 and 700 times more powerful. The damage zones from a 10-megaton bomb (equal to 10 million tons of TNT, and 500 times more powerful than Hiroshima) exploded 2,000 feet in the air, would be:

Total destruction, diameter of 8 miles, area of 50 miles; severe damage, diameter of 16 miles, area of 200 miles; moderate damage, diameter of 28 miles, area of 600 miles; partial damage, diameter of 32 miles, area of 800 miles; extent of fire damage, diameter of 50 miles, area of 2,000 miles.

The death toll from a hydrogen bomb even half this size might be as high as 4,800,000, with 90 percent of those within 3 miles killed and total casualties reaching 7,600,000.

Radiological survey teams would be first to leave shelter and block off areas where latent radioactivity would make entry dangerous to rescue workers.

Survivors would be sent to evacuation areas in Orange, Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess, Rockland, Sullivan, and Ulster Counties. Facilities are available there for 2 million homeless, according to authorities.

The procedure might be different when the city had an evacuation plan. Pending that, a bomb would have the above effects.

New York City has had an office of civil defense since July 10, 1950. In that time more than $9 million has been spent for protection. The current operating budget of $1,712,783 is up $38,346.46 from last year.

The bulk of expenses has been for salaries to a paid staff now numbering 200 (with an additional 121 guards at upstate reservoirs to foil sabotage) and for services such as telephones, light, and administrative costs.

There are two administrative offices. The recruiting and information section at 500 Park Avenue will be transferred to main headquarters at 625 Avenue of the Americas when the city sells the Park Avenue building.

But $3,552,000 went for equipment. This included 65 fire pumpers and fittings ($1,250,000), rescue trucks, the sirens, communications, medical and radiological items.

About $1 million in Federal matching funds has been received as reimbursement for some equipment expenses.

In addition, the State office of civil defense has set aside $4 million in medical supplies for use by the city. Another $5,500,000 worth will be stored. Much of this is in the seven support counties upstate.

Brig. Gen. Robert E. Condon, Reserve Air Force officer, was named by Mayor Wagner June 2 to the $15,000 full-time post of director of civil defense. The post had been filled by an acting director, James J. Costigan, since last November. The former director, Police Deputy Chief Inspector Herbert R. O'Brien, had retired then.

City officials said the delay had been occasioned by the search for the right man to head the office under the evacuation concept.

PUBLIC APATHY WIDESPREAD

The new director faces a formidable task.

First there is public, and to a lesser extent, official apathy. A recent nation-wide study by the Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan showed that people were worried about the possibility of attack.

The researcher said, however, "one finds that those who are nearest 'downtown' show the greatest incidence of people reporting no information at all of civil defense."

Similar findings about New York specifically came from a volunteer committee named by Lieut. Gen. Willis D. Crittenberger, retired, Mayor Wagner's adviser on civil defense.

The committee submitted its findings, known as the Crittenberger report, on February 11. The members are William H. Kyle, vice president of the Bankers Trust Co.; Najeeb E. Halaby, investment associate of the Rockefeller brothers; and Presley Lancaster, Jr., assistant to the executive manager of the Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc.

They found that "here is a vast public indifference, the effect of which is to reduce the sense of urgency among the citizenry in all walks of life for solution of this problem of civilian survival in the hydrogen age."

They also called for "resourceful leadership" to overcome what they termed "a widespread sense of futility [which] handicaps civil defense in general."

ACTIVITY GREW SLACK

While awaiting the appointment of a new chief, civil-defense operations slackened. Except for the Federal-ordered test this week, for instance, no city-wide and no borough-wide exercises have been scheduled since Mr. O'Brien left. The former had been held annually. The latter had been held about once a month in alternate boroughs.

The pressure of other duties has led some city departments to become lax in training volunteers and reporting on their numbers and degree of training.

No one knows how many trained civil defense volunteers there are in New York. This phase has been termed "our weakest spot" by one official. There is some feeling that only by making civil defense training compulsory could the city get the 1 million persons set as a goal.

Recruiting has not done it, as is evidenced by the 19,390 resignations last year and 18,837 enrollments.

The official figures give the number of civil defense volunteers as 543,417. But, of these, 161,218 are police, fire, transit and other city employees of various categories.

Some volunteered; others would be pressed into service because of their qualifications.

Another 117,360 are "certified" employees of private industry, most of them in transportation, who volunteered and would perform duties similar to their present ones.

Of the remaining 264,839, more than 120,000 are untrained. About 30,000 are in training. Fewer than 100,000 are considered fully qualified to perform their tasks. Some of the 120,000, however, are doctors, nurses, clergymen, and other professionals whose defense "training" might be no more than an orientation.

Boy Scouts are used for messenger duty at borough and district control centers during tests and exercises.

Among the most highly trained nonprofessional persons are auxiliary police, firemen, rescue, Ground Observer Corps, and communications volunteers. The first three groups and air-raid wardens have uniforms that they bought themselves.

For them and the rest of the un-uniformed volunteers, the city purchased surplus Army helmet liners and painted them distinctive colors for each corps.

Interest in training may be heightened as the result of a new State law that permits, for the first time, the use of civil defense forces in a natural disaster. They may go into action if requested by local executives or sheriffs.

STATE-CITY LIAISON GOOD

But the picture is not all dismal.

Cooperation between the city and State Civil Defense officials is good. Lieut. Gen. Clarence E. Huebner (retired), State director, has his office in the city. He works closely with the local group.

His authority, now principally in planning and coordination, would change in an emergency to direct operational control of all civil defense forces, under the command of the governor and the State Civil Defense Commission.

In addition, there is close liaison with the National Guard. Civil defense officials and military men have eliminated duplication of work. They have decided on what functions each group will have in an emergency.

There is a possibility, now under discussion, that National Guard troop units will be assigned directly to civil defense chiefs for duty.

Relations with adjacent area and the seven support-counties also are cordial. There was a misunderstanding recently over the closing of Westchester highways to all but civil defense vehicles in an attack. Signs on main arteries inform passing motorists that this will be done.

GOVERNORS TO COOPERATE

State officials said that if they ordered an evacuation, all vehicles taking part automatically would become civil defense vehicles. The signs designating main roads as civil defense routes will remain, they added, to give them better control over such traffic.

Another bright spot is that a start on evacuation planning has been made with the Crittenberger report.

The Governors of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut have pledged mutual support and aid in this field. They have joined in a request for Federal funds to complete plans. An estimated $300,000 to $500,000 would be required for New York City alone.

The Crittenberger Report warning that the scope of such a plan is huge and the measures required are many and complex, holds, nonetheless:

"It would appear practicable to spare a very large proportion of the city's population from blast, fire, and the most serious effects of radiation, if heroic plans and measures for evacuation are adopted in time."

Indoctrinating the public to the idea of leaving the city,, instead of seeking shelter, is only one of the problems. But officials hold that shelter tests have received cooperation and have been successful.

This would indicate that New Yorkers have learned to respond to civil-defense instructions, and that they could be taught the new method of vitiating the effects of the hydrogen bomb—by evacuation.

CAPITAL UNREADY TO FACE BOMBING—MUDDLE REFLECTS CONGRESS' APATHY—GOVERNMENT ITSELF IS PREPARED FOR FLIGHT

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, June 12.—The National Capital is a model of the muddle in civil defense planning.

As a city without home rule, Washington reflects the general indifference of Congress to civil defense. Before it could complete its plans for coping with an attack by an atomic bomb, the Capital was overtaken by the problems posed by the infinitely more powerful hydrogen weapon.

Now, with the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the local civil defense organization is seeking needed legislation. Congressional interest has been aroused somewhat since the report last February on hydrogen bomb fallout. But civil defense officials are not sanguine about the chances of getting before Congress adjourns all the legislation and funds they feel they need.

On civil defense, Congress seems to act as if it had as much immunity from atomic destruction as from traffic tickets.

It never has participated in a civil defense test. It plans to take no active part in the national test from Wednesday to Friday. In this, 15,000 key officials and employees, including the President, will evacuate the Capital.

CONGRESS TO STAY BEHIND

Officials and employees of all the major Government departments will move to prepared, secret bases within a radius of 300 miles of the capital.

Congress, however, will remain, legislating. It has no place to go in an attack.

The Office of Defense Mobilization is seeking a remote place in which the 96 Senators and 435 Representatives, as well as their sizable staffs, could carry on their constitutional duties. There has been some speculation that a huge resort hotel would be selected. The fact remains, however, that if war broke out today Congress would scatter to the winds with no predetermined meeting place.

Congress has been laggard also in assuring its own succession if it suffered numerous casualties. The Senate has passed a proposed constitutional amendment providing that when vacancies occur in more than half the seats of the House of Representatives, the governors of the States involved would be authorized to appoint Members within 60 days. These appointed Members would serve until the vacancies were filled by election.

Governors now have the power to appoint Senators when a vacancy occurs.

A PLAN FOR GOVERNMENT

The House resolution is pending in a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. No hearings on it have been scheduled. The House is jealous of its prerogatives and probably will pay no attention to the problem unless one of its own Members introduces the proposed amendment.

What many consider the best dispersal and evacuation plan in the country is the one worked out by the Office of Defense Mobilization for the Government. This plan is separate from the population of the Capital. This city is in the same dilemma as many other cities that are trying to plan mass evacuations.

This Government dispersal plan will get a comparatively severe test beginning Wednesday. The 15,000 selected persons must go to new austerity offices.

For a widely scattered Government the communications system is necessarily complex. It includes teletype and telephone lines that bypass Washington and connect with the secret White House refuge to which the President will repair.

Microwave radio and closed-circuit television are integrated in the system. The closed-circuit television system is linked to commercial television cables. It would enable the President to address the country. He already has tested this circuit in conversations with members of his staff.

The Defense Department would have the crucial task of marshaling the Armed Forces in an attack. It would disperse to more than a score of secret control centers. The chief one is the command post in a mountain near Thurmont, Md.

NO PLAN FOR CAPITAL

This picture of a developed Government dispersal plan is in contrast with the situation of the Capital unrelated to the Federal Government.

"We have no detailed evacuation plan for the District of Columbia," said Col. John E. Fondahl, a Marine Corps Reserve officer, who is Director of Civil Defense for the Capital.

He explained that last year, after getting fairly authentic data on fallout, his organization had changed its basic concept from shelter to flight.

Until the significance of a hydrogen bomb fallout of 7,000 square miles was realized, the Capital thought of developing shelters as the main civil defense measure.

In seeking to solve its problems both under the old and the revised concept, Washington had a dilemma similar to that of many cities.

It had to struggle against the indifference and inertia of Congress and of the public itself. In seeking to designate shelter areas, the owners of large buildings here refused to cooperate on the ground that if anybody were injured in the premises the owners would be subject to damages.

A few buildings designated basements as shelters, Colonel Fondahl added, but only for employees on the premises.

As Colonel Fondahl discussed the situation in a recent interview, a siren wailed. He explained that the organization was testing a new warning signal. At three sites, he said, it was necessary to place sirens atop towers so that they could be heard, but nearby residents objected.

Then the organization has been handicapped in training its fire and police auxiliary volunteers. The three Commissioners who govern the District under the District of Columbia Committees of the House and Senate have refused to permit these volunteers to engage in training exercises on the city streets. Like the building owners, the Commissioners did not want the Capital to become liable for damages if a volunteer were injured.

In pending legislation, the Commissioners are seeking a provision to cover volunteers under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

So the civil defense situation in the Capital illuminates the civil defense problem of the Nation as a whole. It is hobbled by the public's lack of understanding of the need for it and by a lack of clear legal authority.

It lacks the cohesion and strength of the British system. There the permanent positions are equated with military service. Real authority and command runs from a national control center down through regional, zone, and local levels.

FLIGHT POLICY IS DOUBTED

Under persent law, the District's Commissioners could be invested with emergency powers only if a national emergency were declared. They now are seeking from Congress emergency powers that would authorize them, among other things, to order the city's evacuation.

In hearings on this legislation, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Civil Defense Subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee, has raised doubts on the practicability of evacuation. He has suggested further consideration of shelter.

The Texas Democrat may have in mind that it takes as much as 40 minutes to get from downtown Washington and across one of the bridges into Virginia during the rush hour. He probably also has noted how the city becomes almost paralyzed after a 2-inch snowfall.

But Colonel Fondahl points out that in a civil defense evacuation, movement would be virtually all outward. No cross-traffic would be permitted on the 73 traffic lanes out of the city.

If "strategic" information of a possible attack were received, it would be possible to get Congress and key Government officials and employees out on trains and automobiles ahead of the general population.

But if the first warning was sudden by siren, Congress and the Government officials would have to take their chances in the general evacuation.

The capital occupies only 10 square miles. Thus its whole area would be vulnerable to heavy damage. Virtually all occupants, except possibly some on the perimeter in good shelters, would be expected to leave.

The capital's control system is still based on old-fashioned World War II conditions. Its control center is only 2 miles from 11th and E Streets NW., the heaviest population center and assumed enemy aiming point.

Its headquarters is in a 1-story frame and stucco building about 4 miles away. So a bus is being converted rapidly into a mobile control center that could move 16 to 20 miles out and supervise operations.

Like the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the capital's civil defense organization has not fared well with its budget requests to Congress. The House has been more hostile than the Senate. A kindlier attitude, however, has been taken under Mr. Teague's leadership.

The requests, nevertheless, still are being slashed. The House this year cut the $154,000 request to $75,000. This is pending in the Senate.

CAPITOL PLAN INCOMPLETE

Last year $208,000 was requested. The House cut this to $75,000, but the ultimate figure was $150,000. Two years ago the House cut a $200,000 request to $23,000. Under Senate influence the final figure was $90,000.

At the Capitol, J. George Stewart, Capitol Architect, who has been designated coordinator of civil defense for Congress, refused to discuss the plan for Members.

Such a plan exists, he said, but it will not be quite completed until after this week's tests. Mr. Stewart said he had no idea yet where Congress would evacuate in an attack. He noted, however, that the railroad station was close to the Capitol.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY's speech:

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, before the Senate takes final action on the conference report, I call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Finance to amendment No. 28 in the report. I notice that the language has been changed somewhat from the way in which the committee reported the bill and also from the way in which the bill passed the Senate. I read the amendment as it was approved by the Senate:

> Increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry.

May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance if the bill as reported by the committee and as passed by the Senate did not contain the word "materially."

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. The word "materially" was used. But after considerable discussion in the conference, it was felt by the conferees that the words "contributed substantially" would perhaps better serve the purposes of clarification, without changing the actual meaning of the provision.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand, then, it is the thought at least of the chairman of the committee, and also, I have no doubt, of the other members of the committee of conference that while the word was changed from "materially" to "substantially", it is not believed that it changes the meaning and intent of, at least, the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BYRD. That was the understanding of the conferees. It is merely a change of the word "materially" to "substantially."

Mr. CARLSON. With that understanding, I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter dated June 3, 1955, from Walter S. Hallanan, transmitting a report on import quotas on oil; a letter dated June 3, 1955, from the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association, signed by Tom Orr, executive secretary; and a statement made by George H. Bruce before the Kansas State Corporation Commission on the subject of our oil problems.

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

JUNE 3, 1955.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The enclosed report gives the latest information on crude-oil imports for the week ending May 27, 1955—a total of 1,384,900 barrels as compared with 1,047,800 for the week ending May 20, 1955.

This is one of the highest figures on imports that we have experienced up to this time.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER S. HALLANAN.

[From Platt's Oilgram News Service of June 3, 1955]

IMPORTS TURN UPWARD

NEW YORK, June 2.—Total United States imports of crude and products in 4 weeks ended May 27 averaged 41,900 barrels more than during 4 weeks ended April 29, API reports.

East of California imports were up 51,000 barrels, while California imports were down 9,100 barrels.

Current figures include 56,700 barrels to cover nonreporting companies, all east of California. They do not include rate provision No. 16 (military and other Government agencies) receipts, which averaged 37,000 barrels during January, February, and March.

[Barrels per day]

	Week ended May 27	Week ended May 20	4 weeks ended May 27
East of California:			
Crude oil	866,500	654,100	665,000
Residual fuel oil	375,300	320,200	343,300
Distillate fuel oil	6,400	4,700	4,100
Asphalt	24,300	6,800	12,900
Others	20,800		14,700
Total	1,293,300	985,800	1,040,000
California:			
Crude oil	91,600	62,000	85,300
Products			
Total	91,600	62,000	85,300
United States:			
Crude oil	958,100	716,100	750,300
Products	426,800	331,700	375,000
Total	1,384,900	1,047,800	1,125,300

KANSAS INDEPENDENT
OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION,
Wichita, Kans., June 3, 1955.

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

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The announcement by Chairman Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, that the President's Cabinet Committee On Fuels Policy will reconvene for another look at the general situation has been received with considerable interest here in Kansas. Those of us who are most seriously concerned with the problem of excessive oil imports feel that every shred of evidence of harm to our domestic economy and national defense deserves to be brought to the attention of the administration in Washington.

Such additional factual information of current concern to the Flemming committee is the recent announcement by the Sohio Petroleum Co. that its field price for Kansas crude oil is to be cut by 15 cents per barrel effective June 1, 1955.

This reduction in crude price is a serious threat to the posted field prices for crude throughout the entire midcontinent area, in that it will present the unhealthy exist-

ence of two field prices, standing side by side on adjoining leases, which eventually will result in first one company, then another, following Sohio's lead.

As this unwarranted price cut is taking its economic toll in Kansas, Sohio proudly announces to its stockholders that the company has "taken the initial steps to acquire an interest in the Iranian Consortium which now holds the crude oil production, refining, and export rights in Iran."

The domestic oil industry surely has a right to expect the Flemming Committee to make inquiry into this situation which presents the peculiar picture of a major oil company depressing the posted field price for domestic crude on the one hand, while grasping for cheap foreign reserves on the other.

How can this Nation expect its oil industry to remain strong and vigilant in its capacity to fuel our emergency requirements without some reasonable limitation upon the excessive importation of foreign oil?

Enclosed is a copy of a statement made by Mr. George H. Bruce before the Kansas Corporation Commission at its last hearing on oil proration. Mr. Bruce directs his remarks to the Sohio decision.

I respectfully ask your personal aid in bringing this matter to the attention of the President's Committee on Fuels Policy.

With best personal regards, and our continued appreciation of your yoeman service in behalf of all Kansas, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

TOM ORR,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Director, members of the State corporation commission and gentlemen; my name is George H. Bruce, president of Aladin Petroleum Corp., Wichita, Kans.

You would be shocked if it were announced that one of the important purchasers of crude oil in the State of Kansas contemplated running 5 percent of the oil which they purchase into ditches by the side of the road effective on June 1. This would clearly constitute physical waste and I am certain that this Commission would promptly issue an order prohibiting such action.

The reduction as announced by the Sohio Petroleum Co. of 15 cents a barrel on the oil which they are purchasing in Kansas effective June 1, in my opinion, as flagrantly constitutes waste of a similar nature, that is, economic waste.

This is a rank and thoughtless discrimination against the producers of crude oil within the State of Kansas and is a storm warning to all of the other crude oil producers in the entire United States. There is no justification for such action judged either on a basis of industry statistics or on a basis of Sohio Oil Co.'s published earning statement and certainly not on any basis which considers the cost of finding, developing, and producing crude oil.

I would like, at this point, to give you some industry statistics.

In terms of days' supply of crude oil, the industry is at the lowest point of inventories it has been as of April in the past 6 years. I quote as follows:

	Days
April 1950	38
April 1951	34
April 1952	36
April 1953	35
April 1954	38
April 1955	33

In terms of products, the days' supply is as follows for the same period of time:

	Days
April 1950	48
April 1951	48
April 1952	47
April 1953	47
April 1954	54
April 1955	52

Thus, the total overall crude and products in terms of days' supply for this period is as follows:

	Days
April 1950	86
April 1951	82
April 1952	82
April 1953	82
April 1954	90
April 1955	86

It is true that volumewise stocks are up modestly. Again I quote as of May 14:

	Production (barrels)	Increase or decrease (barrels)	Increase or decrease (percent)
Crude oil	278,208,000	+4,284,000	+1.6
Gasoline	171,134,000	−4,616,000	−2.6
Distillate	72,710,000	+7,179,000	+10.9
Kerosene	22,951,000	+1,361,000	+6.3
Residual	44,161,000	−835,000	−1.9
Total stocks	589,164,000	+7,373,000	+1.3
Refinery runs	7,061,000	+41,000	+.6

However, petroleum demand for both domestic and export is predicted by all of the individual companies and all of the statistical agencies to be considerably higher in 1955 than in 1954 and a generally accepted figure is that the total anticipated consumptive demand for 1955 will be approximately 5 percent higher than it was in 1954. The United States Bureau of Mines report a 7.4 percent increase in consumptive demand for the first quarter of 1955.

For Sohio Oil Co. to justify such a reduction by their own company earning statement is indeed difficult to understand in view of the fact that their earnings for the first quarter of 1955 are 36.3 greater than for the first quarter of 1954. An average net profit of 36 oil companies for the first quarter of 1955 showed an increase of 9.8 percent. In other words, the Standard Oil Company of Ohio's earnings are up almost four times the average for the 36 listed firms. It is interesting to note that in this list of firms which have an average increase of 9.8 percent the first quarter of 1955 over the first quarter of 1954 there are many, in fact, most of the principal purchasers of crude oil in the State of Kansas such as Anderson-Prichard, Cities Service, Continental Oil, Gulf Oil, Lion Oil, Phillips Petroleum, Shell Oil, Sinclair, Standard of Indiana, Texas Co., Skelly, and others.

If the Commission would care for me to do so, I would be very glad to read into the RECORD the comparative earnings of each of these companies named. I make this point simply to illustrate to you that other companies who are purchasing oil in the State of Kansas have not experienced the same percentage increase in earnings in the first quarter of 1955 compared to the first quarter of 1954 as the Standard Oil Company of Ohio and nevertheless they have accompanied their nominations for the purchase of crude oil in the State of Kansas with a posted market of $2.90 per barrel as contrasted with Sohio's posting of $2.75 per barrel.

The Standard Oil Company of Ohio know all too well that there is no justification for the action which they have taken if judged in the light of the cost of finding, developing and producing crude oil. A four-year survey of this company's costs indicates that a $91 million capital expenditure resulted in a net cost of $16,200 per daily barrel of produced crude oil.

It is thus wondered if Sohio's action is taken with a hidden motive that to my mind is a disastrous one for the producers of crude oil in the domestic petroleum industry of the United States. As I view the picture, there is a constant encroachment of imported crude and products which are undoubtedly being offered in certain trade territory of the Standard of Ohio, the products probably at slightly lower prices than the products from domestic crude and undoubtedly foreign crude is being offered for sale to the Standard Oil Company of Ohio at price below domestic production and one wonders if this company is contemplating embarking on a program of purchasing foreign oil.

The Sohio Oil Co. is a large purchaser, refiner and marketer of crude oil, refining and marketing in excess of 120,000 barrels daily as contrasted with a net production of approximately 30,000 barrels daily. Their four refineries, located in Cleveland, Toledo, and Lima, Ohio, and Covington, Ky., are all strategically situated and interconnected by pipelines and they are supplying approximately one-quarter of the gasoline bought in the State of Ohio.

This company has had a remarkable growth in the past 10 years growing from gross sales of $124.9 million in 1945 to $304.4 million in 1954. In this same 10 year period their net income has increased from $3.7 million to $18.5 million and their per share earnings have increased from $1.10 per share in 1945 to $4.41 per share in 1954. In a press release of May 24, it is reported that their earnings for the first 3 months of this year amounted to $6,079,843, equal to $1.46 a common share, compared with $4,460,935, or $1.06 a share, in the comparable first quarter of a year ago. Sales and operating revenues rose to $81,161,120 from $75,227,667 a year ago.

It is difficult to reconcile this impressive growth and earning record with any reason for this action on the part of Sohio unless this is a trial balloon to see how the crude oil producers and public officials will react toward a general readjustment of the domestic crude oil market. Certainly there is no one so naive as to believe a readjustment of the Kansas crude oil market can be made by one purchaser and not be followed eventually by all other purchasers, this in turn spreading to a readjustment of markets in Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, yes, the entire United States domestic crude oil procuding areas. This could lead to a considerably greater adjustment than this initial small bonfire in the plains of Kansas and eventually lead to disaster in all the oil producing States creating the greatest conceivable economic waste to all the individuals and companies engaged in the production of oil and to the economics of all the counties and States in which crude oil production pays and plays so great a part.

I am fully aware that there are those engaged primarily in the refining and marketing of petroleum and with only a very modest interest of the welfare of the production of crude oil who believe that the way to combat imports of cheap foreign oil and foreign oil products is to depress the domestic petroleum market and slug it out with the importers. I have been in the oil business, interested only in one phase of the business and that is the finding, developing, and producing of crude oil and selling same at the posted market price for some 31 years. Oil has gone from $3 a barrel to 10 cents a barrel in that period and finally back to its present posted market of $2.90 for top gravity oil. This was achieved only after a long uphill fight demonstrating a necessity for adequate markets to stimulate the search for new reserves at ever-increasing costs of doing so. The domestic oil industry cannot compete with cheap foreign imports without bankrupting all of those engaged in the industry except possibly those interested only in refining and marketing and such a policy would eventually engulf those who think they could gain. Indeed such a policy could be the spark that set in motion a real business recession.

This is a dismal picture and an alarming one, but gives you a glimpse of what could be precipitated by this action of Sohio's in utter disregard of their responsibility to the petroleum economy of the State of Kansas. My concern could not be greater unless it were one of immediate greater proportions which I think could follow unless this commission takes prompt notice and action. The eyes of the entire domestic oil industry are focused on this situation.

It is my recommendation to you, Mr. Commissioner, and members of the corporation commission, that you promptly take action. You have several courses open to you. You could recommend or suggest to the other crude oil purchasers of Kansas to buy the oil which Sohio has been buying from outside connections. It is my understanding that Sohio purchases 7,300 plus or minus barrels in Kansas of which 4,000 barrels daily is company-owned oil. Thus a reduction in this company-owned oil is simply a matter of bookkeeping, taking away from the production division and giving to the refining division or taking from one pocket and putting into the other pocket. The remaining 3,300 plus or minus barrels is purchased from many independent producers in Kansas. A suggestion or recommendation or, if need be, an order from this commission to the other purchasers that they purchase this 3,300 plus or minus barrels daily would effectively relieve Sohio and take them out of Kansas as a purchaser of crude oil. We are operating this month under a 25,000 barrels a day reduction in allowables and there will possibly be a similar reduction for the month of June. Certainly the 3,300 plus barrels can be absorbed and, if not, a reduction could be worked out by those companies taking this 3,300 barrels. This commission will be taking a constructive step not only in the best interests of Kansas, but of the entire domestic petroleum industry by realizing the important significance of this matter and exercising its authority to prevent economic waste of our State's most important mineral resource—crude petroleum.

I want to apologize for the length of this statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have action concluded on the conference report. It is my understanding that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] wished to be notified when the debate on the Commerce Department appropriation bill was resumed. But in view of the understanding with his staff, I suggest that the Senator from Minnesota proceed with his speech, and I will see if the Senator from Illinois can be located.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I observe that the Senator from Illinois has just come to the floor. May I ask the majority leader if it is his desire to proceed with the consideration of the conference report?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield, so that the question may be put?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

(Mr. HUMPHREY resumed and concluded his speech, which appears in its entirety on preceding pages of the RECORD.)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had expected at this time to ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the customary action in that connection, looking to the creation of a clean bill which would be subject to all amendments, might be taken. However, I find that there is objection to that course, so I suggest that the committee amendments be considered in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 2, after "(not exceeding $1,000)", to strike out "$2,172,000" and insert "$2,217,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be printed in full at this point in the RECORD. I make the request so that with reference to any item on which no question is asked on the floor the report will give the answer the committee thought was adequate.

There being no objection, the report (No. 512) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House	$1,123,685,000
Amount of increase by the Senate	190,932,300
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	1,314,617,300
Amount of appropriations, 1955	1,147,512,746
Amount of the regular and supplemental estimates, 1956	1,366,393,000
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Over the appropriations for 1955	167,104,554
Under the estimates for 1956	51,775,700

Summary of bill

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1955	Estimates, 1956	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1955	Estimates, 1956	House bill
Title I—Department of Commerce	$1,130,632,746	$1,347,800,000	$1,105,810,000	$1,296,322,300	+$165,689,554	−$51,477,700	+$190,512,300
Title II—The Canal Zone	15,433,000	16,898,000	16,300,000	16,600,000	+1,167,000	−298,000	+300,000
Title III—Independent agencies:							
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	120,000	295,000	175,000	295,000	+175,000		+120,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	(250,000)	(280,000)	(280,000)	(280,000)	(+30,000)		
Tariff Commission	1,327,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	+73,000		
Grand totals, titles I, II, and III	1,147,512,746	1,366,393,000	1,123,685,000	1,314,617,300	+167,104,554	−51,775,700	+190,932,300

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

For the Department of Commerce, including the Civil Aeronautics Board, the committee recommends $1,296,322,300, an increase of $190,512,300 above the amount allowed by the House. The total, with comparisons of the amount recommended with the appropriations for fiscal year 1955 and with amounts allowed by the House of Representatives is shown in the accompanying summary table, showing the amounts allowed by title of the bill and by agency.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: The committee recommends $2,217,300, an increase of $45,300 over the amount allowed by the House, and over appropriations for comparable activities in fiscal year 1955. The amount recommended will make available for fiscal year 1956 for the immediate office of the Under Secretary for Transportation no more than the amount made available for this activity in fiscal year 1955. The increase will provide funds to cover the full year cost in fiscal year 1956 of positions established in the Office of the Secretary during 1955, and for adding two positions in the Office of Budget and Management for improvement of accounting methods.

Aviation war risk insurance revolving fund: The language proposed is legislative, and its proper place appears to be in an amendment of the law, section 1306 of the act of June 14, 1951 (49 U. S. C. 716). The remedy should lie in recourse to the legislative committee having jurisdiction over the matter.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The committee recommends $7,100,000 for fiscal year 1956, an increase of $900,000 above the current appropriation and above the House bill. Due to censuses taken in calendar year 1954, the need for certain annual surveys did not exist this year. This is reflected in the reduction of appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Census Bureau from $6,824,824 for comparable purposes in 1954 to $6,200,000 in fiscal year 1955. With resumption of these activities required in fiscal year 1956, the committee feels that within a total of $7,100,000 the Bureau should continue to improve sta-

tistics on employment, and should go forward in development of electronic machines adapted to its work which should speed results and reduce costs of the next decennial census.

The increases are distributed by project as follows:

Annual retail trade report	$50,000
Annual survey of manufacturers	150,000
Expanded population survey	500,000
Electronic equipment development	200,000

Census of agriculture: The committee recommends no amendment. The House allowance of $5,500,000, $10,500,000 less than the appropriation for fiscal year 1955, and $500,000 less than the estimate, will complete this census.

Censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries: The committee recommends no amendment. The House allowance of $4 million is $665,000 less than the budget estimate, and $4,430,000 less than the appropriation for fiscal year 1955.

It is not intended by the committee that this reduction should delay or curtail the planned work on the censuses, but that, if it is demonstrated that additional funds are required in fiscal year 1956 to complete it, a supplemental estimate will be submitted.

Intercensal housing survey: The committee recommends the appropriation of the amount of the estimate for this purpose, $500,000. The item was omitted in the House bill.

The obvious great changes which have occurred in the housing supply and pattern of occupancy since 1950 have not been reduced to any form of comprehensive national statistical coverage. Considering the importance of the subject, to one of the Nation's principal industries and to the whole body of the population—and especially, considering the billions in credit for housing construction and ownership for which the United States Treasury stands as guarantor—it is the belief of the committee that the survey at this time is required for the information of the public, the Congress, and the housing industry, and that it should cover all housing in its sample, including Wherry housing for military personnel.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Operation and regulation: The committee recommends $107,125,000 for "Operation and regulation" for fiscal year 1956. This amount is $4,125,000 above the House allowance and $975,000 over the budget estimate. This recommendation is a result of careful consideration of the adverse effect on our growing civil and military aviation that would result from plans to discontinue certain aids to air navigation. Extensive evidence is available that we should operate the available air navigation and traffic-control facilities and the new facilities that will be ready during 1956. Our recommendation will permit facilities constructed at Federal expense and needed for the air-ground services that assure safety in aviation to be operated. A lesser amount will result in closing facilities which are important to segments of aviation and this committee has always stressed that safety in aviation should not be jeopardized.

The committee therefore directs that no stations or facilities now operating be discontinued by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and that there be reported to the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives a comprehensive plan for future air traffic control routes, facilities, and stations, which shall in any event be made available to this committee and to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives prior to the submission of the budget for fiscal year 1957.

Establishment of air navigation facilities: The committee recommends $16 million, which is $2,500,000 less than the House allowance and $7 million less than the budget estimate. It is the view of the committee that the administration should proceed slowly with installation of new equipment while the question of the type permanently to be used is being determined. The committee feels that this amount is adequate to meet the needs for other new facilities in the Federal airways system during the coming year.

For liquidation of contract authorization previously granted under this head, the committee recommends $7 million, the amount of the House allowance and the budget estimate.

Grants-in-aid for airports: The committee recommends $20 million, the amount allowed for this purpose by the House; it is $9 million more than the budget estimate, and $150,000 less than the comparable amount made available for fiscal year 1955.

Many communications and statements have been presented to the committee by distinguished citizens, Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, urging an increase in this fund up to the maximum authorized to be appropriated in 1 year, which is $100 million. Testimony was presented to the committee as to the criteria employed by the administration in choosing airports for Federal aid under this authority.

In view of the fact that decision is pending on legislation which would substantially change the pattern of selection and extend eligibility for aid to more of the communities throughout the Nation which have sold or authorized bonds, or by other means built up funds to match Federal grants aggregating more than $161 million, it is believed a larger appropriation would be of doubtful value to communities seeking the increased grants.

The committee recommends $7,500,000, the amount in the House bill and in the budget, for liquidation of contract authorization previously granted for the Federal-aid airport program.

Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport: The amount recommended by the committee, $1,415,000, is $65,000 more than the House allowance and the appropriation for the current fiscal year. The increase will provide $45,000 for the increased pay at wage-board rates of custodial employees so reclassified in accordance with Public Law 763, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 1105). It will also provide for an increase of $20,000 for the increased cost of utilities.

The committee asks that a complete investigation and report to the Congress be made by the administration of the monopoly on taxicab transportation from the airport to points in Washington, which appears to be operated to the detriment of public convenience at exorbitant costs to passengers.

Construction, Washington National Airport: The committee supports the action of the House in recommending the budget estimate, $525,000. This amount will provide for additional aircraft fuel storage and distribution facilities and for other critically needed improvements, including the addition of a second baggage room at the south end of the terminal.

Maintenance and operation, public airports, Territory of Alaska: The committee recommends $750,000, the amount of the budget estimate, and $150,000 more than the House bill. The recommended amount will provide an increase of $150,000 above the 1955 appropriation to pay $15,000 for the added costs for employee fringe benefits enacted by the 83d Congress, and $135,000 for bulk utilities purchase by the airport for sale to occupants of its facilities from which the net proceeds deposited in the Treasury will exceed the cost.

Air navigation development: The committee recommends $1,600,000, an increase of $550,000 over the 1955 appropriation and the House bill. Regardless of the outcome of the controversy as to the type of air-navigation aids to be installed on the airways in the near future, the committee believes it important to the safety and the convenience of the public in these days of growing air traffic and air speed that there be increased an active attention to the development of instruments and guiding devices which will provide correspondingly increased speed in air traffic direction and control.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: The committee recommends the amount of the budget estimated, $4,125,000. This is $225,000 more than the House bill would provide, and $348,000 more than the fiscal year 1955 appropriation. The work of the Board in auditing the air carriers—an essential prerequisite to establishment of final rates, which determine the amount of subsidy to be paid—and in settling applications for certification of air routes, has been inexcusably slow.

Undoubtedly there are complex issues which come before the Board for solution in applications for adjustment of rates and for the certification of new routes or improvements to existing routes for the convenience of the public. In granting this full budget request, it is the understanding of the committee that such proceedings will be expedited, and that there will be an increase in frequency and scope of audits of the air carriers.

Payments to air carriers: The committee recommends $55 million for the subsidy payments to scheduled United States flag domestic and international airlines. The amount allowed by the House, $40 million, would not, according to testimony given to this committee, pay the amounts earned and due under the law given the most favorable circumstances. The recommended increase of $15 million is $8 million less than the budget estimate; limiting the appropriation to that amount may very well require provision of a supplemental appropriation in the next session.

Testimony before this committee on this appropriation request brought out the fact that the payments due are earned by a formula which is set up under law, whenever the airline provides service on a certificated route; once a rate is set, no recapture is provided, unless the rate is temporary. The only thing other than flight service performance which thereafter affects the amount due from this appropriation is that there is a deduction of the amount which is paid to the carriers by the Post Office Department computed on the volume of mail actually carried. Any recoveries made are based upon the action of the Board in setting final rates below the temporary rates, which action is subject to court review.

The Board chairman advised the committee that recommendations for a recapture provision, as an amendment to basic law, were under active study and might be provided to this Congress. Such an action appears to this committee to be worthy of encouragement.

The Board's estimates for subsidy payments to air carriers have been in a form which lists amounts to be paid to each air carrier grouped in broad geographical classifications. In evaluating subsidy requirements for the future, particularly for international operations, it would be helpful to the committee if the Board were to segregate and identify with greater particularity the routes and services for which subsidy is required, and those which do not receive subsidy support.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Salaries and expenses: The committee recommends $10,225,000, which is $25,000 more than the House allowance and the 1955 appropriation. The increase is provided to

cover retirement pay of five officers who are being added to the retired list. The committee does not recommend the initiation of a proposed survey of the gulf coast tidelands area.

BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: The recommendation of the committee, $6,900,000, is $702,000 more than the House allowance and would provide an increase of $652,000 over the amount available for comparable activities for the fiscal year 1955. The agency requested $250,000 to increase the Area Development Division and $800,000 to provide for construction statistics projects. The committee recommends that there be less than maximum action in these two areas.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

Salaries and expenses: The committee recommendation, $2,200,000, is $400,000 more than the provision in the House bill and restores the full budget estimate. The Senate last year acted to increase the staff of this Bureau in order to improve its service to American businessmen engaged in foreign trade. The increase provided will simply continue throughout fiscal year 1956 the added staff which was recruited during fiscal year 1955.

Export control: The committee recommends $2,800,000, an increase of $300,000 over the House allowance. Despite the reduction in the controlled list, there are still requirements for enforcement at nearly as many points as in the past. Since much of this enforcement work is done by the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, the committee recommends that the full amount of $800,000 be provided to that agency by the Department of Commerce. The committee also recommends that the amount of $90,000 be available for transfer to the Office of the Secretary for his administrative expenses in connection with export control activities rather than $75,000 recommended by the House.

OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

Salaries and expenses: The committee recommends $900,000, which is $75,000 less than the House figure and $100,000 less than the budget estimate. The committee was told by the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of Commerce that $75,000 earmarked by the House to finance a special study of unemployment throughout the country was for an activity which was not contained in the budget and was not recommended for this agency. Funds recommended for the Census Bureau would provide for the proposed purpose.

MARITIME ACTIVITIES

Ship construction: The committee recommends $102,800,000, the amount of the estimate and $38,100,000 more than the House allowance. The restoration will provide for continuation of the program initiated last year to stimulate the American shipbuilding industry and to provide for replacement which will prevent block obsolescence of the American merchant marine. The amount recommended for restoration by this committee includes the building of 1 prototype tanker and 2 prototype cargo ships, planned for future requirements of national defense. On the basis of testimony that the last proviso, which was included by the House, is not consistent with normal practice in shipbuilding, the committee has recommended striking out language which would limit commencement of construction to vessels for which the entire appropriation of Federal funds required to complete had been provided.

Operating differential subsidies: The committee recommends $115 million, an increase of $25 million over the House allowance and the same that has been provided for fiscal year 1955. The payment of subsidies which have been earned is an obligation of the Government to contractors who operate shipping under terms provided by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as amended. Although certain sums are withheld from these earnings as a matter of policy—such as amounts in dispute and a proportion of earnings during most recent quarters pending audit which will determine possible recapture—it is the belief of the committee that such obligations after determination should be promptly paid. To fail to provide the funds at this time will simply require Congress to consider a supplemental appropriation later in the fiscal year. Language which has been included in the bill by the House would change a provision which has previously limited the number of voyages on which subsidies might be paid. The committee proposes to reinstate the limitation for contractors covered by these subsidies in the form and the full number recommended in the budget, 2,000 voyages.

Salaries and expenses: The committee recommends $14,700,000, which is $700,000 more than the House allowance and $400,000 less than the budget estimate. The increase recommended by the committee will provide additional funds, in the amount of $440,000 more than the allowance of the House, for reserve fleet expenses in order to insure that preservation work is expedited and will also provide for a corresponding increase in the provision for maintenance of shipyard facilities and operation of warehouses.

Maritime training: The committee recommends $2,085,000, the amount of the budget estimate and of the House bill, which is principally for the operation of the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.

State marine schools: The committee recommends $660,000 for this purpose, the amount included in the bill in the House and the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1955. There was no budget estimate submitted for this activity for fiscal year 1956. It is believed by the committee that officials of the Administration have shown a disregard for the effect of the proposed abrupt discontinuance of this aid without advance notice upon the States, the schools, but particularly upon the students who have enrolled in these maritime academies in the expectation that they would be able to complete their course with Federal aid. Furthermore, the committee believes that these State schools are making a valued contribution to national security by providing trained personnel for our merchant fleet and for the Naval Reserve.

Reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authority): The committee recommends $6 million for this purpose, which is the amount of the House allowance and the budget estimate and $6 less than the fiscal year 1955 appropriation.

War Shipping Administration liquidation: The committee recommends no amendment. The House allowed the amount of the estimate, an authority to continue use in 1956 of $5,900,000 of unexpended balances from 1948 appropriations for settlement of obligations approved by the General Accounting Office.

Vessel operations revolving fund: Language has been included in the bill as proposed in the budget estimate but which was not approved by the House, permitting the Maritime Administration to pay the cost of protection, preservation, maintenance, acquisition, or use of vessels returned to the ownership of the United States from other nations or by forfeiture or foreclosure.

Inland Waterways Corporation: The committee recommends authorization for the use of $14,000 from the funds of this Corporation to carry out the audit and physical inspection required in fiscal year 1956 under the terms of the contract of sale of the assets of the Corporation. The amount recommended is the amount of the budget estimate and was disallowed entirely by the House.

PATENT OFFICE

Salaries and expenses: The committee recommends $14 million for this purpose, the amount of the House allowance and $2 million more than the budget estimate.

Testimony before the committee by the Secretary of Commerce, the Under Secretary, and the Deputy Commissioner of Patents was that this money could be used constructively.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Federal-aid highways: The committee recommends $680 million, the full amount of the budget estimate, which is an increase of $80 million over the House bill and $85 million more than the appropriation for fiscal year 1955. This appropriation is a liquidation of an obligation of the Federal Government to the States. The obligation to the States is incurred pursuant to the contract authority contained in the Federal highway acts; not to provide the appropriation for payment would require a supplemental appropriation at a later date during the fiscal year.

Forest highways: The committee recommends $25 million, the amount of the budget estimate, for the liquidation of contract authority granted in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954. This amount, $6,500,000 more than the House allowance, will be needed to meet these obligations.

Inter-American Highway: The committee recommends an appropriation of $25,250,000 for the continuance of the construction of the Inter-American Highway, which is the full amount of the authorized but unappropriated balance.

It is the sense of the committee that the interests of this Nation, our friendship for the neighbor nations, the value of surface access to the Panama Canal, and many other mutual benefits dictate early completion of this highway. Even if the cost of the road is increased by accelerating its construction to completion in 3 years, as requested by the President, it is deemed to be so very much in our interest for the early realization of our objectives, in Latin American peace and in mutual economic benefit, so as to greatly outweigh the added cost.

Public lands highways: The committee recommends $2 million, the full amount of the budget estimate and the same amount approved in the House. This appropriation is for the liquidation of obligations for construction of highways as they cross land owned by the United States.

Reductions in contract authorizations: The committee recommends the concurrence of the Senate in the provision included in the bill by the House on the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget which will cancel the unused authorizations and contract authority for Federal-aid and forest highways under the acts cited in the bill.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Expenses: The committee recommends $7,450,000, which is $450,000 more than the amount in the House bill and $300,000 less than the budget estimate. The testimony disclosed that $550,000 of the increase of $1,450,000 recommended by the committee over the fiscal year 1955 appropriations for comparable activities will go for the elimination of overcharges to other agencies. This practice by the Bureau of Standards has been criticized by the Comptroller General. The $900,000 which is recommended for the increased program in standards, research and testing is needed as a minimum to support an increase in work for improved standards of measurement demanded by technical improvements in industry.

Plant and equipment: The committee recommends $995,000, the amount allowed by the House and $20,000 less than the budget estimate. The committee also recommends language submitted in the estimate which is required by law to be contained in appropriation acts for the construction of facilities.

WEATHER BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: The committee recommends $32 million, which is $2,100,000 more than the amount in the House bill and $4,150,000 more than the budget estimate. With these additional funds, the committee also recommends language which will limit the use of $4,250,000 to operation, improvement, facilities and research in hurricane, storm, and tornado warning services in the United States. Included in the amount which is provided for this purpose is $96,000 for the operation of a ship in the gulf coast areas to give earlier and better warnings for these coastal waters which will be of particular benefit to the fishing industries and installations offshore oil drilling and production.

It is the sense of the committee that the extension of agriculture frost-warning service is to be encouraged wherever communities or local associations of agricultural producers provide required supporting funds. In the case of Maricopa County, Ariz., $10,000 is provided within the amount allowed for the provision of such a service.

Establishment of meteorological facilities: The committee recommends the amount allowed by the House, $5 million which is the amount of the estimate. This amount will pay for the cost of modernization of obsolescent weather-observation equipment, particularly in the field of storm detection and tracking.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The following provisions have been included in the bill by the committee:

"SEC. 104. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriations of the Department of Commerce available for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be thereby increased by more than 5 percent: *Provided*, That such transfers shall be in addition to any other transfers authorized by law, but no such transfer shall be used for the creation of new functions within the Department: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 of such transfers shall be available for entertainment.

"SEC. 105. Hereafter the position of Budget Officer of the Department shall be in GS-17 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

The language proposed in section 105 would place the present incumbent of the position of budget officer of the Department in the grade established by law for the previous incumbent.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Canal Zone Government operating expenses: The committee recommends $14,800,000, an increase of $300,000 over the House bill and $217,000 under the budget estimate. The committee reaffirms its directive of last year that none of the funds available to the Canal Zone Government shall be used for the provision of free kindergartens.

Capital outlay: The committee recommends $1,800,000, the House allowance, and a reduction of $81,000 under the estimate. However, the committee recommends inclusion in the language of provision for replacement of 8 passenger-carrying motor vehicles instead of 6 as recommended in the House bill. These two vehicles are to be used by the Police Department.

Panama Canal Company: The committee recommends $3,740,000, to be derived from revenues of the company, for administrative expenses. This amount is $151,000 more than the House allowance and $110,000 less than the budget estimate. The amount allowed does not provide for any increase in personnel but will cover the added cost of employee fringe benefits during the fiscal year 1956. The committee directs that no action be taken to abandon the Panama Railroad until the appropriate committees of Congress have investigated the proposal and indicated their approval.

The United States Government has a net unamortized current investment in the Panama Canal of $367,764,946, which is computed without allowance for the interest on the cost of the construction incurred from the initiation of the project to the opening of the canal to traffic.

Of this total, nondepreciable items amount to $286 million; although interest is paid on this portion of our investment, there is no depreciation or amortization paid to the Treasury on this nondepreciable cost—which is the value of the digging and the locks themselves, but not the cost of the lock machinery—and toll rates as now set would not produce the funds to make such a return. In short, depreciation is being taken only on an amount which is less than one-fourth of our investment, even after the discounting of interest during construction, which has, like certain other chargeoffs, been taken as its value for national defense.

Sections 205 and 206 are proposed by the committee to be added for the Panama Canal which include provision for the promotion of the Governor, who is also President of the Panama Canal Company, and for regulation of the method of computing travel cost under home leave which requires the full cost to the Government to be taken into account.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

The committee recommends $295,000 which will enable this committee to complete its work and report to Congress on the need for control of rainmaking and other related activities. The amount recommended is $120,000 more than the House allowance in the Mount Washington, New Hampshire, area, and is the full amount of the budget estimate. This amount will permit physical evaluation and test of rainmaking techniques and provide for the accumulation and evaluation of data at a more rapid rate.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The committee recommends the amount of the House allowance and the budget estimate, $280,000, for the administrative expenses of this Corporation. The committee was advised that due to relocation of some of the links in the seaway, the total amount of the United States commitment for the construction will be substantially reduced.

TARIFF COMMISSION

The committee concurs in the action of the House in providing the full amount of the budget estimate of $1,400,000 for this important Government Commission.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1955 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1956

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1955	Estimates, 1956	Recommended in House bill for 1956	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1955	Estimates, 1956	House bill
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY							
Salaries and expenses	$2,050,000	$2,300,000	$2,172,000	$2,217,300	+$167,300	−$82,700	+$45,300
CENSUS BUREAU							
Salaries and expenses	6,200,000	7,400,000	6,200,000	7,100,000	+900,000	−300,000	+900,000
Census of agriculture	16,000,000	6,000,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	−10,500,000	−500,000	
Censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries	8,430,000	4,655,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	−4,430,000	−655,000	
Intercensal housing survey		500,000		500,000	+500,000		+500,000
Total, Census Bureau	30,630,000	18,555,000	15,700,000	17,100,000	−13,530,000	−1,455,000	+1,400,000
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION							
Operation and regulation		106,150,000	103,000,000	107,125,000	+107,125,000	+975,000	+4,125,000
Air navigation facilities, establishment of	5,000,000	23,000,000	18,500,000	16,000,000	+11,000,000	−7,000,000	−2,500,000
Air navigation facilities, establishment of (liquidation of contract authorization)		7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000		
Grants-in-aid for airports		11,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+20,000,000	+9,000,000	
Federal-aid airport program (liquidation of contract authorization)		7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	+7,500,000		
Washington National Airport:							
Maintenance and operation	1,350,000	1,415,000	1,350,000	1,415,000	+65,000		+65,000
Construction	340,000	525,000	525,000	525,000	+185,000		
Alaska airports, maintenance and operation	600,000	750,000	600,000	750,000	+150,000		+150,000
Air navigation development	1,050,000	2,000,000	1,050,000	1,600,000	+550,000	−400,000	+550,000
Salaries and expenses	[1] 98,730,000				−98,730,000		
Technical development and evaluation	700,000				−700,000		
Federal aid airport program	22,000,000				−22,000,000		
Claims, Federal Airport Act	69,449				−69,449		
Land acquisition, additional, Washington Airport	16,297				−16,297		
Total, Civil Aeronautics Administration	129,855,746	159,340,000	159,525,000	161,915,000	+32,059,254	+2,575,000	+2,390,000

[1] Includes $650,000 derived by transfer pursuant to Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1955 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1956—Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1955	Estimates, 1956	Recommended in House bill for 1956	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1955	Estimates, 1956	House bill
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD							
Salaries and expenses	$3,777,000	$4,125,000	$3,900,000	$4,125,000	+$348,000		+$225,000
Payments to air carriers	[2] 48,900,000	63,000,000	40,000,000	55,000,000	+6,100,000	−$8,000,000	+15,000,000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	52,677,000	67,125,000	43,900,000	59,125,000	+6,448,000	−8,000,000	+15,225,000
COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY							
Salaries and expenses	10,200,000	10,400,000	10,200,000	10,225,000	+25,000	−175,000	+25,000
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION							
Salaries and expenses	6,320,000	[3] 7,300,000	6,198,000	6,900,000	+580,000	−400,000	+702,000
BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE							
Salaries and expenses	2,000,000	2,200,000	1,800,000	2,200,000	+200,000		+400,000
Export control	[4] 3,481,000	3,000,000	2,500,000	2,800,000	−681,000	−200,000	+300,000
Total, Bureau of Foreign Commerce	5,481,000	5,200,000	4,300,000	5,000,000	−481,000	−200,000	+700,000
OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS							
Salaries and expenses	900,000	1,000,000	975,000	900,000		−100,000	−75,000
MARITIME ACTIVITIES							
Ship construction	82,600,000	102,800,000	64,700,000	102,800,000	+20,200,000		+38,100,000
Operating differential subsidies	[5] 115,000,000	115,000,000	90,000,000	115,000,000			+25,000,000
Salaries and expenses	[6] 13,900,000	15,100,000	14,000,000	14,700,000	+800,000	−400,000	+700,000
Maritime training	2,200,000	2,085,000	2,085,000	2,085,000	−115,000		
Repair of reserve-fleet facilities	[7] 970,000				−970,000		
Repair of reserve-fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization)	12,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−6,000,000		
State marine schools	[8] 610,000		660,000	660,000	+50,000	+660,000	
Ship mortgage-foreclosure or forfeiture contingencies	[9] 2,019,000				−2,019,000		
Vessel operations revolving fund		(10)		(10)			
War Shipping Administration liquidation	(11)	(12)	(12)	(12)			
Total, maritime activities	229,299,000	240,985,000	177,445,000	241,245,000	+11,946,000	+260,000	+63,800,000
INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION							
Administrative expense limitation	(14,000)	(14,000)		(14,000)			(+14,000)
PATENT OFFICE							
Salaries and expenses	11,500,000	12,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	+2,500,000	+2,000,000	
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS							
Federal-aid highways (liquidation)	[13] 595,000,000	680,000,000	600,000,000	680,000,000	+85,000,000		+80,000,000
Forest highways (liquidation)	[14] 18,500,000	25,000,000	18,500,000	25,000,000	+6,500,000		+6,500,000
Inter-American Highway	5,750,000	[15] 74,980,000	8,000,000	25,250,000	+19,500,000	−49,730,000	+17,250,000
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	[16] 875,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,125,000		
Reimbursement to the highway fund, District of Columbia	290,000				−290,000		
Total, Bureau of Roads	620,415,000	781,980,000	628,500,000	732,250,000	+111,835,000	−49,730,000	+103,750,000
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS							
Expenses		7,750,000	7,000,000	7,450,000	+7,450,000	−300,000	+450,000
Plant and equipment		[17] 1,015,000	995,000	995,000	+995,000	−20,000	
Operation and administration	1,000,000				−1,000,000		
Research and testing	3,150,000				−3,150,000		
Radio propagation and standards	2,100,000				−2,100,000		
Construction of laboratories (liquidation of contract authorization)	115,000				−115,000		
Total, National Bureau of Standards	6,365,000	8,765,000	7,995,000	8,445,000	+2,080,000	−320,000	+450,000
WEATHER BUREAU							
Salaries and expenses	[18] 24,940,000	27,850,000	29,900,000	32,000,000	+7,060,000	+4,150,000	+2,100,000
Establishment of meteorological facilities		5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000		
Total, Weather Bureau	24,940,000	32,850,000	34,900,000	37,000,000	+12,060,000	+4,150,000	+2,100,000
Total, title I	1,130,632,746	1,347,800,000	1,105,810,000	1,296,322,300	+165,689,554	−51,477,700	+190,512,300

[2] Includes $8,900,000 contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.
[3] Includes $250,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 126.
[4] Excludes $119,000 transferred to other appropriations pursuant to Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.
[5] Includes $50,000,000 contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.
[6] Includes $400,000 contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.
[7] Contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.
[8] Excludes $50,000 transferred to other appropriations pursuant to Second Supplement Appropriation Act, 1955.
[9] Excludes $481,000 transferred to other appropriations pursuant to Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.
[10] Language authorizing use of fund for ship mortgage foreclosure, etc.
[11] Not to exceed $6,000,000 of unexpended balance continued available.
[12] Not to exceed $5,900,000 of unexpended balance to be continued available.
[13] Includes $95,000,000 contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.
[14] Includes $3,500,000 contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.
[15] Includes $69,230,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 126.
[16] Contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.
[17] Includes $765,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 126.
[18] Includes $190,000 derived by transfer pursuant to Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1955 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1956—Continued

TITLE II—THE CANAL ZONE

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1955	Estimates, 1956	Recommended in House bill for 1956	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1955	Estimates, 1956	House bill
CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT							
Operating expenses	[19] $14,018,000	$15,017,000	$14,500,000	$14,800,000	+$782,000	−$217,000	+$300,000
Capital outlay	1,415,000	1,881,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	+385,000	−81,000	
Total, Canal Zone Government	15,433,000	16,898,000	16,300,000	16,600,000	+1,167,000	−298,000	+300,000
PANAMA CANAL COMPANY							
Administrative expense, limitation	(3,589,000)	(3,850,000)	(3,589,000)	(3,740,000)	(+151,000)	(−110,000)	(+151,000)
Total, title II	15,433,000	16,898,000	16,300,000	16,600,000	+1,167,000	−298,000	+300,000

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Advisory Committee on Weather Control	$120,000	$295,000	$175,000	$295,000	+$175,000		+$120,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (Administrative expense limitation)	(250,000)	(280,000)	(280,000)	(280,000)	(+30,000)		
Tariff Commission	1,327,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	+73,000		
Total, title III	1,447,000	1,695,000	1,575,000	1,695,000	+248,000		+120,000
Grand total, titles I, II, and III	1,147,512,746	1,366,393,000	1,123,685,000	1,314,617,300	+167,104,554	−$51,775,700	+190,932,300

[19] Includes $230,000 contained in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1955 and the estimates for 1956

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against revenue]

	Appropriation estimate, 1955	Appropriation estimate, 1956	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS			
Special statistical work	$1,000,000	$900,000	−$100,000
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION			
Gifts and donations	48,788		−48,788
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
Expenses, transcripts of studies, tables, and other records	70,000	70,000	
Special statistical work	10,000	10,000	
MARITIME ACTIVITIES			
U. S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.	5,000	5,000	
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS			
Cooperative work, forest highways	30,000		−30,000
Equipment supplies, etc., for cooperating countries	500,000	500,000	
Technical assistance, United States dollars advanced from foreign governments	3,390,396	1,000,000	−2,390,396
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS			
Gifts and bequests	68,400	46,000	−22,400
Special statistical work	500	500	
WEATHER BUREAU			
Special statistical work	1,339		−1,339
Total, Department of Commerce	5,124,423	2,531,500	−2,592,923

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census", on page 2, line 8, after the word "amended", to strike out "$6,200,000" and insert "$7,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 3, to insert:

Intercensal housing survey: For expenses necessary for conducting an interim survey of housing, including personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; and compensation of Federal employees temporarily detailed for field work under this appropriation; $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration", on page 4, line 8, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "$103,000,000" and insert "$107,125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$18,500,000" and insert "$16,000,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the reduction from $18,500,000 to $16,000,000 affect the matter of the smaller weather bureau facilities in the smaller communities throughout the country?

Mr. HOLLAND. It does not. All the smaller weather facilities which were to have been abandoned under the budget estimate in 31 communities are to be restored under another figure appearing in the item previously agreed to.

Furthermore, the Senate action, if it follows the recommendation of the committee, would prevent the closing of 30 other facilities of that nature, which would have been closed if the House action had prevailed.

The effect of this amendment reducing the appropriation of $18,500,000 included in the House bill, would be to

slow down somewhat the adding of new facilities. The appropriation in this field last year was $5 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that.

Mr. HOLLAND. We step it up to $16 million instead of to the $18,500,000 which the House provided, which means there is still an increase of a little more than three times the appropriation of last year.

The reason we suggest this more deliberate approach is that, as the Senator from Minnesota well knows, there is a question pending as to what kind of air navigation facilities will be adopted by the Nation for a long-range program. We think, after investigation, that the program can be slowed down in a minor way without in any way crippling air navigation, and, in fact, we understand that some of the navigation facilities would not have been installed in this coming year at any rate. Therefore we suggest that minor reduction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for the information. I raised the point primarily because of a very unfortunate situation which occurred at Duluth, Minn. I had to come to the floor of the Senate about 3 years ago in reference to the Duluth Airport, where there was a conflict between the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Department of the Air Force.

An intercepter squadron is located at Duluth. A National Guard unit is also located at the Duluth Airport, and there is also commercial aviation there. The North Central Airlines operate out of Duluth. At one time the Northwest Airlines also came into Duluth.

Senators may find it hard to believe that the Government of the United States denied all funds for a period of time for even a control tower operation at that airport, despite the fact that hundreds of passengers were going in and out of the airport and despite the fact that hundreds of flights were taking place every week in terms of the Air Force itself.

Am I assured that there are funds provided in the bill to keep open the control tower at the Duluth Airport and other airports in the State of Minnesota which have control towers at the present time under the jurisdiction of the CAA?

Mr. HOLLAND. There are such funds contained in the bill, I assure the Senator. As a matter of fact, not only is that true of his State, but it is also true of all the States where there are operating facilities at the present time. None of those operating facilities will be disestablished under a direction given to the Civil Aeronautics Administration by the report of the committee. The CAA is required to report to the Congress its full flight-control and flight-safety program. Incidentally, we expect the report to be filed with us before the next appropriation bill comes before the Congress—under the direction contained in the report of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But there is no danger under this appropriation item that there will be a closing down of any facilities which are now operating in terms of a control tower. Is that correct? I am thinking now of control towers.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is completely correct, with respect to both control towers and the other navigational facilities which are now in operation. None of them will be disestablished under the committee report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 5 at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$18,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$16,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 4, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,415,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 14, after the word "uniforms", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$175,000"; and at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "$1,050,000" and insert "$1,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board," on page 7, line 10, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$3,900,000" and insert "$4,125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 16, after "1953", to strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$55,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I discussed this item yesterday on the floor of the Senate. I shall oppose the increase recommended by the committee, and, in view of the lateness of the hour, I ask that the amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. That course of procedure is completely agreeable to me. What I am trying to do is to clear up all amendments on which action can be taken tonight. I understand that there are perhaps three additional amendments which are controversial and which involve substantial sums, and which I believe ought to be debated when more Senators are present than there are now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida may recall that we had a private conversation with reference to the item of $20 million for grants-in-aid for airports.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota has been keenly interested in this grant-in-aid airport program. I have a letter from the Commissioner of Aeronautics of the State of Minnesota, urging that more money be appropriated. He states that the $20 million provided "is nonetheless insufficient to meet the existing needs in the State of Minnesota and the other 47 States; nor is it sufficient to fulfill the policy of the committees of the Congress under the Federal Airport Act of 1946."

Likewise, I have received a letter from the mayor of Minneapolis, Minn., who is a member of the Metropolitan Airport Commission, calling my attention to the inadequacy of the $20 million fund.

I wish to ask the Senator from Florida whether this amount was agreed to in contemplation of the fact that additional legislation may be reported to the Senate which would augment and supplement the airport construction program. I am referring to a bill which is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with which the Senator from Florida is familiar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am familiar with that bill. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is the chairman of that committee, is more familiar with it than I am, but I shall be very happy to relate what transpired in the Appropriations Committee and to give the Senator from Minnesota such assurance as I am able to give him.

In the first place, the budgeted amount for this item, which appears at page 5 of the printed bill, was $11 million, instead of $20 million, as provided in the bill.

The House stepped up the item from $11 million to $20 million. In other words, it added $9 million.

The Senate, recognizing the situation which the Senator from Minnesota has very ably described, was requested by many agencies to consider adding more than the $20 million. However, upon consideration we found it to be a fact that many communities which have already voted bonds and have money in the bank and are paying interest on it cannot qualify under the standards set pursuant to the present law, and that many additional communities which want to come into the program and to have airports constructed and airport facilities improved in their areas cannot qualify, although they make very powerful cases for such action.

Because of that fact, there now is pending in the Committtees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of both bodies dealing with this subject proposed legislation which restates the standards and which will allow much greater flexibility and a much more accurate approach to the program in connection with bringing into it other airports in addition to those which are now included.

The Senator from Washington, as the Senator from Minnesota knows, is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. When this point was brought up in the full committee's discussions of this subject, the Senator from Washington suggested that we should not recommend a further increase, but should await the passage of the proposed legislation pending in committee, which he believes will be passed without fail at this session of Congress.

He indicated to us that, in addition to a restatement of the standards so as to make them much more applicable to present conditions, the new law would also contain very large contractual authority which would make it possible to

move promptly ahead in the field which the Senator has in mind. So I am able to give assurance that that is the prospect, and it is so stated by the able chairman of the legislative committee which has the proposed legislation under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall what the amount was under this particular item in last year's bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. The appropriation last year was $20,150,000 for this same purpose. The budget recommendation this year was $11 million, and, as I have stated, the Senate committee recommends $20 million, which is the same amount provided by the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to say that I have had so many communications in reference to this airport grant-in-aid program that I have been deeply concerned about the amount of money to be appropriated. Apparently the appropriation contained in this bill will severely limit activities under the Airport Development Act. I am only hoping that the proposed legislation which is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I understand the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has been conducting hearings, will be reported so that the contract authorization may be made available.

Mr. President, since we are going to take this matter up tomorrow, I should like to reserve the right to offer an amendment which would increase the sum by $5 million. I should like to talk to the Senator from Florida about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator will not follow that course because I believe that, as a matter of fact, we are going to find the agencies more or less marking time until new legislation is reported and passed because of the many inequities as between equally ambitious and equally meritorious communities which it is desired to straighten out. However, the Senator does not need to reserve the point because this is not a committee amendment, and we will dispose of only committee amendments tonight.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, when the Senate took a recess last Thursday it was thought that the Commerce Department appropriation bill would be reported on Friday, and there would be little controversy involved. Therefore, we had only a routine session on Friday, and we had no session on Saturday. Last year we were meeting on Saturdays and at night, and as early as the middle of March we resisted a motion to meet late in the evening. I have no desire to keep the Senate in session this afternoon any later than the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee wishes to keep it. I had the feeling that there were only two or three controversial amendments and that if those 2 or 3 amendments could be cleared up the bill could be acted on by possibly the noon hour tomorrow or a little after that time.

The Senate must consider the Draft Act, the Austrian Treaty, and the Defense Department appropriation bill. There are about eight appropriation bills which have not yet passed this body. The end of the fiscal year is only 14 days away. There are four bills which have passed this body on which conferees have not yet been appointed. Because of a desire to accommodate certain Senators, we did not hold a session on Monday. It was hoped that we could take care of this bill on Tuesday. We did not get through with it on Tuesday. Today considerable time has been spent on a conference report, and there have been several speeches. We are not going to get through with the bill today, but I hope we can act on every amendment before today's session ends, and we are prepared to remain as late as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee desires.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I am just as anxious as is the majority leader or anyone else to proceed with the debate on the bill. The desire now is to clear up all the committee amendments except three which I understand have been objected to. If there are others, I do not know of them.

There is an amendment which the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] wishes to offer. The matter mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota, which somewhat departs from the understanding I had a few minutes ago, would not affect the committee amendments. I hope it will be found that the Senator from Minnesota will not go ahead with the offer of an amendment in that particular field. However, he has a right to do so if he wishes. I know of only 4 controversial amendments, 3 being committee amendments, 1 of which has been mentioned by the Senator from Illinois, who gave clear notice yesterday of his intention to offer it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not going to offer an amendment. I am going to oppose a committee amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. That will be in accordance with parliamentary procedure. At any rate, there are three committee amendments which will need to be debated. Insofar as I know, there will be at least one amendment which is not an amendment to a committee amendment. That is the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I know of no others that need to go over until tomorrow. However, I have been frequently taken by surprise on the floor of the Senate. Some Senators, after a good night's sleep, may feel that they can add to or subtract substantial sums from the bill. I can only report that the prospect is that there will be three committee amendments which will need discussion in the morning, and one amendment which is not a committee amendment.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If we are all going to have a good night's sleep and feel better in the morning, I should like to offer this suggestion for what it may be worth. The bill has been before the Senate for 3 days, and it may be before it another day, not because of the bill itself and the amendments pending, but there may be a speech on agriculture or civil defense or foreign trade in the middle of the debate on the bill. If there were some way to require Senators, after making their speeches, to remain here and help us pass the bill, perhaps we could make more progress.

I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee and the authors of the amendments would give some thought to an agreement which would allot whatever time they think is necessary for each side to discuss the amendments. In that way, extraneous speeches could be made earlier in the morning or later in the afternoon, and in the interim the Senate could devote its time to the pending business.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am quite agreeable to a limitation of time. I suggest that the matter be discussed with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Delaware. I think they will feel that the time should be limited. I hope they will. Any arrangement which may be worked out with them will be agreeable with me.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I dislike to disappoint my good friends from Texas and Florida, respectively, in regard to the question of airmail subsidies. I think the Senator from Delaware wishes to say something about ship subsidies.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say, with all good humor, that this would not be the first time I have been disappointed by my distinguished friend from Illinois. This is nothing new. We will prepare for whatever time may be needed tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was not at all disappointed. That is why I did not address my inquiry to the Senator from Illinois. I have been here all afternoon listening to the discussion. I can understand the Senator's not wanting to have a rigid limitation. I did not propose a rigid limitation; although when I sit here and listen to extraneous discussion, which does not pertain to the bill, I sometimes wonder why Senators would not be considerate enough to discuss the bill pending at the time.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When I finish, I shall be glad to yield, unless it is more important that the Senator speak now. I will yield, Mr. President.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Texas does not have the floor. If he wishes, I will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Texas would finish his statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not want to place a rigid time limitation on any Senator. There was nothing in my suggestion which indicated that the limitation should be very rigid. I suggested that during the evening and in the early morning tomorrow the chairman of the subcommittee and the authors of the amendments give consideration to the amount of time they thought they would need on the amendments in question. If they thought they could do so, then at

some definite time the Senate could take action on the amendments.

The problem is not the time required for debate on amendments; it is the time which is taken on matters totally unrelated to the bill.

Senators have come to the floor with speeches requiring 20 minutes, an hour and 20 minutes, and some requiring 2 hours and 20 minutes. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has reminded me that he has been sitting in the Senate all day. He is one of the few Senators who have been here all day; but, nevertheless, he has been unable to get action on the bill.

I hope the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Delaware, and any other Senators who have amendments can perhaps determine in their own minds the amount of time they feel they would like to have. If that could be done, perhape a weekend session could be avoided. Perhaps evening sessions could be avoided.

The cold, hard truth is that 14 days remain in June, and 8 appropriation bills are pending. Some of the appropriation bills will require as much time as the Commerce Department appropriation bill.

There are Senators who do not want to vote on the Defense Department appropriation bill on Saturday. Many Senators do not plan to be here on Monday. Several amendments will be proposed to the Defense Department appropriation bill, which involves a large sum of money.

The Public Works appropriation bill is awaiting action in the House today. It is about ready to be reported. In the Senate debate on that bill will require some time.

It will be all right with me if the time of the Senate is consumed in talking about subjects unrelated to the pending business, and I will be here, and I will listen. But I do not want any Senator to think that he is being placed in a straitjacket or is being asked to conform to a rigid time schedule, because I have suggested that thought be given to the amount of time Senators may want to consume, in order that the discussion and attention can be directed to the pending business, instead of to some extraneous subject, to speeches on which other Senators do not care to listen.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Texas that, of course, I will give thought to the amount of time I think should be taken to discuss the very important question of air subsidies. I shall not take any more time than is absolutely necessary.

There is always the danger that one may take comments made by another in an unduly personal fashion. I am certain that the Senator from Texas did not mean to make any personal reference.

Yesterday I discussed the bill for approximately an hour. I think the time was well spent. Today we had sprung upon us, and, under the rules of the Senate, perfectly properly, the conference report on H. R. 1, perhaps one of the most important measures which has been presented to Congress at this session. I felt that since that was the matter before the Senate, I was justified in discussing it and expressing my disappointment at the stand of the administration.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to finish my statement; then I will yield.

So far as I am aware, neither today nor at other times have I spoken irrelevantly. I have tried to confine my speeches to the matters under consideration by the Senate.

I may say to the Senator from Texas that I canceled all my Illinois engagements for the month of June I am prepared to give all the strength I have to trying, in my small way, to expedite as much as possible the measures before the Senate.

But free discussion is the basis of democracy. I feel very strongly about the air subsidy, and I hope the Senator from Texas will not regard it in any sense as a reflection upon his leadership if I say that I think that subject should be gone into in detail, but, of course, I hope not at excessive length.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have made no personal reference to the speech of the Senator from Illinois; as a matter of fact, I did not hear the Senator's speech. However, I heard some speeches which had nothing to do with the Trade Agreements Act or the appropriation bill.

Some Senators came to me and said, "We would like to have some action on the bill. Can you prevail on Senators to withhold their speeches until action has been concluded on the bill?"

I prevailed on one Senator to withhold his speech, and he very graciously yielded to me so that action could be concluded on the conference report on the trade-agreements bill.

I know nothing about the nature of the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Illinois. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to cooperate with them and to urge the Senate to take as much time as they themselves think they need. But when they want to conserve their strength, and they have amendments pending, the situation becomes quite difficult, if some Senator comes to the floor with a 2-hour or a 3-hour speech pertaining to the Dust Bowl, for example, which has no relationship to the appropriation bill. Other Senators will then leave the floor; and when they have been called back to the floor, another Senator perhaps may begin speaking about another subject, also unrelated to the bill.

Progress with the pending bill has not been very unsatisfactory, but the Senate has 2 or 3 important measures which are now pressing, principally the Selective Service Act, which will expire soon. The bill providing for the extension of that act will have to go to conference after it has passed the Senate.

If there are only three amendments to be proposed to the pending appropriation bill, and the Senators who intend to offer the amendments will give some thought to the amount of time they wish to take, and will multiply by 2 the figure they arrive at, I think the authors of the amendments and the chairman of the subcommittee would be given protection from speeches which have no bearing on the bill or the amendments.

But it is not important. We can wait. Perhaps we are taking more time to discuss the question than should be taken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to take additional time to discuss methods of reducing the amount of time needed to discuss the amendments.

I have always believed that it might be well if, in some way, the Senate could adopt the procedure of the House, which the Senator from Texas graced for so many years, so as to confine speeches, while a bill was under consideration, to the bill itself, and to set aside the time after 5 o'clock for general speeches. I think that would be a very excellent procedure. Some modification of the rule of relevance might be made.

I am delighted to see that that is the direction in which the Senator from Texas is moving. I hope he will join many of us in seeing to it that the question of the discontinuance of the practice of prolonged discussions on subjects not related to measures under consideration will be speedily placed before the Senate by the Democratic leadership and pushed to successful completion. If that be done, I am certain it will gain the support of many Senators.

To return to the point under consideration, there are many things connected with air subsidies and I think also, as the Senator from Delaware will point out, in connection with ship subsidies, about which Congress and the public should know. It is not a waste of time to discuss them.

Nevertheless, we shall, I am certain, try to discuss them in good temper, and shall try not to be excessively redundant.

I hope the Senator from Texas, with his good nature, will prevail upon Senators who wish to speak on extraneous subjects to confine their remarks to a more opportune time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Illinois feels he should like to follow the House procedure, he can do so on tomorrow by specifying to how much time he desires. Then we will put the rule into effect so far as time is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would be desirable to have a combination of both the methods of the House and of the Senate. I do not approve of the rigid rules which have been adopted in the House with respect to restricting debate, but I do approve of the practice of the 5 o'clock hour, whereby speeches of a general nature are made after the business of the day has been consummated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have been appealing to Senators to do that today, but they, like the Senator from Illinois, do not want to be put in any straitjacket, and do not want any rigid rules applied to them. It is all right to have

rigid rules when they are applied to somebody else, but one becomes a little concerned when there is talk of applying such rules to him.

Notice has been given that the Senate will convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. So far as I am concerned, every Senator who has an amendment to offer should have an opportunity to talk on the amendment as long as he feels there is any value in what he is saying. Every Senator ought to have a chance to be recorded. The majority leader will do everything in his power to bring that about. I hope the Senate may be able to complete action on the bill tomorrow. The Senate will convene at 10 o'clock in the morning, and, if necessary, will remain in session until late in the evening.

After completion of the pending bill, consideration of the extension of the draft act is expected to follow. I expect to follow completion of action on that bill with action on the Austrian treaty. That will be followed by consideration of the Defense Department appropriation bill.

I want the RECORD to show, and I want Senators present to know, that it may be necessary to have Saturday sessions and night sessions from now until the end of the fiscal year, because I do not want the responsibility of holding up action on appropriation bills beyond the end of this fiscal year.

I shall do everything in my power, whether it is after 5 o'clock or at 2 or 3 o'clock in the afternoon, to see that Senators discuss the pending business. There is a morning hour each morning, during which time Senators may make brief statements. There has not been an evening during this session when, if a Senator so desired, he has been deprived of the opportunity of making a speech. We have had what the Senator from Illinois refers to as the 5 o'clock hour. The trouble is not many Senators are here at 5 o'clock to know we have one. The majority leader sits in the Senate for an hour, or 2 hours, or two and a half hours, and hears statements which should be made after the 5 o'clock hour. Some of them were made today in the middle of the consideration of the conference report on the reciprocal trade bill. He heard some of them made after the Senate proceeded to consider the Commerce Department appropriation bill. The Senator from Illinois did not hear them, so he thought I was talking about him. I make no personal references. All I am attempting to do is work out the procedure satisfactorily. I do not want to change the rules in order that that may be done; I merely want to have Senators give some thought to the question. Perhaps they will be willing to go along.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think we are making progress. We have proceeded to page 7. I understand there is one amendment——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield, I should like, for the sake of the RECORD, to point out that neither the Senator from Illinois nor the Senator from Delaware is offering amendments. What we are doing is opposing committee amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, what I was about to say, before the Senator from Illinois made his remarks, was that there was one amendment of the committee which will have to be discussed. If the clerk will proceed reading the amendments, I think we can make further progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 8, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "$10,200,000" and insert "$10,225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Business and Defense Services Administration," on page 8, line 24, to strike out "$6,198,000" and insert "$6,900,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, upon the request of the Senator from South Dakota, I ask that this amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection to that course being followed.

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

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign Commerce," on page 9, line 4, after the word "reports", to strike out "$1,800,000" and insert "$2,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,800,000"; and in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Business Economics," on page 9, line 18, after the word "Economics", to strike out "$975,000" and insert "$900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we have come to the subhead "Maritime Activities," near the bottom of page 9. I understand the Senator from Delaware wishes to be heard on this committee amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there are certain committee amendments in different sections of the bill which are going to be opposed. I should like to ask that the maritime activities section go over in its entirety until tomorrow, because the adoption or rejection of some of the amendments will affect the action to be taken on other amendments. I think we can make progress if we proceed with the amendments beginning on page 18 of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator that several of the committee amendments will stand or fall together, but it appears to me that beginning on page 12, at the bottom of that page, there are several minor amendments, from there to the end of that provision which have no direct relationship to others.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as the Senator from Delaware is concerned, that is correct, but I was not quite sure, from the information left with me, whether some question might be raised by other Senators as to those amendments. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to many of the items contained in that section of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator suggests it, suppose we pass over all that part of the bill which appears under the heading "Maritime Activities."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think we can make progress by doing so, and I say that without any prejudice to some of the amendments to which I have personally no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, that will carry us through page 17 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Public Roads," on page 19, line 11, after the word "expended", to strike out "$600,000,000" and insert "$680,000,000"; and in line 13, after the numerals "1954", to strike out "$248,500,000" and insert "$328,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 8, after the word "expended", to strike out "$18,500,000" and insert "$25,000,000, which sum is composed of $19,000,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955, and $6,000,000"; and at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 23, after "(66 Stat. 158", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "including purchase of five passenger motor vehicles, $25,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards," on page 23, line 8, after "(15 U. S. C. 286)", to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$7,450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 20, after the word "facilities", to insert "and construction of an electronic calibration center at a cost not to exceed $765,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau," on page 24, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$29,900,000" and insert "$32,000,000 of which $4,250,000 shall be available only for the improvement and operation of hurricane, severe storm, and tornado warning services in the United States, including research related thereto, and construction of necessary facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions—Department of Commerce," on page 25, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 104. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriations of the Department of Commerce available for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be thereby increased by more than 5 percent: *Provided*, That such transfers shall be in addition to any other transfers authorized by law, but no such transfer shall be used for

the creation of new functions within the Department: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 of such transfers shall be available for entertainment.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. I wish to take this opportunity to ask the Senator from Florida whether he is willing to accept an amendment on line 2, page 25 of the bill, which would strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000." It has been proposed and advocated by a number of Senators that such an amendment be made.

Mr. HOLLAND. The appropriation would be increased from $5 million to what figure?

Mr. GREEN. The amendment calls for an increase from $5 million to $10 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The Senator from Florida would not be in a position to accept that amendment at this time. We are considering committee amendments. That would be an amendment not under that head. I shall be glad to discuss the matter with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island between now and tomorrow morning.

Mr. GREEN. I thought I would bring the matter up at this time, since we had reached that point in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to be offered by the Senator from Rhode Island will go over for later action.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, all amendments which are not committee amendments will be considered tomorrow, and I expect to discuss the matter with my distinguished friend from Rhode Island between now and tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 25, after line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, have the committee amendments which constitute both sections 104 and 105 been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment constituting section 104 has been agreed to.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 105. Hereafter the position of Budget Officer of the Department shall be in GS-17 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have a request that that amendment also go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will go over until tomorrow, with the other amendments ordered to be passed over.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, that is not the committee amendment which constitutes a new section 104; is it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the committee amendment constituting a new section 105, on page 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; on page 26, beginning in line 3.

Mr. HOLLAND. And not the new section 104; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Delaware. That course is acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—The Panama Canal—Canal Zone Government," on page 27, line 2, after the word "transfusions", to strike out "$14,500,000" and insert "$14,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "six" and insert "eight."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Panama Canal Company," on page 27, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,589,000" and insert "$3,740,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions—The Panama Canal," on page 31, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 205. The Governor of the Canal Zone and the President of the Panama Canal Company, in computing allowances for the cost of travel on home leave for persons who elect at their expense to take other than the lowest first-class travel to the United States, shall take into account as the cost to the United States the actual cost, as computed by the General Accounting Office, of travel by United States owned and operated vessels rather than a reduced fare rate which is available for such employees when traveling on their own account.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 15, to insert:

SEC. 206. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law the officer of the Army now serving as Governor of the Canal Zone shall, effective July 1, 1955, be considered to hold the grade of major general for all purposes, without regard to any limitations on the number of officers in that grade, and while so serving shall receive the pay and allowances of an officer of that grade and his length of service, and when retired under any provision of law shall be advanced on the retired list to such grade and shall receive the retired or retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the basic pay which he would receive if serving on active duty in such grade.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have the same request in regard to that amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, Mr. President, without objection, that committee amendment will also be passed over until tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over until tomorrow, along with the other committee amendments so passed over.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Independent Agencies—Advisory Committee on Weather Control," on page 32, line 9, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$295,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, except for the ones which have been passed over until tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a further comment. As I understand, there are two committee amendments which certainly will require discussion tomorrow, namely, the one opposed by the Senator from Illinois, which is the amendment relative to airline subsidies payable by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and the amendment or series of amendments to be opposed by the Senator from Delaware regarding subsidies for merchant shipping. I believe there are three other reservations of sections on which the committee amendments will not be acted upon this evening. But with those exceptions, I understand that all the other committee amendments have been adopted. I wish to serve notice now that I shall strenuously object to any proposal to open up any of the committee amendments which already have been agreed to if in the morning any move of that sort is made.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators desire to address the Senate at this time, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

I wish to give notice to the Senate that Senate Joint Resolution 77, to modify the authorized project for Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir, Texas, and to provide for the local cash contribution for the water-supply feature of that reservoir, reported today from the Public Works Committee, may be taken up in between some of the major bills later in the week.

I also wish to remind Senators that the Senate may be in session late tomorrow evening, because we have the draft bill scheduled for consideration tomorrow, and it appears that we shall spend considerable time on the pending Department of Commerce appropriation bill. It is hoped that on tomorrow it will be possible for the Senate to complete action on the pending bill and also to complete action on the draft bill.

Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 16, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of June 14), 1955:

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

William J. Hallahan, of Maryland, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1959.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 509, and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended. All of-

ficers are subject to physical examination required by law:

Lieutenant colonel to colonel

AIR FORCE

Beckwith, James Orrin, 1316A.
Knox, Omar Ellsworth, 1420A.
Wells, Joseph Breece, 1453A.
Reid, William Mason, 1518A.
Rueter, Chris Henry William, 1536A.
Schmitt, Arthur William, Jr., 1573A.
Kiehle, Edward George, 1580A.
Smith, Sydney Thomas, 1626A.
Wynne, Prentiss, Davis, Jr., 1699A.
McKeever, Matthew James, Jr., 1710A.
Webb, Byron Benjiman, 1716A.
Brannon, Dale Donald, 1718A.
Seim, Howard Bayzand, Jr., 1724A.
Overing, Glendon Philip, 1739A.
Slayden, Van Hatton, 1769A.
Sluder, Chester Lee, 1780A.
French, Donald James, 1781A.
Bleyer, Julian Marian, 1782A.
Kime, Duane Louis, 1787A.
Mason, Robert Julian, 1798A.
Kellond, Arthur William, 1832A.
Taylor, Broadus Beene, 1833A.
Endress, Albert Vandenburgh, 1843A.
Barksdale, William Sydnor, Jr., 1844A.
Bailey, J. C., 1862A.
Greenfield, William Dumont, 1899A.
Vaughn, Harley Camden, 1915A.
Dittman, Henry, 1922A.
Loberg, Edwin Andrew, 1923A.
Mace, Wallace Packard, 1929A.
Witty, Robert William, 1932A.
Frontczak, Arthur Theodore, 2017A.
Harper, Bryan Brand, 2036A.
Boyd, William Ellsworth, 2050A.
Graves, Frank Norton, 2064A.
O'Keefe, Keefe, 2087A.
Todd, Harold Elworthy, 2096A.
Hawley, Ray Matthew, 2105A.
Larson, Carl Henry 19669A.
Sweeney, Henry Morrow, 2210A.
Estes, Murl, 2213A.
Dreier, Wendell Carl, 2226A.
Gibson, William Louis, 2359A.
Lange, Harry Alfred, 2390A.
Churchill, Randolph Emerson, 2496A.
Kerbel, Walter, 2507A.
Gallagher, Robert Emmett, 2575A.
Nay, Paul Franklin, 2584A.
de Tolly, Nicholas Semigradov, 2623A.
Hedleston, Robert Webb, 2625A.
Wickland, Daniel William, 2628A.
Long, Lewis Rex, 2638A.
Wolters, Delevan Edward, 2652A.
Sullivan, Harold Joseph, 2764A.
Hope, John Warren, 2778A.
King, Herbert Thompson, 2855A.
Olson, Harry Armand, 2858A.
Hotmann, William August, 2863A.
Hreha, Joseph Albert, 2865A.
Parrot, Kent Kane, Jr., 2930A.
Holland, Thomas Elbridge, 2933A.
Caples, James Stephen, 2943A.
Krieger, George Hubert, 2953A.
Lindstrand, Carl Barber, 2962A.
Woodward, Lester Lee, 2964A.
Waddell, James Marion, 2973A.
Humphreys, Lloyd Ronald, 2989A.
McKnight, David Thomas, 2998A.
Fischer, Milton, 3002A.
Hahn, Clarence William, 3003A.
Leonhard, William Edward, 18095A.
Trotter, John Turner, 3012A.
Smith, William, Hightower, 3013A.
Sladek, Robert Frederick, Sr., 3014A.
Bechtel, Howard John, 3015A.
Houghton, Edwin Gordon, 3031A.
Lay, Dent Leroy, 5264A.
Holdiman, Thomas Alexander, 3049A.
Blaha, Elmer Carl, 3051A.
Rizon, Robert Lewis, 3074A.
Rowden, Burton Houston, 3076A.
Peck, Ben Jackson, 2844A.
Impson, Ivan Hurst, 3077A.
Bell, Leon Edwin, Jr., 3091A.
Gillis, Charles Francis, 3097A.
Robinson, Raymond Edward, 3106A.
Lee, James Lyle, 3112A.
Pinson, Ernest Alexander, 3117A.
Loomis, Oliver DeMond, 3118A.
Seeley, John Milton, 3132A.
Neuendorf, Charles William, 3139A.
Carson, Charles Edgar, 3140A.
O'Connell, James Francis Xavier, 3142A.
Johnson, James McLean, 3160A.
Jackson, Jerome William, 3168A.
Dishuck, John Joseph, 3189A.
Hylton, John Thomas, Jr., 3203A.
Morgan, Chester Harvey, 3210A.
Reed, Elliott Hartley, 3224A.
Hampton, Thomas Kerns, 3228A.
Hight, Fred Thomson, 3233A.
Donley, John Bland, 3241A.
Gauss, William Henry, 3243A.
Drysdale, Taylor, 3276A.
Richard, Septime Severous, Jr., 3312A.
Johnston, Ronald Alexander, 3315A.
McConnell, Landon Edward, 3316A.
Bonawitz, Norval C., 3320A.
Belville, Robert Edward, 3323A.
Peterson, David Allen, 3325A.
Hosken, Robert Thomas, 3330A.
Braddock, Joel Quinn, 3331A.
Thackara, Paul Nelson, 3332A.
Edmonds, Melvin Thornton, 3339A.
Lindgren, Richard Wendell, 3343A.
Christensen, John Albert, 3347A.
Murray, John Edward, 3351A.
Long, Charles James, 3d, 3354A.
Foerster, Frederick Henry, Jr., 3355A.
Maxwell, Ernest Beverly, 3356A.
Hall, Leonard Roger, 3364A.
Knierim, Charles Frederick, 3378A.
Felton, George Boyd, 3380A.
McCrery, Robert Riley, 3381A.
Andersen, Milo Peter, 3386A.
Forsyth, Allen Peter, 3393A.
Proctor, John Peebles, 3405A.
Smith, Weldon Halliwell, 3407A.
Lawrence, Reesor Mott, 3408A.
McNeal, Thomas Carl, 3410A.
Fletcher, Thomas, Jr., 3414A.
Casey, Edward Richard, 3415A.
Walker, Arthur James, 3421A.
Clark, William Coombs, 3422A.
Terhune, Charles Houston, Jr., 3424A.
Bridges, John DeGraff, 3425A.
Healy, John Patrick, 3429A.
Dechaene, Andre Jacques, 3442A.
Sharp, Frank Douglas, 3444A.
Gurnett, Thomas Edward, 3446A.
Beightol, Willis Eugene, 3448A.
Meng, Lewis Bruno, 3449A.
Longino, Houston Walker, Jr., 3452A.
Bane, Edwin Ronald, 3454A.
Clausen, Leslie Conway, 3459A.
Barrere, Robert Andrew, 3460A.
McCants, Leland Stanford, Jr., 3473A.
Cox, Albert Lyman, Jr., 3475A.
Andrews, Charles Comer, 3476A.
Wood, Harold Lee, 3479A.

MEDICAL

Myers, Harold Allen, 19098A.
Ferris, Donald Lockhart, 19110A.
White, Claude Benjamin, 19632A.
McCarroll, William Harroll, 19111A.

DENTAL

Gillinger, Clarence Wayne, 18825A.

VETERINARY

Robinson, Charles Edwin, 18980A.
Miller, Robert Ransome, 18981A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Crow, Allen Randolph, 19398A.
Zagelow, Leonard Paul, 19579A.

CHAPLAIN

Taylor, Robert Preston, 18737A.

First lieutenant to captain

AIR FORCE

Ray, Colonel Scudder, Jr., 26755A.

DENTAL

Adkisson, Sam Robert, 26749A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers under the provisions of section 415 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned duties of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 415 in ranks as follows:

Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, United States Marine Corps, as lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Alfred H. Noble, United States Marine Corps, as lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Christian F. Schilt, United States Marine Corps, as lieutenant general.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

I. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be medical directors

Ladislaus J. Zbranek
John B. Hozier
E. Ross Jenny
Thomas R. Dawber
Theodore F. Hilbish
Raymond F. Kaiser
James V. Lowry
Michael L. Furcolow
Robert T. Hewitt
Aaron W. Christenson
Francis T. Zinn
Weldon A. Williamson
Karl Habel
Murray A. Diamond
Robert D. Wright
Harald M. Graning

To be dental director

Gordon G. Braendle

To be dental surgeon

Frank W. Nelson

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

John C. Greene
Warren E. Maley
James R. Lambrecht

To be sanitary engineer director

Hugh R. McCall

To be senior sanitary engineer

Lawrence B. Hall

To be sanitary engineer

Jack H. Fooks

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Ralph K. Longaker
David H. Howells
Robert L. Harris, Jr.
Eugene T. Jensen
Frederick A. Flohrschutz, Jr.
Harold W. Wolf
Edward R. Williams
Francis M. Crompton

To be senior pharmacists

Roberts L. Proper
Arnold H. Dodge

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Carl H. Brown
George J. Gruber

To be scientist director

Martin D. Young

To be senior assistant scientist

Earl S. Schaefer

To be senior sanitarians

Ralph L. Perkins, Jr.
Evelyn Rahm

To be sanitarian

George R. Hayes

To be senior nurse officers

Harriet G. Dexheimer
Clarice M. Russell
Josephine I. O'Connor
Anna M. Matter
Genevieve S. Jones
Lola M. Hanson

To be nurse officers

Marie D. Grant
Vivian L. Gibson
Mildred K. McDermott
Mary N. Bouser
C. Vistula Lancaster
Helen L. Roberts

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Florence A. Canada

To be assistant nurse officer

Frances R. Donoghue

To be dietitian

Anette L. Buza

To be nurse officer

(This name is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in spelling in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on January 10, 1955, and confirmed by the Senate on January 27, 1955.)

Marie F. Hanzel

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of June 14), 1955:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

John B. Hollister, of Ohio, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Donald Ross, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Kenneth P. Grubb, of Wisconsin, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward G. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Donald D. Kennedy, of Oregon.
Hayden Raynor, of the District of Columbia.

Robert G. Miner, of Maryland, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 3 to class 2.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida.
George M. Czayo, of Illinois.
Edwin G. Moline, of Maryland.
Cromwell A. Riches, of Oregon.
Alexander M. Rosenson, of the District of Columbia.
Howard H. Russell, of North Dakota.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Howard W. Brown, of Missouri.
Eldon J. Cassoday, of New York.
Howard J. Hilton, Jr., of Washington.
Arthur G. Lund, of Utah.
Idar Rimestad, of North Dakota.
Robert O. Waring, of New York.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Hampton Davis, of Virginia.
Warren G. Dougherty, of Illinois.
Roger W. Grant, Jr., of Virginia.
Clarence J. McIntosh, of Florida.
Ray Sena, Jr., of New Mexico.
Ralph C. Talcott, of California.
Thomas A. Cassilly, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

John R. Bartelt, Jr., of Massachusetts, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

David B. Bolen, of Colorado.
John P. Call, of California.
Miss Marjorie L. Cheatham, of Washington.
Weikko A. Forsten, of Washington.
George R. Irminger, of Missouri.
Wesley E. Jorgensen, of Washington.
Robert A. Lewis, of New York.
Miss Martha J. Moses, of Texas.
Howard L. Walker, Jr., of California.

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

James B. Brown, of California.
C. Jefferson Frederick, of Washington.
William B. Grant, of Massachusetts.
Donald E. Herdeck, of Pennsylvania.
Herbert S. Malin, of Connecticut.
Virgil P. Randolph III, of Virginia.
Owen W. Roberts, of New Jersey.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

William C. Gantt, Titus.

COLORADO

Hannah Esther Fairchild, Peetz.

DELAWARE

Henry V. Tobin, Sr., Kings College.

FLORIDA

Clyde P. Stickney, Key West.

ILLINOIS

Chester B. Stanton, Dawson.
Alfred St. Aubin, Harvey.
Herbert S. Biller, Illiopolis.
William G. Needham, Maple Park.
Earl S. Wagher, Oneida.
Jerome P. Arkels, Tonica.
Emery H. Doden, Toulon.

INDIANA

Helen L. Ort, New Haven.

KANSAS

Julian S. Forrer, Ulysses.

LOUISIANA

Erma E. Poland, Bienville.

MAINE

Edward A. Ludwig, Washington.

MICHIGAN

Ralph H. Derickson, Manitou Beach.

MINNESOTA

Clifford W. Mattson, Gully.

MONTANA

Adolph Freier, Box Elder.
Delbert Trulson, Kremlin.

NORTH CAROLINA

John F. Drake, Holly Springs.
William B. Early, Old Fort.
Thomas F. Littlejohn, Ruffin.

SOUTH CAROLINA

James M. Ritter, Cope.
Charles C. Withington, Greenville.
William F. Lanier, La France.
William R. Shealy, Little Mountain.
Harry E. Moose, Newberry.
John J. Wise, Rock Hill.

WISCONSIN

Richard J. LeJeune, Solon Springs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1955

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Roger G. Imhoff, pastor, Fenner Memorial Lutheran Church, Louisville, Ky., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth. We know that the whole earth is Thine, the fullness thereof, and all the people who dwell therein. We thank Thee that we are numbered among Thy free people. We pray for Thy blessing upon Thy servants gathered here in Congress today, that we may constantly listen for words of guidance from Thee.

Thou knowest, O Lord God, our downsitting and our uprising. Give us true and clear thinking in our downsitting that we have a sense of profound mission in our uprisings.

Give us wisdom, Lord, that in our deliberations we may rightly divide words of truth. Yea, Lord, withal, give us understanding that, being alert to needs of our people, our decisions be worthy of Thy way, and according to Thy will. In serving our people, Lord, never let us be guilty of subversive inactivity.

According to Thy great goodness and tender mercies, see to it that what we poor sinners do will redound to the glory of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, the first and greatest speaker in the house of humanity.

Let the daylight of Christian fellowship shine all day in our hearts.

In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Alberto Cortez Cortez;

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of Kyung Ho Park (Syung Sil Park) and his wife, Mrs. Young Sil Lee;

H. R. 1002. An act for the relief of L. S. Goedeke;

H. R. 1401. An act for the relief of Ewing Choat;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Rosa Maria Phillips;

H. R. 1656. An act for the relief of Chen Chih-Keui;

H. R. 1974. An act for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alice Rose Spittler;

H. R. 3020. An act for the relief of Buonaventura Giannone;

H. R. 4359. An act to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 4659. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c);

H. R. 5146. An act to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade; and

H. R. 5398. An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is