Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

# SENATE

## TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1956

*(Legislative day of Monday, May 7, 1956)*

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:

Almighty God, with whom there is no shadow that is caused by turning, whose throne standest steadfast and sure: Into Thy hands of love we commit ourselves and our troubled world. In this great day of challenge and opportunity Thou hast set us tasks which test all our courage and fidelity. May we be strong to do the things which need to be done and to put aside the things which are unworthy or belittling or base. Grant us the steadfastness to follow in faith and confidence Thy ways of love and truth until our lives become Thy revelation and Thy spirit touches into the beauty of holiness our thoughts and deeds.

As those into whose fallible hands have been placed the crying needs of stricken humanity, may the thoughts of our minds and the sympathies of our hearts, the words of our lips, and the decisions of our deliberations, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 21, 1956, was dispensed with.

### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 18, 1956,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, reported it favorably, with amendments, on May 21, 1956, and submitted a report (No. 2034) thereon.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes;

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

S. 1790. An act to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels;

S. 1791. An act to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats;

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose;

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba;

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended;

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act;

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 3524. An act to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders; and

S. 2822. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of Nihat Cengiz; and

S. 1244. An act for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) amending Senate Concurrent Resolution 67, favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

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

H. R. 3350. An act to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which acquired;

H. R. 3351. An act to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which asquired;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 4031. An act to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of governments thereof, and their dependents, as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes;

H. R. 4137. An act for the relief of Mitsuko A. Hachita;

H. R. 4456. An act for the relief of Cpl. Oscar H. Mash, Jr.;

H. R. 5591. An act for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 6029. An act for the relief of Robert D. Grier (individually, and as executor of the estate of Katie C. Grier) and Jane Grier Hawthorne;

H. R. 6742. An act for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick;

H. R. 7896. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville;

H. R. 8008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper;

H. R. 8102. An act to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8110. An act to incorporate the National Music Council;

H. R. 8643. An act for the relief of the Knox Corporation of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended;

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports;

H. R. 9085. An act to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to members of the civilian faculties of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 9371. An act for the relief of John R. Henry;

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 9956. An act to amend subdivision e of section 58, Notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 10108. An act to amend section 314 and section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 10230. An act to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States;

H. R. 10368. An act to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports and other communications of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10417. An act to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States;

H. H. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11205. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak.;

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens;

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to each surviving veteran of the War Between the States;

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 611. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall; and

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.

## HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 3350. An act to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which acquired; and

H. R. 3351. An act to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which acquired; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 9085. An act to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to members of the civilian faculties of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; and

H. R. 10368. An act to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports and other communications of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4031. An act to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of the governments thereof, and their dependents, as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes;

H. R. 4137. An act for the relief of Mitsuko A. Hachita;

H. R. 4456. An act for the relief of Cpl. Oscar H. Mash, Jr.

H. R. 5591. An act for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 6029. An act for the relief of Robert D. Grier (individually, and as executor of the estate of Katie C. Grier) and Jane Grier Hawthorne;

H. R. 6742. An act for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick;

H. R. 8110. An act to incorporate the National Music Council;

H. R. 8643. An act for the relief of the Knox Corporation of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 9371. An act for the relief of John R. Henry;

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 9956. An act to amend subdivision e of section 58, Notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 11205. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak.;

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; and

H. J. Res. 611. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7896. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville; and

H. R. 10417. An act to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 8102. An act to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports;

H. R. 10230. An act to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States;

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to each surviving veteran of the War Between the States; and

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 10108. An act to amend section 314 and section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 8008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges; placed on the calendar.

## ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

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

## CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Knowland | Schoeppel |
| Bush | Laird | Scott |
| Carlson | Lehman | Smathers |
| Dirksen | McClellan | Wiley |
| Fulbright | Murray | Williams |
| Goldwater | Payne | Young |
| Johnston, S. C. | Russell | |

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. WOFFORD entered the Chamber and answered to their name.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED DONATION BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF CERTAIN BOATS TO UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER LIFE SAVING CORPS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the United States Volunteer Life Saving Corps has requested the Navy Department to transfer certain boats for use in rescue work and training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, to establish in the Department of Defense an Office of Under Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the first quarter, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TARIFF COMMISSION TO SUBMIT REPORT ON CUSTOMS LAWS

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 101 (c) of Public Law 768, Eighty-third Congress, so as to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

CHARGE FOR SPECIAL SERVICES TO PURCHASERS OF TIMBER FROM INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## RESOLUTIONS OF WOODROW WILSON POST, NO. 1491, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two recent resolutions adopted by the Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Minneapolis, Minn., be printed at this point in my remarks, and appropriately referred.

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

To the Committee on Finance:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
WOODROW WILSON POST, NO. 1491, INC.,
*Minneapolis, Minn., May 17, 1956.*

ADJUTANT, DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS.

DEAR COMRADE: At the regular meeting of the Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, held May 1, the following resolution was presented and passed:

"Whereas the Commission on Veterans' Benefits (Bradley Commission) has recommended veterans' pensions be minimized and gradually eliminated by tying them in with social-security payments; and

"Whereas the pension recommendation, if adopted, would fundamentally reduce and/or eliminate many of the veterans' benefits now being granted, including disability compensation, widow's pension, GI insurance, survivors' benefits, and readjustment payments; and

"Whereas these recommendations are merely another method of amputation of veterans' rights, and will, if adopted, eliminate any veterans' rights whatsoever in the future: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That we, the members of Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, do hereby go on record opposing this diabolical Bradley report as wholly unjustifiable, unfair, and discriminatory toward all veterans, and respectfully urge all-out efforts toward the defeat of this Commission's report and to prevent any legislation toward these ends; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the following: Senators THYE and HUMPHREY; Congressmen WIER and JUDD; Seventh District, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Department of Minnesota, Veterans of Foreign Wars."

Yours in comradeship,
DONALD D. KAMMER,
*Adjutant.*

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
WOODROW WILSON POST, NO. 1491,
*Minneapolis, Minn., May 17, 1956.*

ADJUTANT, DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS.

DEAR COMRADE: At a regular meeting of the Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, held May 15, 1956, the following resolution was presented and passed:

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration is scheduled to close the veterans' hospital annex at Fort Snelling; and

"Whereas closing the annex will create an acute shortage of much needed facilities, thereby denying many veterans entitled to, and in need of hospitalization, the hospitalization they should have;

"Whereas the closing of the annex is just another step toward freezing out the rights of the veteran; and

"Whereas the need for retaining the use of the hospital annex at Fort Snelling is urgent: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we, the members of Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, do hereby go on record favoring, and do urge that action be taken immediately to keep this annex open; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the following: Senators HUMPHREY and THYE; Congressmen JUDD and WIER; Seventh District, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Department of Minnesota, Veterans of Foreign Wars."

Yours in comradeship,
DONALD D. KAMMER, *Adjutant.*

## REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American Warehousemen's Association, at its 65th annual convention at Los Angeles, relating to a reduction of Federal expenditures.

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

Whereas the Federal Government has continued on a course established several decades ago of tremendous deficit spending and high taxes to support evergrowing governmental bureaucracy; and

Whereas such spending and taxing will ultimately result in destruction of America's free enterprise economic system and democratic political structure: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That our industry again warns the Nation of this great danger and prays Congress to make every effort to reduce Federal expenditures while at the same time lowering taxes on individual citizens and business enterprise.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 3255. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2035).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1893. A bill for the relief of Harold D. Robison (Rept. No. 2036).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 8225. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota (Rept. No. 2037).

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Russell A. Stuart, of Virginia, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, vice Frank L. Roberts, resigned.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3904. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Quigley; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3905. A bill for the relief of Mr. Polychronis Paschalidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3906. A bill to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, by transferring certain property to the Republic of Panama, adjusting the fiscal obligations of the Panama Canal Company, and by other provisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 3907. A bill to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3908. A bill for the relief of Peter Jocher Webb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 117, ENTITLED "A HANDBOOK FOR AMERICANS"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary 75,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 117, A Handbook for Americans.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF TREATY AND AGREEMENT WITH REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Bureau of the Budget I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, by transferring certain property to the Republic of Panama, adjusting the fiscal obligations of the Panama Canal Company, and by other provisions.

The Bureau of the Budget also has recommended the enactment of additional legislation to implement the treaty and agreement by amending the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Inasmuch as that is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I understand the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] will introduce the bill relating to the Classification Act of 1949.

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

The bill (S. 3906) to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, by transferring certain property to the Republic of Panama, adjusting the fiscal obligations of the Panama Canal Company, and by other provisions, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## PROVISION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PAYNE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3855) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3855, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3855, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## INVESTIGATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS BY TARIFF COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on April 11, 1956, I submitted Senate Resolution 236, to direct the United States Tariff Commission to make an immediate escape-clause investigation of textile imports. Subsequent to the submission of this resolution, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] indicated his desire to cosponsor it.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] be included as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 236, the next time the resolution is reprinted.

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

## 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. BUTLER:

Maritime Day address delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL before Propeller Club of Baltimore, Md., on May 22, 1956.

## TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN FAIRS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, summertime is county fair time, and throughout all America, preparations are being made for local and State fairs.

It may not generally be appreciated how important a role—particularly in cities—the fair plays in American life.

In my own State, America's Dairyland, the fair is a particularly honored and valued occasion, in both rural and urban areas.

During these coming months, it is my personal intention to visit as many Wisconsin county fairs as possible, and of course to take in our State fair, as well.

I have prepared a statement on the subject of the importance of fairs, and I am pleased to ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Throughout the 71 counties of Wisconsin, local fairgrounds are now being spruced up for the grand openings.

Newly appointed fair officials and supervisors are knee-deep in planning and coordination of the thousands of submitted entries. Before we know it, Wisconsin county fairs and the State fair will be drawing Wisconsinites from far and wide. Town and countrymen alike will be out to see quality crops, dairy produce, livestock, and the tops in farm equipment and machinery.

Tourists will be pouring in to enjoy the festivities. Merchants will have their best wares on display, and women's and youngsters' groups will be proudly busy.

The county fair has long taken its place as a cherished institution in this country, every bit American as the visiting circus, or as football or baseball. This annual exhibition of the year's best hybrid corn, prize steer, and mother's choicest strawberry preserves, is looked forward to by rural folks all over the Nation. And, while the fair is primarily for the benefit of our farm population, the urban dweller can be equally excited over the prospect of seeing "the biggest and best" of his State's products, the colorful displays, and entertainment events.

1954'S $792 MILLION OF BADGER FARM INCOME

The local fair does more to portray the agricultural accomplishments of a State than perhaps any other means. The great productive capacity of Wisconsin has certainly been proved through displays, demonstrations, and exhibits—all positive evidence of the skill, spirit, and ingenuity of our Wisconsin people. The quantity and quality of products presented before the public view, have always served to inspire confidence in our continuing prosperity and economic progress. In 1954, the value of Wisconsin farm products surpassed three-fourths of a billion dollars from our 168,000 farms—certainly an enormous achievement.

Reflecting that achievement we have come a long way from the old English country fair or its 19th century counterpart—a time when "a journey to the fair" meant days of travel for the whole family and months of preliminary planning. Then, only the local agricultural products were up for inspec-

tion and appraisal. Today, the modern fair calls for participation of the merchants and tradesmen from a broad surrounding area in furnishing exhibits. For example, what better market could we have for our Badger craft and wood-working industries?

Yet, the essential spirit of the fair will forever remain the same—an annual event sparked with fun, frolic, learning, and good healthy living.

And participation still means a year's worth of time and effort in the required grooming and care of prospective prize-winning entries.

DEVELOPMENT OF FAIR IN WISCONSIN

Wisconsin with its marvelous agricultural resources and thriving dairy industry naturally gave early attention to the development and improvement of "that what it produces best." This was first done through the early county agricultural society, designed to step-up farm methods in line with newer trends; to improve the quality of crops and dairy produce; and to inform other States of our agricultural potential.

The "fair" as we know it today was thus a creation of the county society. And the friendly competition among these local societies inevitably led to vying between counties for honors in area produce. Consequently, each succeeding county fair would try to top the preceding event in exhibits, quantity and quality of items displayed, as well as in innovations. Each spurred the other on with additional improvements and new contributions in the public interest.

I doubt if there are many other events which offer so much to our material and spiritual wealth, as the fair. We see prosperous grains in the cross-the-counter sales made between display owner and buyer—when the latest certified seed potato of Langlade or Portage counties finds a profitable market; when a further refinement of U. S. grade A Cheddar cheese brings in more dollars to the Marathon County Cheese Factory.

THE INTANGIBLE VALUES

At the same time, we see the more immeasurable contributions to good living, in the enjoyment of the truly good and simple things of life: the glowing pride of a 4-H clubber showing off his prize calf; the excitement of a child's first ferris wheel ride; or warm fellowship among farmers, engrossed over the latest time-saving addition to the milking machine.

These are the basic qualities which add up to make America what it is today. Individual initiative, pride in one's hard-earned efforts, healthy competition and sportsmanship, a zeal for learning—all these characteristics come out during fair-time and are part and parcel of our democratic society.

FARM INCOME HAS DECLINED UNFORTUNATELY

Economically, of course, the county fair has marked the steady agricultural development of Wisconsin. And it is the most concise indication of our State's progress in this field. Now, when farm income has dropped unfortunately and when the farmer is caught in a serious cost-price squeeze, the fair is particularly important.

The fair itself has served to foster concrete advances in dairying, production of our cash crops, and improved livestock breeding. How could we have refined the flavor, texture, and color specifications of our famous Wisconsin cheeses without constant research and experimentation?

Of course, many things accelerated development of the Nation's finest cheeses and the many types of milk manufacturing from processing to condensing. After all, as America's dairyland, Wisconsin had to take the lead in developing top-quality standards. Nonetheless, we needed central seedbeds for ideas, which the fair has certainly given us.

What better place to stimulate advances in scientific farming, to show the latest improvements in farm machinery, or introduce better cultural and breeding fundamentals?

BLUE RIBBONS SPUR ADVANCES

Nor could we find a greater incentive to farmers in forging ahead in their industry. Demonstrations of new ways of doing things, display of the new hybrid corn or giant potato or tastier peas or cabbage or cherries, and showing of purebred livestock, serve to inspire the farmer and dairyman. And the blue ribbon element is a special boost to improvement and innovation. Fair prizes and rewards for the best in produce, livestock, foods, clothing, and the hundreds of other category entries, accelerate lively competition among county farmers. Such contributions to farm prosperity are what make agricultural progress tick, and recognition for these deeds is an important incentive factor.

Also, the grand exhibition of goods provided by the fair is a valuable advertisement for Wisconsin. It brings out visitors and buyers interested in the latest of local wares. Certain counties have earned the reputation of topnotch displays and exhibition standards which may furnish a special market for the farmer. Counties compete for top-grade entries in hopes of finding new outlets for marketing of their district produce.

Thus, one of the best ways of increasing the use and consumption of dairy products is through the fair. The 4-H Club milk sales, cheese parties, milking contests, and all the milk you can drink for 10 cents booths are typical of what fairgoers can take part in so as to cut the dairy surplus.

The county fair could be termed a sort of educational symposium. This is obvious from the practical instruction available for better crops and livestock. The simple learning of a few new methods can literally change the volume and character of the farmer's yearly output. He might never have discovered these improvements, nor been able to realize so fair a profit had it not been for his attendance at the fair. Moreover, there is no greater impetus to modernizing methods than to see the actual results of what can be done and what is possible in improved farming. There is, in fact, scheduled as part of most fairs a kind of daily farmers' institute, usually in session every morning throughout the event. Here the farmer can get the details of what he has seen among the entries, and obtain more information on the displays which interest him the most.

WOMEN'S ACHIEVEMENTS

No less important are the fair accomplishments rendered by our womenfolk. The novel recipe and tangy new preserves are not only important to the ladies, but are major morale builders to the "men of the house." Production goals are nothing without the energy food value of that prize apple cobbler and fruit preserves during the long, cold winter months. Farm and town housewives eagerly compete for honors from the food line to home-made clothing, handicraft accomplishments, and flower arrangements. They themselves will be introduced to new household products to ease their burdens.

YOUNGSTER'S CONTRIBUTIONS

The fair is a site of the young and old alike. Especially important is its role as a meeting place for members of such leading organizations as the Junior Fair, Future Farmers, and 4-H Club. Their own active participation in the exhibits and entries prepares them for outstanding leadership in their farm communities. New methods acquired in farming, conservation, and home-making give the young man or woman a fuller understanding of the many problems faced in the fields, in farm kitchens, and rural meeting place.

I have long been closely acquainted with the project achievements of our Wisconsin 4-H Clubbers and know the high quality entries which they submit. The young lady who is a 4-H member adds to the comfort and happiness of her family through her demonstrated skills in meal planning and sewing, as does the boy versed in the care and management of farm machinery or familiar with modern methods of crop raising. All of these talents are basic services which meet home, farm, and community needs, and make for increased standards of living.

WHOLESOME FUN

A point not to be overlooked is that the fair provides entertainment and fun besides its tremendous educational value. Picnic lunches, games and contests, sociability with old friends, all afford need relaxation for both fair goers and the participants themselves. In this era of constant hustle and bustle, it is a rare and wonderful thing to have an opportunity to enjoy the companionship and reunion with true friends. The county fair gives us a meeting place for acquaintances and neighbors to get together, talk over mutual interests, find out the latest news about people of the county, the farm situation, national and world affairs. It represents the freest exchange of thought and assembly.

It is typical of the spirit of mutual help and cooperation which has always characterized civic and community spirit. It is a prime example of individuals getting together for their common interests and common good. The county fair is Democracy in action.

## ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY GOVERNMENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the frustrations of redtape have long been among the most depressing and confusing characteristics of the Federal Government. The Second Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the Hoover Commission, recognized this problem of modern government and recommended that the President, with the assistance of the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration, "give increased emphasis in their reports program to the need to protect the public from unnecessary reporting burdens."

Through the elimination of confusing, duplicating, and unnecessary reporting, the Commission estimated that sums amounting to millions of dollars could be saved for both private persons and the Government.

I was pleased to see that the President just recently sent a letter to Mr. Percival F. Brundage, the Budget Director, stating his endorsement of the Hoover Commission's recommendation and authorizing and directing the Bureau of the Budget to earnestly pursue its implementation.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by the White House, including a copy of the President's letter to Mr. Brundage, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

The President, in a letter to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has called for a stepped-up campaign to eliminate Government reporting requirements which impose unnecessary paperwork on the public and industry.

The President's letter endorsed a Hoover Commission recommendation that "increased

emphasis" be given to protecting the public from excessive reporting burdens. The President also expressed gratification at "substantial progress already made" in this area by the Budget Bureau and its Advisory Council on Federal Reports.

The Budget Bureau has made a vigorous effort to cut the paperwork required in the Government's official business with the public, in keeping with instructions issued by President Eisenhower at the outset of his administration. This is in line with the Bureau's broad responsibility for coordination and improvement of Government statistics and for promotion of better business management throughout the executive branch. The Federal Reports Act of 1942 gave the Bureau the specific function of reviewing and approving the public-use forms of all Federal executive agencies excepting the Internal Revenue Service, the Comptroller of the Currency, Bureau of Public Debt, Bureau of Accounts and Division of Foreign Funds Control in the Treasury Department, and bank supervisory agencies.

In carrying out its responsibilities under the Federal Reports Act, the Bureau of the Budget has the help of the Advisory Council on Federal Reports, composed of representatives of seven national business organizations. The Advisory Council applies its collective experience through specialized committees in recommending the elimination or consolidation of reports, changing the frequency of reporting, eliminating ambiguities in questions, and otherwise simplifying and standardizing requirements. Sponsors of the Council since 1943 are: American Chamber of Commerce Executives, American Retail Federation, American Trade Association Executives, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Controllers Institute of America, National Association of Manufacturers, National Industrial Council.

Typical improvements during the past 2 years in the Government's reporting and record-keeping procedures which have brought substantial savings in time and money to the public generally and cut clerical costs, filing requirements and warehouse needs of Government follow:

(1) As part of an examination still underway all of the public-use forms promulgated by the State offices of the Selective Service System have been reviewed. In this project some 60 different forms used to determine dependency status were consolidated into a single form; forms used by physicians to report on medical conditions, and those used by employers to report on occupational deferments were greatly simplified.

(2) Small-business establishments were particularly benefited when final plans were made for the last Census of Business. More than 1 million small-shop keepers, those having no paid employees, were relieved from having to file a report to the Bureau of the Census. As a substitute, arrangements were made for the transcription of the required information by the Internal Revenue Service to the Census Bureau.

(3) Cooperative arrangements have been made between Federal agencies and trade associations for the use of identical forms, as in the case of the Rubber Manufacturers Association; or for the use by the Government of trade association statistics, as in the case of Bureau of Mines' requirements for data on aluminum.

(4) Passport application forms and procedures have been revised and simplified by the Passport Division of the State Department; report forms used by regulatory agencies, such as Federal Power Commission, Federal Communications Commission, and Civil Aeronautics Board, have been simplified and revised.

(5) Substantial savings to industry resulted from revisions in the forms used by the Department of Defense in its industrial-security program. One industrial company estimated that the savings to it alone were approximately $75,000. Many other forms used by the Department of Defense and its services, particularly those used in connection with procurement, have also undergone material revision.

The President's letter to the Budget Director follows:

"DEAR MR. BRUNDAGE: The recent report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government entitled 'Paperwork Management, Part II, the Nation's Paperwork for the Government' directs attention to the problem of Government requirements which impose unnecessary paperwork on the public. The report recommends: 'That the President direct the Bureau of the Budget, together with its Advisory Council on Federal Reports and in cooperation with the General Services Administration, to give increased emphasis in their reports program to the need to protect the public from unnecessary reporting burdens by continuing the method of cooperation between industry and government pursued by our task force as outlined above.'

"I endorse the Commission's recommendation that increased emphasis be placed on actions to reduce unnecessary reporting burdens on industry and the public. In recognition of the responsibilities for the improvement of Government statistical activities and for the promotion of economy and efficiency in executive branch operations already assigned to the Bureau of the Budget, I believe the Bureau is the logical agency to assume leadership in such activities. A significant portion of the paperwork required of the public is associated with Government forms and related reporting requirements which require your approval under the Federal Reports Act, and I am gratified as the substantial progress already made in this program by the Bureau and its Advisory Council on Federal Reports.

"I wish you to give increased emphasis in this program to the elimination of reporting requirements which impose unnecessary paperwork on the public. With respect to matters not subject to review under the Federal Reports Act, I want you to proceed with the development, in cooperation with the affected executive agencies, of plans for eliminating unnecessary public reporting requirements and for simplifying related procedures and systems in such agencies.

"In carrying out this program I assume that you will make maximum use of the advisory services of the Advisory Council on Federal Reports and its various specialized committees. You will also wish to consult freely with the affected Federal agencies and when appropriate with the General Services Administration. You are authorized and directed to issue such circulars or other instructions as you may find useful in carrying out this assignment.

"I should like to receive from you by September 30, 1956, a report of your progress together with any recommendations you may have as to further steps required for the effective control of the paperwork burden on the public.

"Increased efforts to reduce the reporting burden on the public, together with actions being taken by the General Services Administration and other executive agencies aimed at solution of paperwork problems within the Government, will go far toward attaining the desirable objectives of the Hoover Commission's recommendations for improvement of paperwork management. They form a logical and valuable part of the broader responsibility and program of the Bureau of the Budget to bring about better internal business management throughout the executive branch.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

## REA PROGRESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, last Sunday, May 20, the dedication service was held for the new office building of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Washington. This modern, million-dollar building, a milestone on the path of progress, should be brought to the attention of the entire Nation, for it symbolizes the most outstanding single act of legislation for the benefit of rural America.

Twenty years ago, a relatively short time so far as history goes, electricity on the farm was only a dream in the minds of almost 90 percent of farm families.

Night after night, farm families would crowd around the kitchen table, turn the lamp a little higher, and try to read the news and farm magazines by its light. Can you now, you who lived in rural America those few short years ago, look without nostalgia on the evening chore of filling the kerosene lamp, the polishing of the chimney, or the burning down of a new mantle on that wonderful invention, the gas light?

In those days the hiss of the gas mantle light was audible, for the only other sounds on a farm were muted in the stillness of the evening. The radio was turned only for news broadcasts, in order to save the battery. Perhaps, then, the only other sound was the steady drip of water from the ice box as the ice melted away in its vain attempt to provide refrigeration.

The advances that have been made in the standard of living of the farm family have been tremendous in the past 20 years. Not only in the home where the modern conveniences of electrical appliances have eased the work of the housewife, but over the entire farm where electricity has been put to work in hundreds of jobs that were formerly left to manual labor or were not done—pumping water, running the grindstone, running the drill, welding, and the hundreds of other uses.

Not only has the Rural Electrification Administration brought untold advantages for the farm family, but the advances in technology have further increased the time- and labor-saving devices now in common use.

While no figures have been presented, there is no doubt in my mind that the opening of this vast new field of rural America to the manufacturers of electrical goods brought out many of the machines and techniques that we enjoy today.

This tremendous new market, opened to our great competitive system, brought forth the new and improved appliances and new techniques that are now shared by town and country alike.

Statistics can be quoted for hours on the number of farms now electrified, the number of kilowatts being used. Figures can show how much money has been loaned to rural cooperatives, how much has been paid back, how far ahead of schedules the repayment programs are. But these figures are cold, blind facts that might lead us into a statistical analysis of the situation instead of paying credit to the advances that have been made in our standard of living—a

case, once again if you please, of the farmer pulling the entire Nation ahead by his own bootstraps.

Today, America's farm families are current. They hear the news on their radios and television sets as soon as do their city cousins. They have running water, both hot and cold, in their homes, and they enjoy the cool efficiency of a modern kitchen with its electrical refrigerator and deep freezer. A flick of the switch brings light into any room or floods the farmyard while chores in the outbuildings move swiftly and easily under the help from electric motors and pumps.

Yes, Mr. President, the past 20 years has brought a revolution to the farm family that is nothing short of fantastic. Today more than 90 percent of farms are electrified, as against the 90 percent that were without electricity 20 short years ago.

This means we have reached the turning point in our progress, and now activities are in order to bring about the stabilizing of the movement, the increased education in more and better uses of electrical equipment on the farm and in the home.

Under the leadership of the Rural Electrification Administration, the many individual rural electric cooperatives across the length and breadth of the land, this transition is proving a smooth and profitable operation for the farm family.

Let us then, on this 20th anniversary, pay tribute not only to the Rural Electrification program and its founders, but also to the farm families themselves, who through their own efforts have made this program into a true milestone of progress in America's history.

## THE TREND OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Action by Congress Sought," ably written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of Sunday, May 20, 1956.

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

### ACTION BY CONGRESS SOUGHT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—The most determined effort since 1938 is now being pressed to check and reverse the trend of Supreme Court decisions. In 1938 President Roosevelt pursued this objective through a statute to enlarge the Court's membership and put an age limit on the tenure of the justices. In 1956 12 Senators, former Associate Justice James F. Byrnes, and the sponsors of about 70 legislative proposals led the attack.

Roosevelt was not the first President, and probably he will not be the last, to seek by one method or another to impose curbs on the Supreme Court. The usual Presidential resort has been to article III of the Constitution. This leaves the number of Justices to Congress, and also subjects the power of the Court to review appeals (except in specified legal areas) to "such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress shall make." But this is perhaps the first period in American history when a former member of the Supreme Court has joined in an appeal to Congress to put new and severe limits on the appellate jurisdiction of the highest tribunal. Some proposals include a requirement of prior judicial service for membership on the Court.

### INDIRECT CONGRESS ACTION

Ever since Chief Justice Marshall established judicial supremacy over the other two branches of the Government and over the laws and constitutions of the States there have been attempts of the same nature. But only twice, though State governments and inferior courts (State and Federal) have at times refused to enforce Supreme Court decisions, has Congress responded. This was by the indirect route of decreasing the number of Justices from 10 to 8 in 1801 and increasing it from 8 to 9 at the request of President Grant in 1870.

The purpose in 1801 was to prevent the incoming President, Jefferson, from making an appointment to the Court. The purpose in 1870 was to get a ruling that the Legal Tender Act was constitutional. A few hours before the Senate confirmed the 2 new Justices, Bradley and Strong (a resignation had given the President another place to fill), the Supreme Court ruled against the act, 4 to 3. In 1871, however, thanks to the 2 new members, the decision was reversed, 5 to 4.

But public opinion, reflected, as Mr. Dooley noted, in the election returns, has checked and reversed the judicial trend of the Supreme Court and this public opinion is what President F. D. Roosevelt appealed to in 1938, and Byrnes and Members of Congress are appealing to now, for support of legislative curbs proposed. Roosevelt failed to get his "packing" bill, but the public-political pressure he invoked swung the Supreme Court the other way on New Deal legislation. The current effort is to bring about a repetition of this history.

### OBJECTORS CITE TRENDS

The trends of the Supreme Court that have brought about this situation are classified by the objectors as follows:

An ever-broadening concept of federalism as contrasted with that of a Republic of sovereign states; decisions on the basis of what the Court majority thinks the law ought to be as contrasted with what the law is; growing adherence to the "preemption doctrine" by which the Court excludes the States from any legislative area occupied by Congress without any clear proof of such congressional intent; the use of psychological and sociological research as guides to decision when the Constitution and the statutes provide no specific authority.

The final charge derives from the references to this research in the unanimous Supreme Court opinion that held racial segregation in the State public schools to be unconstitutional as violative of the "equal protection" clause of the 14th amendment. And this decision in particular accounts for the southern uprising against the Court. But the protest is much wider and deeper, as Senator BYRD revealed when, with 11 other Senators and a number of Representatives, he asked Congress to overrule the preemption doctrine. It is proposed to do this through a statute giving this instruction to the judiciary:

"When Congress intends a Federal law to invalidate all State laws in the same field it will say so; otherwise no court is to presume such an intention."

### STATE LAW STRUCK DOWN

The provocation of this bill, first introduced in 1954 before the school decision, consists of a line of Supreme Court rulings since 1940. But it came to a head recently when the Court struck down the Pennsylvania antisedition law on the ground that a Federal act invalidated similar State laws. This ruling was made despite the fact that Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, author of the Federal law, assured a questioner in the House debate there was no such intent in his legislation, and despite the further fact that the Smith Act was incorporated in title 18 of the Federal Penal Code which states in its preamble that no part of it invalidates State laws to the same purposes.

In 1941 the preemption doctrine was applied to an Alabama statute dealing with inspection and regulation of stock butter in commerce. Justice Reed, on a 5-to-4 decision, held that Congress by law had preempted this field. Chief Justice Stone, hotly dissenting, said Congress should "not be deemed to have intended to strike down a State statute unless it conflicts with the Federal statute and palpably infringes on its policy." Since then, in other close rulings, dissenting justices have encouraged the current movement for curbs by harsh criticisms of the majority.

### OPINIONS IN DISSENT

Justice Harlan, dissenting from the majority ruling that due process was lacking in the dismissal of a New York City schoolteacher and therefore the dismissal could not stand, asserted that the right of dismissal was basic when a teacher refused to answer questions about his official conduct. When the majority, 5 to 4, ruled that the equal-protection clause required Illinois to furnish a free transcript of his trial to a convicted burglar on his statement he could not afford to buy one, Justice Harlan said the case "contained none of the elements heretofore regarded as essential to justify action by this Court under the 14th amendment."

Thus, as in 1938, the Supreme Court is under fire from without and within. But this time the Department of Justice and 42 State governments are arrayed against it on the preemption doctrine; 30 States and Congress resentfully remember that it overruled Congress' exemption of intrastate natural gas gatherers; and a sectional group of States is resisting the school desegregation decision.

## NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, today is National Maritime Day. Throughout the country the Merchant Marine and allied industries are being honored for their long service and devotion to the commerce and defense of America. I should like to join today in paying tribute to the accomplishments of those men "who go down to the sea in ships."

Since colonial times American men and vessels have sailed the trade routes of the world. They have been one of the greatest moving forces in the economic development of the United States and in the fostering of international understanding and good will.

Down through the years in time of war the merchant marine has been the mainstay of our overseas forces in action, and indeed, the very lifeline of our allies. Throughout the dark days of World War II, American merchant ships carried on under almost impossible odds, bringing hope and strength to Europe and Asia. Economic development and rehabilitation of the war-torn countries could never have been accomplished without the aid of the American merchant marine.

Coming from a State which has a rich seafaring history, I have long been concerned with maritime interests and problems. The work which the various Maritime Associations, and especially the contributions which the Maritime Academies, both State and Federal, have

made to promote this time-honored and important industry, are worthy of note by all Americans. It is fitting today that we salute the American merchant marine for its outstanding contributions in both war and peace.

## PERCENTAGE OF PARITY RECEIVED BY AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, some weeks ago, in a controversy on the floor of the Senate in connection with the farm bill, I made certain statements as to the percentage of parity being received by the American farmer for what he sold. My statements were questioned by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. It is my purpose in a little while again to obtain the floor and document the accuracy of the statements which I made.

I wished to make this statement so that if the Senator from Indiana desired to be present at the time, he would have notice of the fact that I intend to submit for the RECORD evidence of the accuracy of the statements which I made and with reference to which the Senator from Indiana made certain remarks.

## FEDERAL INDIAN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for approximately 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on occasion during this session of Congress I have discussed Federal Indian policy in general terms as it affects Indians throughout the Nation, and more specifically I have referred to Hill 57, a settlement of off-reservation Indians, living in the most squalid of conditions. As my colleagues may recall, the main topic of discussion with respect to these Indians is their need for welfare assistance and rehabilitation, and where does the responsibility lie—at the Federal, State, or county level

There are many varying degrees of opinion on this matter. As my colleagues in the Senate know, I feel that the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs have been too severe in determination of aid for those Indians on the reservation and those who have moved off the reservation.

With respect to the situation at Hill 57 in Great Falls, Mont., I wish to present some more detailed information. I am in receipt of a report on Hill 57 prepared by students of the College of Great Falls and presented at the Montana State University Institute of Indian Affairs, April 11, 1956. This lengthy report is very complete and presents the situation as they found it among the off-reservation Indians on Hill 57, including historical, social, and educational background material.

Mr. President, in view of the length of the study I ask that portions of the panel report be printed at this point in my remarks, including a letter dated May 17 from Francis Mitchell of the College of Great Falls, giving credit to those who have done so much work in behalf of the Indians on Hill 57; an introduction, and background material, prepared by Angela Kenfield; and the sociology staff's conclusions and recommendations.

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

COLLEGE OF GREAT FALLS,
*Great Falls, Mont., May 17, 1956.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In light of your recent efforts on the Senate floor as regards Hill 57 here in Great Falls, we are sending you the panelists' reports on the subject, which were given at the Montana State University Institute on Indian Affairs, April 11, 1956.

Our panel from the College of Great Falls was titled "A Census of Hill 57 for 1954–55," and it was delivered the first day of the institute at Missoula after the opening talks of Dr. Leslie Fiedler, Mr. Joseph Garry, president of the National Congress of American Indians, and the remarks of Dr. Harold Tascher, the university's director of the institute.

As chairman of the panel group, I opened the census report with an introduction of the student panelists. These were Mrs. Andree Deligdisch, a Fulbright scholar from Holland and a sociology senior at our college, Miss Angela Kenfield; Mr. James Sibert; Mr. Richard Charles, post graduate, University of Wisconsin; and two special consultants from the audience whom we invited to join us.

These consultants were Mr. Joseph Marino, Cascade County social worker in charge of Hill 57's relief clients, Mr. Paul Eagleman of the Rocky Boy's Reservation where most of the Hill 57 families originate, and Mr. Bernard King, college president of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. It was the confraternity that began the first work on the hill from our school.

The order of the panel reports and the contents, as we are sending them to you have been revised somewhat to meet the discussions and questions concerning Hill 57 which have been raised since. We are now limiting our number to the 12 months between July 1 and June 30, rather than the previous listing from those people on the hill from January 1954 to July 1955. This recasting has been done with the advice and the assistance of our project's director, Sister Providence, FCSP, a master of arts in sociology from the Catholic University of America and on the faculty of the college, and with the help of other advisers like Dr. Catherine Nutterville, Mr. John Gedeon, and Max Gubatayao.

Before closing I would like to add a personal view in regard to the Hill 57 situation. I do not feel that the hill is or should be considered an isolated case or something entirely apart from the reservation picture. Others with whom I have talked seem to feel as I do, that Hill 57 is a part of the whole Indian question, and that the Indians of Hill 57 and their problems are related to the problems of all American Indians.

The other members of the panel and myself hope that these papers will be an aid to you in your work for Hill 57 and all other American Indians.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS MITCHELL,
*College of Great Falls,*
*Great Falls, Mont.*

PANEL INTRODUCTION: THE CHIPPEWA OF HILL 57

(By Angela Kenfield, College of Great Falls)

Hill 57 received its name from a Heintz 57-variety sign which stood on the eastern slope many years ago. The Indians live in 2 villages, 1 on the western side and 1 on the top of the hill, approximately 5 miles from the city center of Great Falls.

The permanent residents of Hill 57, numbering continually more than 300 people, are identified as Chippewa Indians, many of whose families have traditions leading back five generations to the shores of the Great Lakes. Some of the families have a Canadian background, and a few have never had relations with the Federal Government on a reservation, for their grandfathers were members of little lost bands of Chippewa wandering into Montana more than 100 years ago. Most of the families, however, are truly off-reservation Indians, and not nonreservation Indians of no particular identity. The fathers or grandfathers of the children now on the hill were driven off their reservations by military action or more recently by economic pressures.

Hill 57, therefore, is not a reservation. It is not a temporary labor camp. The Federal Government's Indian Bureau has no contact with the Hill people, nor does it provide, as is falsely presumed for all Indians, a monthly payment of tax money for them. Hill 57 is a permanent fringe area of Indian settlement adjacent to the city of Great Falls for more than 20 years.

It is reached from the city center by crossing the Missouri River and driving west toward a rim of hills which half-encircle Great Falls. A turn onto a gravel road will lead to the section of a city where there are railroad yards, trailer courts, and small houses, a people who are half-rural, half-urban.

Beyond these about a mile is the first of two Indian settlements, referred to as the camp; the other on the top of the Hill is called Mount Royal.

THE CAMP

In dismal array, six clusters of cabins are situated over 10 or more acres of prairie land. Only 7 of the families in these cabins are owners of them. Only 4 families own land in the camp. Citizens of the nearby non-Indian neighborhoods are the owners. Instead of trees there are overturned, wrecked cars, and numerous outbuildings all in need of repair. Instead of streets there are wandering automobile tracks from one cluster of paper-covered shacks to the other. Instead of the usual indications of modern social living that the usual residential area may have; street signs, bus-stop signs, telephone and electric wires, water hydrants, mail boxes and house numbers, there is only the red arm of a single pump handle over the well amid the central cluster of abodes, as George Engstrom calls them.

STAYING ALIVE ON HILL 57

The men of the camp walk or drive from one-half to 5 miles for work sporadically, according to season and the demand. Some of the common labor is had at the nearby railroad yards, where the men clean boxcars which carry sheep and cattle to market from Montana ranches. The contractor pays them a dollar or a dollar and a half to clean cars sometimes 32 feet in length, sometimes double-tiered. In season, there is work at the cement plant or the brickyard, or at the stockyard, but it is seasonal. Out of season, the men and their wives, frequently, drive to the city dump grounds to salvage food, furniture, and scrap iron which may be sold for a few cents to buy the gasoline without which there would be no hauling of water or wood to the isolated cabins.

MOUNT ROYAL

By continuing past the camp in a 3-mile circle to the top of the hill, the observer will come upon a more orderly row of cabins, erected and rented to Hill Indians by a non-Indian landowner. This is Mount Royal. There is a mud street of sorts and some evidences of a city's utilities, such as electricity, and a cold-water faucet in each house. However, there is no indoor plumbing. Beyond

these two-room houses made of discarded lumber from railway boxcars, there are more tar-paper shacks scattered about in the manner of the camp below. Some of the Indians own the land where these are situated, Indians like the Damons who have been residents of the hill since the 1920's. The State of Montana owns many acres on top of the hill.

THE NEIGHBORS

Mount Royal has a more progressive air than the camp. Some construction workers live here. There is even an antennae of a television from the one man who holds a steady job at the Anaconda smelter. The incentive to own may come from close proximity to the upper-class homes of the city's non-Indians which line the approaches to Mount Royal on the southern slope. None are more aware than the Indians at the top of the hill that their shacks are situated on one of the finest residential sites of the city, and they watch uneasily the housing development below them. Stories still burn in their minds of forced removals from the ancient camping grounds by the Missouri River to these windy heights above the city.

MORE THAN ONE HILL 57

If the observer looks from Mount Royal toward the great smokestack of the smelter on another hill, he will see another shack village. Once there were five such settlements in Great Falls, and the students have learned that other Montana cities have such Indian city colonies. They have many characteristics in common: (1) there are too many school-age children not in school; (2) there is disorder, lack of sanitation and the most primitive conveniences; (3) there is polite but unmistakable rejection of every non-Indian who steps into the area; (4) there is evidence of widespread malnutrition and poor health; (5) there is no spokesman, no evidence of social organization, no sign of any other value than that of survival.

It is true that closer acquaintance has shown the Ah-On-Te-Ways Chippewa band to have a procedure of election for ceremonial purposes, that there is a secret cycle of culture ways involving sweat lodges and peyote. On Mount Royal among the members of yet another band of Chippewa until recently there were no signs of religious life or any contact with a church group in the city, except the presence of religious symbols in the homes.

On the positive side of a Hill 57, there are remarkable family ties, a sharing and a suffering together. The grouping of the houses have indicated a sort of clan arrangement without any clan organization, but even in this area of social relationships, when the crisis periods develop and food is to be fought for, the residents of the Buckskin Fringe are individualized to the point of sacrificing every loyalty. It is dangerous at such times to venture to the dump grounds and to grub about for scrap iron. Barriers of silence and hostility are erected; outrageous prices are charged one's brothers and sisters for rides or errands to the city. On Hill 57 when relief orders are cut off, and men and women "get the shakes" from hunger, then the dream of the individualized, nontribal Indian comes true for all enthusiastic proponents of termination.

---

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(By members of the sociology staff, College of Great Falls)

CONCLUSIONS

1. The facts of the study of the Hill 57 population bear out the estimates of Dr. John McGregor, Great Falls physician, that the Hill people are less than 1 percent of the city's population, but that they make up 10 percent of the welfare caseload, and 25 percent of the Cascade County's welfare medical load.

2. The census indicates that the averge family size exceeds that of the average city dweller, and that kinship ties bring added members.

The social climate on Hill 57 is marked by fear and hostility, and that personality disorder is the rule rather than the exception, as was indicated in the difficulties experienced in collecting research data.

4. There is nearly a total lack of normal material goods necessary for pursuit of the American way of life.

5. There is a high mobility rate in the population, and a close tie between Indian urban areas and the reservation areas.

6. The Indians are one as a social unit of the American population, whether residing off or on the reservations. There is interchange, there is impact of personalities and events between the two areas. A crisis on the Rocky Boy's Reservation brings new families to Great Falls' Hill 57. A period of good times on the reservation such as the CCC program sees many families returning there.

7. The Federal Government is giving nothing by way of services except through the categorical services of the Social Security Act.

8. The State of Montana is doing nothing by way of rehabilitation.

9. Cascade County is meeting only part of the need part of the time.

10. Private agencies within Great Falls provide sporadic and feeble resources when stimulated by various crises on the Hill.

11. The types of families of whom 36 are more or less stable father-mother-child families, the number of children being raised by grandparents and the proportion of 1-parent families should do away with the facile local dismissal of fringe Indian colonies: "They won't help themselves. Why should we?" The fact that permanently beyond the outskirts of the city there are 193 undernourished children should change the approach to discussions of Hill 57.

12. Institutional contacts between the city and the Hill are at a minimum as indicated by the fact that only 10 of the 79 Indian families on the Hill during 1954–55 had all their school-age children in school.

RECOMMENDATION

Standardize research and provide some beginning for planning at all agency levels by a registration of Indians everywhere in the United States.

Let there be application blanks provided at such places as the post offices of this country which any Indian so desiring could fill out:

My name _____.
My residence _____.
My tribe _____.
Past recognition of my family as an Indian family by the United States Government _____.
Present recognition from the Government that I have Indian tribal membership or rights _____.
I would like a certificate testifying to my position with the Federal Government.

Let such a certificate be issued by the appropriate office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs which would state:

This is to certify that John Doe-Child is an American Indian of the _____ Tribe. His reservation is _____ and he is/or is not entitled to service there.

Signed _____
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent months there has been considerable discussion about the relocation program available to Indians on reservations as provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The general idea is commendable, but there is considerable dispute as to its success, and the state of affairs that many of the Indians find themselves.

In April I received a letter from Sister Providencia, F. C. S. P., of the College of Great Falls, a tireless worker in behalf of the distressed Indian. She has presented a moving picture of the problems that must be faced by the off-reservation Indians on Hill 57. It is a pathetic picture that Sister Providencia paints for us. I hope that interested Senators will take time to read this letter.

Sister Providencia wonders if Hill 57 is atypical. I doubt it. I suspect that there are a number of concentrations of off-reservation Indians who find themselves in a similar situation.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, Sister Providencia's letter of April 22, and a copy of my letter to the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, at which time I forwarded to him the conclusions drawn from the report sent to me by the students.

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

COLLEGE OF GREAT FALLS,
*Great Falls, Mont., April 22, 1956.*

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

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In my last letter I told you that we had not pursued our research of the Hill 57 population as far as the ages of the children, that we had only the total number under 21 years of age. Yesterday, Joseph Marino, the Cascade County caseworker for the Hill spent 2 hours with us on the ages of the children from his records, and the school attendance which the students had gained for the year 1954–55 from the county offices of education. The school bus list and a list of Hill children attending the West Side Junior High School seemed most conclusive about attendance.

We concluded that there were 92 children in the permanent population of Hill 57 between the ages of 6 and 18 years, computed from November 1, 1949, for those 6 years old in the fall of 1954, and from June 1, 1937, for those who were 18 years old or less. The school bus list showed 50 children in attendance for the year chosen, of whom 11 were in junior high school. We would therefore have a percentage of 54.3, for this sample off-reservation population.

On the basis of this, I think the Indian Bureau progress is to be commended as regards the reservations, and the tribal council scholarship programs even more. The Blackfeet Tribe, for instance, has educated 49 college graduates since 1951. Hill 57 has not even produced 1 high school graduate during the same period.

I have both good and bad to report about the Hill for this month. From a little loan fund maintained here at the college by some women like Mrs. George Roberts, and town Indians like the Thumms, we have helped six men from Hill families to retain or to acquire union cards which will permit them to join the city's construction crews. The fee at present is $15 for a downpayment, for the Trades and Laborers' Union. We are trying to help every man who comes down from the Hill to seek aid, because the unemployed from other places will soon be attracted here by new projects, and up will go the fee. It is only right that the Great Falls men who have maintained the payment of dues all winter should have protection of employment services by the union.

We also helped 4 out-of-town Indians, 2 from Canada whom we aided to the border. From there the Canadian Government will take over for its needy natives, who may be stranded far from their reserves. One of

the Canadians said to us, "I was down here looking for work, but I am going back. My people are going crazy with this enfranchisement business. Seventeen wells on our land, you know."

The other two men were from the Havre dumps. One had a wife and child in an $8-a-week hotel room, and we are trying to keep them there until he finds work. These people had their shacks leveled to the ground by the steam shovels of the Army engineers a few weeks ago, the Federal men being intent on opening a flood-control project. Some Indian families, who had suffered all through the winter without a bit of help at the edge of the city there, had not even time to remove their belongings from the makeshift dwellings.

Now for the good again—two men of the Hill who received their first pay checks last week returned a total of $25 to the loan fund, and other families were helped to solve the cash problem. When a man has been 6 months on food and fuel orders from the county general relief program—more than 30 families on the Hill—the $15 union fee is hard to come by. There were two such families at the college yesterday, father, mother, babe in arms, to ask if we knew of any rock-picking jobs.

"Cleaning boxcars is no good," one man said, an enrolled Fort Belknap Indian. "We worked 6 hours and only got a dollar and a half. When they are double deckers, we have about 3 feet to work in cleaning out the manure, and then we throw the sand in on the floor of the car. This is as high as your head from the ground."

All general relief clients of the county were told last week, April 11, that there would be no more food orders until next winter. So a sign of spring for us here in the Falls is an automobile waiting at the hospital kitchen door for food. The other day I counted 11 children under 7 years of age belonging to the young mothers in the front seat of 1 car. "Yes," they said, "they all belong to us. Yes; this is Martin. He hasn't rustled money for a union card yet."

The look on Martin's face set me to meditating on the English poor-law policy of the State and county welfare boards. It goes something like this: Spring is the season for common labor on farms and construction jobs. There must be work. Therefore, there is work. The able-bodied can look for it, and feed their own families.

During April we may observe the process, better known at Institutes on Indian Affairs as the Indian finding his rightful place in our society. The union agent meets his application for work with the words, "Find the price of a union card." The employment office tells him, "There is a rock-picking job 30 miles from here. Find the money for gasoline." The farmer tells him when he has stolen or begged his way to the farm, "You can pick for $2 an acre, but find yourself a place to live." His wife says upon his return, "Leave town for that job and find yourself another wife."

She will be left on the Hill, you see, to keep the children in school, it may be, but without food, water, or fuel for a week, or the means to get them. The old tribal law of sharing, still left to these detribalized Indians, breaks down during such crisis periods. It is each man for himself. Consequently the process culminated for some families in school withdrawal for the children. Everybody went out to pick rocks on the Great Plains.

I wonder about them this morning. There is snow on the ground.

Sad to say, more serious alternatives developed from the announcement by the county caseworker that the last food order had been dispensed. One Hill mother left her three small children and her husband and ran away to relatives in a distant town. I know this girl. I know it could only be a kind of frenzy. She is devoted to her family. For an Indian woman to desert her children is the final word in disorganization. Another mother sought employment on the southside to the shame of everyone.

We need more research, Senator. Perhaps life on Hill 57 is atypical. Dr. Nutterville suggests a request to the Bureau of the Census for figures on the concentrations of off-reservation Indians. The college students brought home a remark by an official attending the Missoula Institute that there were 5,000 of them at Rapid City, S. Dak. How do they fare in the spring?

God bless you for your thankless efforts in behalf of the distressed.

Sincerely yours,

Sister PROVIDENCIA, F. C. S. P.

---

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, D. C., May 21, 1956.*

Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART,
*Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. D'EWART: I am sending the attached conclusions and recommendations prepared by members of the sociology staff of the College of Great Falls concerning Indians on Hill 57, Great Falls, Mont., for your comment.

The students at the College of Great Falls have spent a great deal of time over the past year studying conditions among off-reservation Indians, particularly on Hill 57. The complete report is very thorough and more than substantiates the need for some sort of Federal assistance for these destitute Indians.

The conclusions drawn from the report merit serious consideration by the Department of the Interior. A program of registration of Indians in the country, as recommended by the students would be most beneficial.

Please return the attached copy with your reply.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

---

## PROSPECTIVE COLLAPSE OF SCIENCE ATTACHÉ PROGRAM IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for approximately 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 9, 1956, I called the Senate's attention to the fact that the 5-year-old science attaché program in the State Department was on the verge of collapse. I would now invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that this program is on the verge of being dissolved and completely forgotten at the very time when our country is hard pressed in the scientific race with the Soviet Union.

A competent staff reported of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. Warren Unna, has recently written a column concerning the same problem, entitled "State's Science Program Dying." This column appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 13, 1956, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

DIPLOMATIC SNUB?—STATE'S SCIENCE PROGRAM DYING

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 13, 1956]

(By Warren Unna)

The State Department's 5-year-old science attaché program is now down to two small rooms in a condemned tempo with a roster consisting of exactly 1 acting science adviser and 2 secretaries.

The minute, punched-out beaverboard quarters in State Department Annex No. 3 are due for demolition in a month or so. The last four science attachés came home from United States Embassies in Paris, Stockholm, Tokyo, and London last December and January. There hasn't been a departmental science adviser since 1954.

The program's acting adviser, Walter M. Rudolph, is an economist who now spends his days assorting scientific inquiries from other Washington agencies and seeing that they get into the right regional mailbox at State.

Rudolph explains that he can't do anything about the attaché program until a reappraisal study, informally begun in 1953, comes from the Secretary's office. He concedes that with all the science attachés now home from their foreign posts, there isn't much activity to reappraise.

"We've got a backlog of scientific applicants but we're not recruiting at all," Rudolph observes. "We're not permitted to. It's the feeling in the Department that it wouldn't be advisable to send science attachés out until a decision was reached on the kind of program we're to have."

(The Soviet apparently is not bothered by such decision problems. A recent dispatch from Stockholm declared that the Russians, aware of their tendency to underrate western science and technology, had already assigned a scientific counselor to their Swedish Embassy and would extend the program to Embassies in all major capitals.)

The attaché program is an outgrowth of State's 1949 reorganizational activities. It was set up to keep the diplomatic service informed on scientific and technical matters affecting foreign relations.

Explains Rudolph: "More and more, scientific activities are affecting our foreign relations. It is not only what a guy does in a lab, but what a foreign government appropriates for a scientific program. This can affect our foreign policy, our diplomatic relations. If you want to spot these activities, you better get a scientist who can recognize them."

In 1952 the program had 10 scientists attached to 5 United States Embassies. Joseph B. Koepfli, a prominent organic chemist from the California Institute of Technology, was the program's science adviser.

The program, even in its brief existence, fell somewhat short of expectations. University scientists proved reluctant to forsake their campus research and academic tenure for more than a sabbatical year plus a summer at either end; a total of 18 months instead of the 4 years attachés usually sign up for.

But American scientists reported the program a success. Rudolph says the attachés helped set up international scientific conferences, selecting and briefing delegates; helped in the international exchange of scientific personnel, and helped in the early planning of next year's International Geophysical Year.

When the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953, it began a reappraisal of embassy attachés. Agricultural attachés were put on the Department of Agriculture's payroll.

But the science attachés were left on a limb. The Hoover Commission last year recommended that they be made responsible to the Central Intelligence Agency.

Chemical & Engineering News reported in its January edition: "The science attachés view this recommendation with alarm. Some believe that, at best, such a transfer would enervate the work of the science attachés and, at worst, would create downright resentment abroad to the detriment of our foreign relations."

The attachés were set up to handle unclassified scientific information. They saw a direct conflict in being attached to an intelligence agency.

Similarly, there has been little enthusiasm for putting them under the Office of Naval Research, whose interests are maritime; or the National Science Foundation, whose interests are the promotion of fundamental science.

Comments Rudolph: "If you place a science attaché in any other agency you change his function. This would not be carrying out scientific relations with foreign countries."

Once State comes to a decision on its science attaché program, Rudolph foresees no difficulty in attracting the right men. He says the salaries provided are comparable to the full and associate professorship salaries at leading American universities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in reading the report as written by the staff reporter of the Washington Post and Times Herald, one is struck with the fact that a program which was well underway some years ago and subject to reevaluation and analysis in 1953 is still today without any report as to its activities, and without any analysis being made available by the Department of State as to its further activities, its continuance or discontinuance. Apparently the Department has not as yet made up its mind what it is going to do about having scientific attachés at our respective Embassies in some of the major countries of the world. I would have my colleagues note that the Soviet Union is not quite so definite. Only this past week the Kremlin announced that they were assigning a special scientific counselor to their Swedish Embassy and that they would extend the program of having scientific attachés to Embassies in all the major capitals.

The attaché program in this country is the outgrowth of the State Department's 1949 reorganizational activities. It was established to keep the diplomatic service informed on scientific and technical matters affecting foreign relations.

Concerning what is left of this service, Mr. Walter M. Rudolph had this to say:

More and more scientific activities are affecting our foreign relations. It is not only what a guy does in a lab, but what a foreign government appropriates for a scientific program. This can affect our foreign policy, our diplomatic relations. If you want to spot these activities, you had better get a scientist who can recognize them.

Mr. President, in 1952 this program had 10 scientists attached to 5 United States Embassies. At the present time I believe it is down to the acting director, and I believe that is all; namely, Mr. Walter M. Rudolph.

The program, even in its brief existence, fell somewhat short of expectations. University scientists proved reluctant to forsake their campus research and academic tenure for more than a sabbatical year plus a summer at either end—a total of 18 months, instead of the 4 years attachés usually sign up for. But American scientists reported the program a success.

I would hope, Mr. President, that the State Department would give its final judgment as to what is to happen to the program.

It appears to me that at a time when we are deeply concerned about the scientific progress of the Soviet Union and the vast amounts of money which are hidden away in the Soviet Union's budget for science the presence of scientific attachés at our Embassies in the major capitals of the world might be very desirable.

Furthermore, the scientists, if attached to the Embassies, could do much to seek cooperation among scientists of the free nations, and to correlate or to bring together some of the most important scientific work that has been done and that needs to be done. This is apparently one of those "minor problems" that affect our Government, and it appears to have rather long term and serious consequences.

I noted in the press only the day before yesterday that the American representatives who are visiting in the Soviet Union and examining some of the developments in the field of nuclear science have been very much impressed by the laboratories which they have seen, the quality of the work which has been undertaken, and the very, very generous—indeed, extravagant—allocations of funds on the part of the Soviet Union in the field of nuclear science. If these things be true, it appears to me that the State Department would do well to implement its program of scientific attachés.

---

## SOVIET ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEMOBILIZATION OF A MILLION SOLDIERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Another Soviet Initiative," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 17, 1956.

Mr. Lippmann has recently returned from Europe and has written an incisive analysis of the effect in Europe of the new Soviet announcement that a million Soviet soldiers will be demobilized. It appears to me that this matter, like that of the scientific attachés, requires the most careful analysis and consideration on the part of our Government.

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

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ANOTHER SOVIET INITIATIVE

Returning to Washington after 2 weeks in London and Paris, I cannot help feeling that we may be missing one of the main points of the Soviet decision to demobilize about a million men. "I do not think," said Mr. Dulles at his press conference on Tuesday, that "what the Soviet Union is here doing * * * is calculated appreciably to alter their military power." Mr. Dulles was implying that for this reason the Soviet move had no bearing upon the military policy of the NATO countries. Since the Soviet military power will be just as great as before the reduction, the menace to be guarded against will be just as great as ever.

This is not, I believe, the way the Soviet announcement will be read in Western Europe. The question there is more likely to be this: If the Soviet Union can demobilize something like a quarter of its men under arms and still be just as powerful as ever, how many men could be demobilized—or, in the case of the Germans, not conscripted—without making Western Europe less secure?

The more it is proved by Mr. Dulles that the Soviets have lost nothing by economizing military manpower, the more impressive will be the example they have set. For Britain, France, and Germany are short of industrial manpower. Military service is regarded as a wasteful and tiresome thing. The action of the Soviets will be judged not so much as a gesture for peace but to see whether it is an example of military realism.

The question is whether in the revolution of military technology amidst which we are living, the Soviet Union is seizing the initiative in the strategical thinking about that revolution. There has been much discussion here in Washington as to whether the Soviet Union has a lead in certain fields—as for example guided missiles. But what we need to ask ourselves also is whether the Soviet Union is adapting its high policy more quickly than we are to the new military developments.

The Soviets have been ahead of us in realizing the political consequences of what happened in 1949 when they broke our monopoly and began to develop nuclear weapons. They saw, as our official policymakers for so long refused to see, that the unavoidable consequence would be the growth of neutralism in all countries that do not themselves possess nuclear weapons. It could not have been otherwise. When a country is unarmed for modern nuclear warfare, when it has no deterrent power and no defensive power, it must move toward a neutral position between the nuclear powers.

The Soviets saw this and very promptly made their own the encouragement of neutralism. This piece of military realism on their part has increased enormously their political influence in Asia. We have just begun to come around to it in the past few months. In the visit of President Sukarno of Indonesia and the coming visit of Pandit Nehru, we are beginning to try to repair the damage of an ill-judged policy.

Thanks to Churchill's genius, the West was ahead of the Soviets in realizing the political consequences of the second military revolution, that of the hydrogen bomb. This second revolution has led us to the acknowledgment at the summit meeting in Geneva that the great nuclear powers themselves are in a military stalemate and that they cannot contemplate war as an instrument of their policies.

We are now in a third phase of this evolution in strategical thinking. It has to do primarily with the adaptation of Western European military policy to the military stalemate which was acknowledged at Geneva. The NATO army is in trouble because of a growing skepticism as to whether it reflects a right estimate of the coming military situation. I was surprised to find how far this skepticism has gone, how deep is the questioning in high quarters abroad as to the true military value of much that never has been questioned before. As an example of how drastic the reexamination is, there is serious thought being given in Great Britain to the abolition of Fighter Command, of the glorious service which in 1940 won the Battle of Britain. The argument today is that Britain cannot be defended successfully by interceptors against the modern supersonic bombers. The reexamination does not stop there. It has begun

to reach out toward the ground forces in Western Germany.

It is against this background, I believe, that the Soviet action needs to be interpreted. The question is not really whether the Soviets are beguiling and deceiving us but whether they are going to persuade Western Europe that they know how to show the way to security and prosperity. Certainly in this matter of reducing military personnel, the door on which they are pushing is already ajar.

## REPORTED DISCONTENT IN COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when I sponsored Senate Joint Resolution 21 last year, and when Congress adopted the joint resolution, I was hopeful that within a reasonable period of time we would have a comprehensive report from the bipartisan Commission on Government Security which was to be created. To date, there have been few reports about the Commission's progress, and those that have appeared have been pessimistic about the likelihood of early results.

One such article was written by Murrey Marder, a staff reporter of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and was published in that newspaper on May 19, 1956. Mr. Marder's article was entitled "Bipartisan Security Study Discontent Reported, but Group's Chief Denies It." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

BIPARTISAN SECURITY STUDY DISCONTENT REPORTED, BUT GROUP'S CHIEF DENIES IT

(By Murrey Marder)

There is considerable grumbling behind the scenes of the slow-moving Commission on Government Security over the pace and direction it is taking.

While there has been no public talk about it, within and outside of the Commission, there is growing skepticism that it will attain the "reforms" envisioned when Congress authorized it last August over the Eisenhower administration's opposition.

Chairman Lloyd Wright, in an interview, expressed surprise at the idea of any discontent within the group.

The 12-member bipartisan Commission, he recalled, was not named until November 10, and did not organize until December 14.

"We didn't get our offices until January," said Wright. "We didn't really get started until February."

TELLS OF TASK'S MAGNITUDE

He added: "We had all of $50,000 to start to study all of Government—167 departments, agencies, divisions, sections.

"We've got to analyze, study, and digest every Executive order, law, and regulation of all branches of Government in this security field, plus all of the Government's prime and subcontractors handling sensitive work—between 1,000 and 1,200 of them."

When Congress created the Commission, it was thought it would take off from where congressional studies of much of the background had left off.

But Wright said: "We're not supposed to take somebody else's recommendations. We've got to take a look-see ourselves. It takes more time than appears at first blush."

Wright, a past president of the American Bar Association and a right-wing Republican, said neither his own nor the Commission's view has "jelled" on appraising the present personnel security programs.

SEE HONEST JOB DONE

Later in the interview, however, he indicated some fairly jelled views about his approach.

"The overall program that I've studied so far," he said, "indicates that the Government people handling the (security) work are doing an honest, fearless, sincere job.

"That there have been honest mistakes of judgment, of course, goes without saying.

"But you only hear," he said, "of the cases that have been mishandled. You never hear of the vast majority of cases that have been properly handled."

That should be music in the ears of Federal security officials; they frequently have expressed the same view.

Wright, who was active in urging legal aid for those accused in security cases, said, "I think there are some corrections that have got to be made. * * * As long as you have humans handling things you will have human mistakes."

He said he thought it significant that "since the Commission was organized, the British came out with their White Paper that advocated the security procedure we have been following for years."

(A British commission advocated broadening their security program to Communist sympathizers and employees with character defects; in operation, however, the British security program still has many differences.)

Asked if he felt there was any solution to the stigma borne by the term, "security risk," Wright replied:

"Every time you get a ticket for a traffic violation you have broken the law—but no 'stigma' attaches."

When asked whether the Commission will study qualifications of (Federal) security personnel, Wright said, "at first glance, I don't see that that is within our province."

The Commission has received pleas to step into individual security cases "from a whole slew of individuals—poor devils—who feel they are being questioned," he said, but "that's not within our jurisdiction. We can't clear anybody. We can only examine cases that suggest weaknesses or strengths of procedure."

Wright said the Commission is receiving, "I am happy to say, full cooperation from Government," through conferences with agency heads and interdepartmental groups.

The Commission's original $50,000 was quickly spent, and Congress has just allotted $200,000 more—some of which already is spent in delayed salaries and expenses. Last February, Wright caused considerable surprise when he told a House committee the whole job should cost "at least $3 million" and could not be done by the deadline of December 31, 1956. Now, he said, "I'm hopeful we will be able to get through by the first quarter of next year, or not to exceed the second quarter—and do a bangup job."

Since its organization meeting, the Commission has met only twice, he said, but will again meet "very shortly—within 30 days."

One Commission member, Senator NORRIS COTTON, Republican, New Hampshire, an Eisenhower Republican, when asked yesterday if he was satisfied with the Commission's progress, said:

"I am hopeful that this Commission will be able to get down to brass tacks. I think there is a lot of work to be done and I am not going to say that I am entirely happy about the progress so far."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to encourage the members of the Commission to proceed forthwith to this all-important study. It appears to me that it is one of the most important tasks which has ever been assigned to a Government commission.

It was the wish of Congress that the task be performed rather expeditiously and, at the same time, thoroughly and objectively. I hope that before the end of this Congress, we may have an interim report as to some of the observations made by the Commission, together with some of their interim recommendations and findings.

It should be recognized that the life or the term of the Commission extends until the end of 1956. It was felt that that would allow ample time for a rather extended and complete report on the Government security and loyalty program.

## UNFAIR TREATMENT OF CERTAIN SUPPLIERS OF SUGAR

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared remarks concerning the conference report on the sugar bill, which was approved by the Senate last week and sent to the President. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Last week the Senate approved the conference report on the sugar legislation that we considered earlier in this session and sent it to the President. I wish I could have been present when the conference report was taken up. I had a number of observations to make in connection with that legislation which I would have liked to see become part of the legislative history.

However, I was not on the floor at the time. I hasten to say that I would not have voted against the conference report in any event since I know the difficult job it was to arrive at even the formulation that is included in the bill now pending before the President.

That bill has its defects, from my point of view, and, I am sure, from the viewpoint of others.

My purpose in rising at this time is to speak for those of our suppliers of sugar who in my judgment were not fairly treated in the sugar legislation and who deserve more consideration, or at least more equitable consideration than they did in fact receive. I refer to Puerto Rico and to the Philippines. I want to speak of each of these two sugar-producing areas separately because they present different problems in connection with the sugar legislation. Today I shall speak of the Philippines and of the unwise manner in which the sugar legislation overlooked the legitimate interests not so much of the Philippines but of the United States in our relations with the Philippines.

My views on this matter are based on the assumption and the conclusion that we have a tremendous stake of interest in the Philippines and in the maintenance of Philippine-American relations on the closest possible basis. The Philippines is the showcase for democracy in the Far East. This is often said but much too frequently the words are uttered without reference to substance and meaning. The substance and meaning lies in the fact that the Philippines is the staging ground in the Far East for our type of democracy. Thus it is to our highest interest to see to it that Philippine democracy works and that the economy upon which this democratic form of government rests is given every proper and possible assistance. It is also essential that we show the Filipino people the special favor of our special concern.

Now in this sugar legislation we made available to many producing areas a share in whatever growth and expansion there is in our sugar consumption. As we consume more sugar, we will distribute, under the terms of the sugar legislation, more or less

equitable shares of that growth increment among the various producing areas, both domestic and foreign. In the sugar bill we give the Philippines not a single pound of that increment.

It is true that the Philippines already have a large share of the American sugar market. This is guaranteed to them by mutual compact between our two countries. But that is not the matter at issue. The Philippines have had that share of our sugar market for a long time, and as our sugar consumption increases, I believe that the Philippines should be given an equitable share of the increment * * * or at least a token share. We should constantly show to the world and to the Filipino people that we consider them among our most-favored allies.

I am aware that there were certain problems connected with Philippine-American trade which this year effectively prevented the careful consideration, on its merits, of the case for granting the Philippines a share in the growth increment of our sugar consumption. I wish that had not been so.

However, I should like to make part of the record at this point the State Department's recommendation which was given to the House Committee on Ways and Means when the sugar legislation was before that committee in reference to the Philippine quota:

"The Department does not recommend an increase in the Philippine quota at this time. The Department believes, however, as it indicated in its report on H. R. 5406, that consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share an increased consumption when sugar legislation is next amended, and after sugar from the Philippines begins to pay a tariff."

I should also like to take note, in the course of these remarks, of the communication addressed to the State Department by Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo on this subject, a communication which Senator MANSFIELD inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the course of the debate on sugar legislation on February 9 of this year.

Under the terms of the sugar legislation we sent to the President last week, the Philippines is the only major sugar-producing area denied any participation at all in future increases in United States sugar consumption. I think this is unwise and unfair. I think this is repugnant to the interests of the United States. I hope that Congress will, at the earliest possible time, make the necessary adjustment in the apportionment of the increment of increased sugar consumption in the United States so as to give the Philippines an equitable share. I know it will help the Philippines and I firmly believe that by so doing it will help the United States.

As I have said, I expect to make some further observations on this subject, in connection with Puerto Rico, on another occasion.

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FIELDING L. WRIGHT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in the recent and untimely passing of the Honorable Fielding L. Wright, late a governor of my State, the State of Mississippi as well as the Nation lost one of its most loyal and devoted public servants.

Governor Wright served as Mississippi's chief executive for almost 6 consecutive years. He brought to that high office many outstanding qualities which combined to make him one of the most effective and constructive governors in the entire history of our State. Prior to serving in this position of highest trust, he had served Mississippi as lieutenant governor, as a member of the State senate, and as a member of the State house of representatives, later becoming speaker of that body. Along with this fine background of experience and training, Fielding Wright was a man of firm purposes, with a strong mind and a courageous heart, one who consistently and untiringly worked in a quiet but effective way for the principles of government in which he believed.

Governor Wright began his tenure as Governor of Mississippi soon after the end of World War II. He approached postwar problems, both at home and on the national front, with a constructive and forward-looking view. Under his leadership, Mississippi made great strides forward in public-school education, in industrial development and the development of our natural resources, and in highway transportation, including our secondary highways and farm-to-market roads. Our people prospered and our State became a better place in which to live.

In 1948, Governor Wright was recognized as a national leader. He was earnest, sincere, and effective in his leadership in the fight for the preservation of the principles of States rights in government. He sincerely and steadfastly believed in this principle of government because he realized that this great Nation of ours, with its vast area and diversity of people, must have the powers of the State broken up into many units, in order to meet varying local conditions. He also clearly saw that long, continuing centralization of power in Washington would ultimately completely destroy the States as units of government. Fielding Wright was sincerely fighting for a cause, and he did not seek to create a circumstance where he would be in demand for a high position of power and responsibility. He deliberately stood aside, and would not let himself be considered for what was to be the first position in a political movement for States rights in 1948. Through it all, Fielding Wright constantly kept his eye and his mind on the single purpose of what was best for the people and the Nation. He had not the slightest thought of personal advancement and personal gain.

Governor Wright was a man of the very highest integrity, not only in public affairs, but also in his personal affairs. He enjoyed the respect and confidence of those associated with him in public affairs, and the esteem and love of those privileged to know him intimately and to observe his real qualities.

Without the unselfish services as such men as Fielding L. Wright, our form of government could not long continue in existence. The State of Mississippi and the entire Nation will long reap the benefits of his unselfish and constructive service, always sincerely dedicated to the public good. God grant that more such men and women will answer the clarion call of duty, in being willing to serve on the same high plane that Fielding Wright did, so that our freedom and liberties will be preserved and protected, and the blessings of constitutional government can be enjoyed by successive and future generations.

## REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the various terms used throughout the existing law are accompanied either by definitions or by reference to a section which defines them. In other instances, regulations and administrative rulings are relied upon for the meaning of the terms used.

For the first time, all general terms are brought together and defined under one section. It was not intended that this orderly presentation would result in any change in meaning of the various terms except as specifically noted in the report on the bill.

It has been brought to my attention that section 1 (K), which defines the term "Government," might be construed as either limiting or extending coverage under the act. That is not the case, the term as defined in the bill is intended to apply to exactly the same employees—no more, no less—covered under present law. This has been checked with the Civil Service Commission, and the Commission agrees that the wording of section 1 (K) which defines the term "Government" neither extends coverage to anyone not now under the act nor denies coverage to anyone now under the act. In other words, it makes absolutely no change with respect to a person's coverage under the act.

Mr. President, I have made this statement because I feel that some persons are fearful that changes might be made on account of these definitions.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Inquiries have been addressed to me by persons who might be called half-time or part-time employees of the Federal Government, such as those employed in the Extension Service, and agencies of that type. As I understand, they are not included in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are not included in the bill. At one time the committee considered including them, but the subject is controversial, and the committee at present is considering the introduction of a separate bill to cover such persons.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is such a bill now pending before the Senator's committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee has not introduced such a bill, but the same staff which has been working on the bill which is now under consideration is making a study of the other subject. The coverage of those persons was stricken from this bill, although at one time the committee considered including them.

Mr. HAYDEN. Were they excluded by the unanimous action of the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As well as I remember, that action was unanimous on the part of the committee, because it was thought best that that matter be considered as a separate item.

I should like to read two paragraphs from the committee report, on page 8, which I think will answer the question asked by the Senator from Arizona.

A number of present Federal employees are denied retirement service credit for past periods of service under a number of Federal-State cooperative programs because they were not designated as Federal employees through the usual formal appointive procedures. The committee does not believe that one employee should receive retirement-service credit and another should be denied retirement-service credit, who worked side by side on the same program, merely because the first was appointed in one manner and the second in a different manner.

In order that equity might be accorded to all groups, the committee directed that the matter be studied with the view to appropriate action next session.

The committee wanted to do something in this field, but did not know exactly how far to go at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I take it from the committee report, and from what the Senator has said, that there is merit in the representations which have been made to me by constituents of mine.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There was so much merit in the bill that the committee reported it last year, and the Senate passed it. The House passed the bill, it went to the President, and the President vetoed it. That is one reason why we wish to work out a bill that can be enacted into law.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have at the desk, one amendment to the committee amendment, which is just a perfecting amendment. I do not think any Senator wishes to disagree to it. I should like to dispose of that first. It merely corrects errors throughout the bill. There are several of them. It is just a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire that it be read at the desk, or merely printed in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD. It makes merely grammatical changes. For instance, it may change the word "as" to "a." Such changes are made all through the bill by the perfecting amendment. The amendment is known as "5-18-56-A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous request of the Senator from South Carolina that the amendment to the committee amendment be printed in the RECORD?

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

On page 41, line 14, strike out "employe" and insert in lieu thereof "employee."

On page 42, line 4, strike out "military pay."

On page 42, line 6, after *"Provided,* That" insert the following: "the term 'basic salary' shall not include military pay for persons who enter upon active military service after the effective date of this act: *And provided further,* That."

On page 44, line 20, strike out "srevice" and insert in lieu thereof "service."

On page 45, line 13, after the word "as" insert "a."

On page 46, lines 20 and 21, strike out ", of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, or of the Library of Congress" and insert in lieu thereof "; and the Architect of the Capitol and the Librarian of Congress are authorized to exclude from the operation of this act any employees under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and the Library of Congress, respectively, whose tenure of employment is temporary or of uncertain duration."

On page 47, line 7, after "employee" insert "or Member."

On page 47, line 9, after "employee" insert "or Member."

On page 47, line 16, strike out ". A Member" and insert in lieu thereof ", except that for purposes of section 9 (c) (1), a Member (1)."

On page 47, line 17, after the word "credit" insert the word "only."

On page 47, line 22, strike out the period at the end of the line and insert "and (2)."

On page 47, line 23, strike out "A Member."

On page 48, line 1, strike out "member" and insert in lieu thereof "Member."

On page 49, line 10, after the word "as" insert "a."

On page 52, line 25, after "employee," insert the following: "to the Architect of the Capitol or any employee under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol."

On page 53, line 7, after "Canal" insert "Company" and in lines 7 and 8 strike out "Panama Railroad Company" and insert in lieu thereof "Canal Zone Government."

On page 55, line 2, after "Member" insert "or survivor of a Member."

On page 55, line 23, strike out "wthin" and insert in lieu thereof "within."

On page 57, line 17, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

On page 58, lines 24 and 25, strike out "or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "as a Member."

On page 59, lines 3 and 4, strike out "or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "as a Member."

On page 60, line 9, strike out "such" and insert in lieu thereof "his."

On page 60, line 11, strike out "such" and insert in lieu thereof "his."

On page 63, line 5, after "election," insert the following: "excluding any increase because of retirement under section 7."

On page 68, lines 3 and 4, strike out "a present or former employee or Member not retired" and insert in lieu thereof "an employee or Member."

On page 68, line 6, after "filed," insert the following: "or if a former employee or Member not retired dies."

On page 71, line 15, strike out "list" and insert in lieu thereof "record."

On page 71, line 17, strike out "list" and insert in lieu thereof "record."

On page 76, line 16, after "annuitant" insert "heretofore or hereafter retired."

On page 76, line 23, strike out ", is" and insert in lieu thereof ") hereafter becomes."

On page 77, line 11, after the period insert the following: "If an annuitant under this act (other than (1) a disability annuitant whose annuity is terminated by reason of his recovery or restoration of earning capacity, or (2) a Member retired under this act) hereafter becomes employed in an appointive or elective position not subject to this act, annuity payments shall be discontinued during such reemployment and resumed in the same amount upon termination of such employment."

On page 77, line 12, after "Member" insert "heretofore or hereafter."

On page 77, line 12, strike out "is" and insert in lieu thereof "hereafter becomes."

On page 84, line 4, after the period insert the following: "If the deposit is made, such service shall be held and considered to be service during which the employee was subject to this act."

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I cannot let this opportunity pass without complimenting the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina. A short time ago I was chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I know the detail and the hard work that must be engaged in by the chairman of that particular committee. There is a terrific amount of detail connected with the work of the committee. The chairman of the committee is besought continuously in his office by Federal employees not only from the city of Washington, but, as the distinguished Senator knows, from all over the United States. Delegations come to Washington from Los Angeles, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and from every State in the Union.

I particularly desire to commend the distinguished Senator for the judicious way in which he has presided at the meetings of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think I have attended every meeting of the full committee during this session and the last session. If there is any committee in the Senate which works harmoniously, it is the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and that is largely due to the way in which the fine chairman takes his time about every bill. He goes into each bill in the minutest detail. If any Senator has any question, every precaution is taken that his question is answered completely.

The chairman of the committee has been courteous, not only to members on his own side, but to members on the minority side.

We have been helped in our work by having a magnificent staff, one of experience, headed by Mr. Brawley, who has been very helpful in assisting Senators on the Republican side.

I wish to repeat that I do not know of any chairman of any committee who could have done better than has the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I recall when the first retirement bill was passed. At that time the outlook for it was rather hopeless, but because of the way in which the Democrats, who were in the minority at that time, cooperated with the Republicans, a fine bill resulted.

I think the bill now pending is an outstanding measure for the benefit of Federal employees who may retire, as well as for those who have heretofore retired. In great measure, that is due to the untiring work of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, sometime ago I made a speech on the floor of the Senate in which I asked the people of South Caro-

lina to send the distinguished senior Senator back to the Senate. I called on every Republican in the State of South Carolina to vote for him. I thought I was doing the Senator a service, and one can imagine my surprise when a short time later a newspaper writer, while commending me on the speech, pointed out that the total number of Republicans in the State of South Carolina was only 125. He pointed out the total population and the fact that, after all, the Republicans in that State represented only a minor fraction of 1 percent.

Mr. President, I cannot resist also paying a compliment to Bob Johnson, who for a long time has been on the staff, and who has been assigned to represent the minority. He has been most helpful to the minority members. At the request of our distinguished chairman, Mr. Brawley has also been helpful to us. These gentlemen not only help us when there are meetings of the committee, but they willingly come to a Senator's office after hours to explain any question a Senator may have to raise, so that he may fully understand the matter.

I want to extend the highest commendation to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina. I know that Federal employee organizations all over the country feel they have a friend in the Senator. They may not always get all they are asking for, but they know they can get a fair hearing whenever they have a complaint, and that is all the organizations ask for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina has a number of technical amendments to present. Does he desire that they be considered en bloc?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Just the technical ones.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from South Carolina asked unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered at this time. I reserve the right to object until such time as I may be able to get a clearance, through the minority leader, relating to the disposition of one particular amendment at this time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, while the Senator from Maine, who is presently acting as minority leader, is trying to get clearance, I should like to say that I appreciate everything the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] said about me, the committee, the committee staff, and the work which the committee has done in the past. I wish also to say that since I have been a Member of the Senate he has been on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and he has been a faithful worker at all times, and has acquitted himself excellently, both as chairman and as ranking minority member. After the Senator was off the committee for a brief period he returned, and he is working just as faithfully on the committee as he ever did. I wish to thank him for his cooperation.

I desire also to thank all the Democratic and Republican members of the committee for working faithfully with me, and trying to have reported from the committee what I believe to be a bill which will result in a much better civil-service retirement law being put on the statute books.

If the bill should be passed and enacted into law it will, in my opinion, mean much to the Federal Government and employees who work for the Federal Government, because it will provide a greater incentive for Government employees to remain in Government service. One thing that has hindered the departments in the past has been that after a person has entered the Government service, and has just about become familiar with the duties of his office, he has started looking around for greener fields. We think that a better retirement system will deter so many employees from leaving.

Mr. President, at this time I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to the committee amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

---

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 11177 making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia.

Does the bill contain emergency funds for the FHA?

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill increases the loan authority for FHA rural farm ownership loans by $5 million. It also increases loan authorizations under the production and subsistence program.

Mr. LANGER. Can the distinguished Senator tell me how this loan authority would operate?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not involve farm housing. That subject is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I understand that in the near future there will be before the Senate a bill dealing with that subject.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Title I—Regular Activities—Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 3, line 7, after the word "stations", to strike out "$49,972,000" and insert "$49,676,400", and in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,300-000" and insert "$1,900,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the chairman will recall the letter which I wrote him and with which I enclosed some communications calling attention to the fact that there were more requests in many counties with reference to the rotation practice, under which grass and legumes are planted, than there were funds to honor them. Funds for the Department were allocated last year to the several States, and it developed, I think, that some twenty States are finding that there is an insufficient amount of funds to meet all the requests received. Since these requests all referred to good soil-conservation practices, it occurred to me that it would be well if an increase in funds could be made available, and I so stated in a letter to the chairman. It came after the hearings were concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the appropriation to which the Senator refers is made to carry on the agricultural conservation program. It was suggested that a revolving fund be set up with a reserve of $5 million to take care of these practices. The committee examined into the matter and concluded that $5 million was not adequate for the purpose, and we have made an increase in the appropriation of $25 million, which makes the total appropriation for that purpose $250 million. In addition, there is a carry-over from the 1954 program of $25 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman and to the committee for the action which they have taken. It seemed to me that particularly since the so-called soil-bank program would be limited in its application this year, at best, it was highly desirable that these conservation practices, particularly in the field of rotating crops and getting out of surplus crops into grass and legumes, should be encouraged.

The action of the committee, as I understand, will make the additional $25 million available for apportionment among the States, so that they can meet their extraordinary requests for these other practices.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the hope of the committee that the sum will be entirely

adequate to provide for the condition which the Senator from South Dakota has described, which is more or less acute in a number of States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to inquire about the appropriation shown on page 7 of the report, title 1, with reference to the animal disease laboratory facilities. As I understand, the House approved $10 million for this item. The Budget request was for about $18,900,000. The Senate deleted the entire amount.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wyoming is correct. This is a very important program, one in which the committee is very much interested. But the committee did not approve of the location of the proposed laboratory at Beltsville, Md., in the very environs of the city of Washington. A provision was included in the report directing the Department to confer with the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to the location of the laboratory.

If an agreement can be reached as to the location of the laboratory at some suitable place, somewhere near the location of the large animal population of the country, and where the animals can be treated and be easily subject to the cures which may be found for animal diseases, I do not think the Senate conferees will insist on this provision.

We are not satisfied that the location of the proposed laboratory shall be at Beltsville. The committee over a period of years has undertaken to restrict the concentration of all types of agricultural research at Beltsville. This is a great country. Different conditions exist in different areas. The committee felt that some of the research work to be done on diseases of animals should be carried on in the areas where the animals are infested with the diseases. Certainly Beltsville, Md., is not a central point of the cattle population of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. I certainly agree with that particular statement. I should like to ask if any money has already been spent for the building of the proposed facility at the Beltsville station.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not to my knowledge. Congress made an appropriation to prepare plans for the laboratory, but at that time no indication was given to the committee that it was proposed to locate the laboratory at Beltsville. A very comprehensive set of plans has been prepared. The plans were submitted to the committee. They seem to be completely adequate for what we had in mind, namely, to have the greatest research center for animal disease in the entire world.

But there was some waste in the plans. Taking cognizance of the fact that Washington would be one of the first targets of atomic attack, several hundred thousand dollars were provided for strengthening the walls of the buildings so as to reduce the effect of possible bomb explosions over Washington. That and similar matters make it most important to locate the proposed laboratory at some other place.

If Washington is to be the target of an atomic attack, we do not want to have the animal diseases released to follow in the wake of death and devastation by atomic attack, by reason of having such a laboratory located near the Capital City.

Mr. BARRETT. The committee, then, believes that the location of the laboratory is the determining factor at present, does it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall read from the committee report, in which there was unanimous agreement:

> The committee supports the establishment of adequate facilities for research on animal diseases, but does not approve the budget request for building the laboratory, and further concentrating this work, at Beltsville, Md. The committee believes that before it recommends an appropriation for the establishment of a national animal disease research facility, the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should approve the project, including its location.
>
> In connection with the long-range research program the committee requests the Department to make a study of its needs for research facilities and report to the committee.

We are heartily in favor of the laboratory; all we ask is that the Department and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry come to an agreement as to where the laboratory shall be located.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the effect of the action by the committee be to hold the matter in abeyance for 1 year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not necessarily. It was generally understood in the committee that if the Department saw fit to consult with the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry before the conference was held on the bill, the Senate conferees might even recede in this bill. But if a decision has not been reached by that time, there will still be several supplemental and deficiency appropriation measures to be considered before the adjournment of Congress, and that will give the Department of Agriculture adequate time to consult with the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and for Congress to make an appropriation this year. If the Department is diligent, there should be no cause for delay in the construction of the laboratory.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. Is it not true that Beltsville is better equipped for research than any other place in the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department testified that the facilities needed did not exist at Beltsville; that the existing facilities could not be used, and that new ones must be constructed. Undoubtedly there are a number of scientists at Beltsville.

Mr. BEALL. Beltsville has the personnel with which to do the work.

Mr. RUSSELL. The testimony before the committee indicated that the Department would be compelled to hire 300 new experts in science to conduct the research. They are not now at Beltsville; they would have to be recruited for this work.

Mr. BEALL. But there are scientists working in hospitals in the vicinity of Baltimore and Washington, and land is available at Beltsville. Why not utilize Beltsville for this purpose? Beltsville has a research plant.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I can understand the diligence with which the Senator seeks to further the purposes of the Department of Agriculture in concentrating everything at Beltsville. But Congress has gone rather far in that direction already. A large amount of research has been conducted at Beltsville on plants which are not indigenous to Maryland and this area. A great deal of research is done at Beltsville on animals. Although Maryland is a great agricultural State, it does not stand preeminent among the cattle-producing States of the Nation.

Mr. BEALL. But there must have been a reason for establishing the research station originally at Beltsville.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was for the same reason which is given every time any new research project is created. The Department wants it located at Beltsville, where it will be convenient for the Secretary of Agriculture and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of research to ride out in an automobile and look things over.

Also, very naturally, the scientists who are already employed here like Washington—or Maryland, if they happen to reside in Maryland. Therefore, they have every reason to want to continue to reside in Washington or in the great Free State of Maryland; they dislike to move somewhere else. For that reason, research has been pyramided upon research at Beltsville.

A great deal of the research, I say in all candor, cannot be done as effectively at Beltsville as it could be done in areas where the plants are more afflicted by disease, or where the large herds of cattle are infested. There are other areas which have a scientific interest in these conditions. Many States have excellent colleges for veterinarians. I observed the Senator from North Dakota rise to ask me some questions. I visited an excellent college for veterinarians at Fargo, in his State. It is one of the best in the Nation. There are many other places where the proposed laboratory could be located.

While I appreciate the zeal of the Senator from Maryland in protecting his State, I must say that the committee does not feel that Beltsville is an appropriate location for the proposed laboratory.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I rose for the very reason which the distinguished Senator from Georgia mentioned. We have a very fine laboratory at Fargo, N. Dak. It is perhaps the last place in the United States which would be bombed. That is one reason why the proposed laboratory should be located there. I hope the

chairman and the other members of the Senator's committee may see fit to have the laboratory located at Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. RUSSELL. That will be up to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The testimony before the committee, given by Assistant Secretary Peterson, who was very frank, was to the effect that they could locate the laboratory almost anywhere where there was a veterinarians' school. I knew at that time that there was such a school in North Dakota. Also, there is one in Georgia; a very excellent school.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator state how much money is appropriated for REA, and how the amount compares with the appropriation of last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. The total amount available for the Rural Electrification Administration for electrification loans, for fiscal 1957, including a reserve of $68.7 million, is $214 million, as compared with a total for 1956 including the reserve of $260 million.

But it must be pointed out that there was a considerable carryover from 1956, and the Rural Electrification Cooperatives requested $214 million, which is the amount which is made available in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Could the distinguished Senator give us similar information about the telephone program?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. For the telephone program there is available, including the reserve, the sum of $100 million for fiscal 1957. I might say the representatives of the Rural Electric Cooperatives, who also spoke for the telephone program, requested that amount of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell us approximately the amount that was spent last year for the telephone program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the figures somewhere in my papers, but I do not recall them at the moment.

Mr. LANGER. I want to say, in passing, that that program has not been carried out as well as has the REA program, at least in the Northwestern part of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it has not moved forward as rapidly, because in some sections the cooperatives have been rather slow about submitting their applications for loans. In addition, there is a great deal of difference between the telephone program and the rural electrification program as pertains, for example, to the distances between houses and the standards that are fixed in the bill. I do not know whether in the administration of the program the tendency has been to restrict it, but it has not been for lack of money that it has not gone forward faster. We have made available more money than has been expended.

Mr. LANGER. There does not seem to have been the "push" behind the telephone program on the part of the administration that there was behind the REA program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer as to that.

I might say to the Senator from North Dakota, in response to the question he previously asked, that the carryover for the telephone program in unexpended funds for this fiscal year is $33,556,176.

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to direct the chairman's attention to the item for agricultural research, which begins on page 3 of the report. The item I have in mind is in the middle of page 4 and refers to the payments to States.

To get my question before the chairman, I should like to make a statement and ask a question. The statement is rather lengthy, and contains factual background.

Mr. President, the amount of funds made available for agricultural research and education by our agriculture subcommittee is indeed gratifying. I consider this as one of the best and most forward-looking programs that the committee has ever approved. I visualize the appropriations made available for fiscal year 1957 as a step in the right direction and one which will lead to an expanded long-range program. Our committee increased Federal research funds by $9,471,245 over fiscal year 1956, and increased research payments to States by $6 million over last year. We also provided an increase of $5,625,000 for the Cooperative Extension Service Program.

Our committee made one important change in the budget recommendations by transferring $1,250,000 from Federal research to research payments to States. The committee did not include a statement in the report as to how the Department should handle this transfer. I understand that the Department of Agriculture plans to handle this transfer by making an across-the-board cut on all Federal research projects to make up for this transfer.

I do not believe that this was at all the intent of the committee. It was my understanding that the committee desired the transfer of $1,250,000 to the States to be used according to the justification of special research projects by the land-grant college representatives to our committee. This procedure would not interfere with the overall research program, but would mean a transfer of a part of Federal projects and funds to States to be used for the same purpose. In other words, State justifications indicate that if they had $1,250,000 more funds, they would use $344,000 of this total for animal production research.

In this case, I visualize this as a reduction of $344,000 for animal production research at the Federal level, and an increase of $344,000 for animal production research at the State level. It would seem logical to apply the same procedure to all of the items mentioned in the State justification. This would appear to be a far more logical way of taking care of this transfer rather than an across-the-board transfer of funds for all Federal research projects.

I should like to ask the Senator, based on the facts which I have outlined as a background, if I have correctly stated the intention of the committee in transferring the funds from the Federal to the State level.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure I can answer that question categorically. That was the intention of the committee. The Senator from Mississippi knows, of course, that the question of the Federal-State research has been a matter of great concern to the committee for several years. It has been felt that when States have a problem immediately at hand, and have a staff of experts, they are better qualified to deal with problems of sectional or local character than is the United States Department of Agriculture.

I have in my hand a table relating to the estimated distribution of increases in payments to the States, which includes the entire $1,250,000, to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred. The first item indicates that the estimated distribution of the increase in payments under the Senate bill would bring $344,000 to animal production research. It was felt that, instead of this being done by the Federal Government, that instead it be done by the States.

I also hold in my hand a table which gives the estimated distribution of the increase in payment to States, which shows how the transfer affects each State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two tables to which I have made reference may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

*Estimated distribution of the increases in payments to States for 1957 by subject-matter fields*

| Field of research | Estimated distribution of budget estimates, House bill | Estimated distribution of increase (+) under Senate bill | Estimated distribution of total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Animal production | $250,000 | +$344,000 | $594,000 |
| Animal diseases | 440,000 | 56,000 | 496,000 |
| Grass and forage crop production | 337,000 | 46,000 | 383,000 |
| Field crop production | 135,000 | 189,500 | 324,500 |
| Horticulture and forest crop production | 221,000 | 206,000 | 427,000 |
| Plant diseases and insects | 598,000 | 76,000 | 674,000 |
| Soils | 205,000 | 23,000 | 228,000 |
| Water use and conservation | 322,000 | 36,000 | 358,000 |
| Farm mechanization and structures | 322,000 | 40,000 | 362,000 |
| Economics of production | 459,000 | 51,000 | 510,000 |
| Marketing and utilization | 1,025,500 | 115,000 | 1,140,500 |
| Foods, human nutrition, and home economics | 293,000 | 30,000 | 323,000 |
| Administration | 142,500 | 37,500 | 180,000 |
| Total | 4,750,000 | 1,250,000 | 6,000,000 |

*Estimated distribution of the increase in payments to States for 1957*

| | Estimated distribution of budget estimates | Estimated distribution of increase under Senate bill | Estimated distribution of total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | $105,400 | $27,737 | $133,137 |
| Alaska | 20,803 | 5,474 | 26,277 |
| Arizona | 29,977 | 7,889 | 37,866 |
| Arkansas | 87,486 | 23,023 | 110,509 |
| California | 95,026 | 25,007 | 120,033 |
| Colorado | 39,618 | 10,426 | 50,044 |
| Connecticut | 32,034 | 8,430 | 40,464 |
| Delaware | 23,012 | 6,056 | 29,068 |
| Florida | 51,770 | 13,624 | 65,394 |
| Georgia | 109,077 | 28,704 | 137,781 |
| Hawaii | 27,648 | 7,276 | 34,924 |
| Idaho | 34,501 | 9,079 | 43,580 |
| Illinois | 100,771 | 26,519 | 127,290 |
| Indiana | 87,314 | 22,977 | 110,291 |
| Iowa | 88,774 | 23,362 | 112,136 |
| Kansas | 61,256 | 16,120 | 77,376 |
| Kentucky | 109,055 | 28,699 | 137,754 |
| Louisiana | 74,237 | 19,536 | 93,773 |
| Maine | 35,098 | 9,236 | 44,334 |
| Maryland | 44,063 | 11,595 | 55,658 |
| Massachusetts | 39,461 | 10,384 | 49,845 |
| Michigan | 95,411 | 25,108 | 120,519 |
| Minnesota | 86,241 | 22,695 | 108,936 |
| Mississippi | 108,851 | 28,645 | 137,496 |
| Missouri | 96,104 | 25,290 | 121,394 |
| Montana | 32,859 | 8,647 | 41,506 |
| Nebraska | 53,985 | 14,207 | 68,192 |
| Nevada | 20,834 | 5,483 | 26,317 |
| New Hampshire | 26,301 | 6,921 | 33,222 |
| New Jersey | 39,057 | 10,278 | 49,335 |
| New Mexico | 32,878 | 8,652 | 41,530 |
| New York | 95,929 | 25,244 | 121,173 |
| North Carolina | 147,815 | 38,899 | 186,714 |
| North Dakota | 41,531 | 10,929 | 52,460 |
| Ohio | 114,871 | 30,229 | 145,100 |
| Oklahoma | 70,809 | 18,634 | 89,443 |
| Oregon | 45,819 | 12,058 | 57,877 |
| Pennsylvania | 123,182 | 32,416 | 155,598 |
| Puerto Rico | 101,607 | 26,739 | 128,346 |
| Rhode Island | 21,997 | 5,789 | 27,786 |
| South Carolina | 83,721 | 22,032 | 105,753 |
| South Dakota | 41,078 | 10,810 | 51,888 |
| Tennessee | 110,779 | 29,152 | 139,931 |
| Texas | 147,975 | 38,941 | 186,916 |
| Utah | 28,469 | 7,492 | 35,961 |
| Vermont | 28,072 | 7,387 | 35,459 |
| Virginia | 94,592 | 24,893 | 119,485 |
| Washington | 52,116 | 13,715 | 65,831 |
| West Virginia | 68,450 | 18,013 | 86,463 |
| Wisconsin | 87,555 | 23,041 | 110,596 |
| Wyoming | 24,731 | 6,508 | 31,239 |
| Total | 3,420,000 | 900,000 | 4,320,000 |
| Regular reserve fund | 1,187,500 | 312,500 | 1,500,000 |
| Administration | 142,500 | 37,500 | 180,000 |
| Total | 4,750,000 | 1,250,000 | 6,000,000 |

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia very much for his very complete reply, which I think makes very explicit the intention of the committee on this problem. I should like to express the hope that the chairman, insofar as he can, will maintain that position in the conference on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. That certainly would be my position, and I hope that if we can get the House to accept the Senate amendment, that matter can be clearly stated in the report of the conferees.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to the Senator that the people in the West are very much interested in some experiments which have been carried on at the Colorado A. and M. College at Fort Collins, Colo., with reference to sealing irrigation canals with bentonite. I appeared before the committee and urged that an item be inserted in the bill to carry on those experiments. I may say the House report indicates that the committee was in favor of the provision, but, referring to page 6 of the House report, I find this statement:

> Another has to do with the need for further research on colloidal sediments for sealing irrigation canals. The committee has not dealt separately with each of these because the Department, within the large amounts provided in this bill for research, has ample authority and funds to meet these and other similar research problems.

I take it that the Senate committee takes the same position, and that these same experiments can be carried on. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understood the testimony of the Senator from Wyoming, it was that he was supporting the House provision. We did not touch it. It is in the bill just as it came to us. It certainly is the position of the Senate committee that it approved the research to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

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

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

Mr. THYE. I am very much interested in the question of the livestock research laboratory. In the House bill there are funds provided in the amount of $10 million. In the Senate committee bill there are no funds provided. I regret that I was not present in the Appropriations Committee at the time this particular item was up for discussion by the committee.

Therefore, I was not then able to plead my cause, so to speak.

I suggest to the chairman of the subcommittee that we consider amending the bill in such a way as to provide for appropriation of the $18,915,000 which was called for in the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation for this research laboratory, because I believe it would be a mistake for us to permit a lag to develop in this research activity into animal diseases. That is evident because annually we suffer a loss of almost $800 million as a result of animal diseases of various sorts. In addition, there is the danger that humans will be contaminated by many of those diseases. Therefore we should proceed to take steps to make progress in this research activity, rather than permit it to come to a standstill—whether for 6 months or for a year or for a longer period—because of a lack of appropriations.

I believe that if we include a provision for the necessary funds in the bill, then the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senate Appropriations Committee can request representatives of the animal husbandry division of the Department of Agriculture to testify before them and to make known the needs in connection with such a research laboratory, including the ground space necessary for the protection of the workers and the citizens who reside near the laboratory. In that way, the proper determination can be made.

That is the procedure that was followed in connection with the establishment of the research laboratory dealing with the hoof-and-mouth disease. The Congress appropriated the necessary funds, and instructed the executive agency to decide on the proper location. That was done, and today some very excellent work is being done in the hoof-and-mouth disease laboratory.

In this case I believe we could well proceed in a similar manner, and I am sure that it is important that we do so. As evidence of that fact, let me state that I have received telephone calls from Dr. West, executive secretary of the Minnesota State Livestock Sanitary Board; and Dr. West tells me that if any lag were permitted to develop in connection with this activity, it would have a most serious effect upon the livestock industry of the Midwest.

I realize that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is vitally interested in agriculture, and is an apt student in that field, and that as chairman of the subcommittee he was only endeavoring to obtain as soon as possible the opinion of the Department of Agriculture in regard to the most suitable location for the research laboratory. In my opinion, the absence of such a statement was the reason why this item was not provided for in the Senate committee's version of the bill.

I believe we can safeguard ourselves in this connection by writing in the report or stating during the present colloquy that we wish to be sure that both the Department of Agriculture and the research technicians working in such a laboratory will present us with their recommendations.

I might suggest that the laboratory be located in the Midwest; but if I were to do so, I would seemingly be acting on the basis of a selfish interest. Therefore, I shall not make a recommendation that the laboratory be established adjacent to my own State.

I believe that in the pending bill we should provide the necessary funds; and then we should urge that representatives of the Department of Agriculture testify before the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and make their recommendations to those committees. In that manner, I believe we could assure the approval within the next 6 months of a research laboratory.

I believe that the establishment of such a laboratory is a necessity, particularly in view of the fact that it was necessary to suspend some of the activities in the Department of Agriculture because of the fear of contamination of the employees in the Department of Agriculture building where a spread of the disease through the corridors of the building was threatened as a result of improper ventilation within the laboratory.

As I understand, the necessary facilities do not exist at the Beltsville plant, and the work in this field cannot be expanded there. I further understand that the facilities and site at Denver are inadequate, and that the employees there are being endangered. Therefore, this entire research activity is threatened with being brought to a standstill or with being shut down.

In connection with this matter, I should like to refer to an amendment I have had drawn. My amendment provides that, on page 6, the matter pro-

posed to be stricken out in lines 17 through 21 be restored, and that in line 20 the figures "$10,000,000" be stricken out, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the figures "$18,915,000."

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, so that it may be available at the appropriate time, as we proceed to act on the bill.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for yielding to me, in order to permit me to make this explanation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have been glad to yield, and I shall discuss the Senator's amendment when it is reached in its proper place in the bill.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have already undertaken to explain that the committee was not indifferent to this subject. We had very lengthy hearings on this matter, and we tried to obtain from the Department a statement as to where it would locate the laboratory. In its report, the House committee stated that they did not favor locating the laboratory at Beltsville. However, the Department indicated a disregard for that view of the House committee, and the Department, in its appeal letter, did not state that it would consider locating the laboratory at any other place.

The Senator from Minnesota is a little more confident of what the Department would do than the committee was at the hearings. We went very fully into all these matters, including the diseases and the personnel requirements.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to add—and let me say that I was reluctant to do so earlier, for fear that the distinguished Senator from Georgia would believe I was taking a selfish attitude if I proposed that the project be established in my own State——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will say unhesitatingly that it is my opinion, after dealing with these research programs over a period of 24 years, that I think it would be better to locate the laboratory somewhere other than at Beltsville. I do not know where the laboratory should be established. I do not say it should be established in Minnesota. But I know that Beltsville is not the proper place for the laboratory; I know that.

Mr. THYE. In Minnesota, a site comprising more than 800 acres is now only partly in use.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not undertaking to say where the laboratory should be located.

Mr. THYE. But I should like to make an explanation for the RECORD. The Gopher ordnance plant and ammunition plant was established at Rosemont, in Minnesota, during the war, and the plant is still intact. The building and roads have been installed. The site is now being operated by the University of Minnesota, in connection with its research work. That plant has sufficient land, sewerage, water, and highways to accommodate such a research laboratory; and I should like to call that site to the attention of the Congress, because the Government owns that property, and the facilities there have been developed in such a way that only a minimum of expense would be involved if the research laboratory were located there.

I refer to that site only for the information of the Members of Congress; I am not taking a selfish attitude in that connection, for I believe that at this time the most important consideration is to have provision made at once for establishment of the research laboratory, and that should be done by having such an item included in this appropriation bill. Thereafter, the best location for the project can be determined, as we proceed to discuss the matter with representatives of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Congress votes to include this money in the pending bill, the books will be closed, I may say, insofar as this matter is concerned, and the laboratory will be established at Beltsville. We have done everything within our power to get the Department of Agriculture to show that it is even aware of the fact that Congress has any say-so in connection with the location of the laboratory.

We have asked them, in the committee report, to come before the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and discuss the question. So far as I am aware, the Department has not lifted its hand. If the Senate wishes to vote to establish the laboratory at Beltsville and close the door on any sensible and logical location, all it has to do is to adopt the amendment proposed by my friend from Minnesota. I have tried in every way to persuade the Department to discuss with the standing committee the very important matter of the proper location for perhaps the most important laboratory the Department of Agriculture will operate.

Mr. THYE. I absolutely agree with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that Beltsville is not the best place to locate the research laboratory, because the Department is already short of space at that location. It is in a densely populated area. It is not desirable to have the research laboratory in the Department of Agriculture facility at Beltsville, because of the danger of contamination. Certainly we should not place the research laboratory adjacent to all the cattle and other livestock which, for several decades, we have been developing and building up through research and breeding. Certainly we should not locate the research laboratory, where animal diseases are confined for purposes of research, in such a location as Beltsville, because the result might well be to contaminate all the livestock which we have at that location in research projects. So I definitely share the conviction of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that the labortory should not be located at Beltsville. I have been there several times, and I know exactly the area which the Department has. I am familiar with the number of livestock concentrated in that area as research livestock. For many decades we have been engaged in the development of various breeds. The proposed laboratory should be at a place where it could be isolated, and where it would not be a source of constant danger of contamination to livestock which might be carriers of various diseases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 8.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief question, and a request for an observation on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the bill as passed by the House, in connection with the subject of soil conservation and water resources, I note that the Bureau of the Budget recommended $1,055,000, and I believe the House added another $386,000 or $387,000, making a total of $1,441,910.

My question to the chairman of the subcommittee is this: Does the bill, as reported by the Senate committee, carry the amounts proposed to be appropriated by action of the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. As it appears from the bill before us, the Senate committee affirms the action of the House in making this increase, which I think is completely justified, because of the importance of the work. If the bill as now before the Senate shall be passed, this item will not even be in conference. The appropriation will be $1,441,910.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement which I have prepared on the subject of the soil and water conservation programs.

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

The committee in its usual manner of thoroughness and wisdom has done a highly commendable job. The bill presented to us reflects the committee's knowledge that it is providing not merely for the operations of an important department of the Government, but is, in fact, dealing with many practical matters that affect the welfare of all farm families.

I particularly like and appreciate the emphasis placed by the committee on soil and water conservation.

I take my stand with the committee in favor of accelerated operations by the Soil Conservation Service in locally organized locally controlled Soil Conservation Districts and in the watershed programs, including the pilot watersheds mentioned by the committee report, and in favor of accelerated scientific studies by the Agricultural Research Service on problems of soil and water conservation. On this last matter, I should like to ask a question. It is not entirely clear to me how the funds in this bill compare with the amount for conservation research recommended by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and how it compares with the amount voted by the House of Representatives.

The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts which has no axes to grind and no interests to promote except public-spirited interest in the preservation of our resources for the good of present and future generations, has wisely called our attention to the many problems that need scientific study and has estimated that research in this field

should be increased at the rate of about $3 million a year for several years. This is a small amount of money in relation to the value of the resources we are seeking to protect and in relation to the amounts of money being appropriated for action programs.

I was happy to note that the bill as recommended by the House Appropriations Committee and passed by the House included not only the $1,055,000 recommended in the budget but a considerable amount in addition. I am informed that the increase for soil- and water-conservation research as the bill passed the House was $386,910 above the budget estimate or a total increase of $1,441,910. I trust that the bill as it is now presented to the Senate includes no less than that amount, and I should be happy to learn that it includes as much as was recommended by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. Would the chairman of the subcommittee please reassure me on this important matter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one further question, in reference to the REA funds. The Senator from Georgia may recall that last year we changed the formula relating to the allocation of Rural Electrification Administration funds. As I understand the bill, there is an item of $214 million for the REA, of which $145,300,000 is in regular funds, and the balance is held in what is known as the contingency fund. That action was taken by the House, and I gather that the Senate committee has done exactly the same thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. We did not disturb the appropriation made by the House. The total was $214 million, which was the amount requested by the rural electric cooperatives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The point which the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association raises is in connection with the necessity of having a substantial share of the $214 million plus, in what might be called a contingency fund. The reason is that the formula was altered by Congress in 1955.

I shall read a letter dated May 21, 1956, addressed to me by the president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D. C., May 21, 1956.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: By resolution adopted by our national board of directors meeting here in Washington today, I am writing you this urgent letter about the electric loan funds in the pending agricultural appropriations bill.

Based on NRECA's annual survey, our elected national legislative committee requested the committees of both Houses to authorize not less than $214 million in regular electric loan funds for fiscal 1957.

The House has authorized $214 million in electric funds, but only $145.3 million is in regular funds. The Senate committee has recommended $214 million but, like the House, has placed all of this in the contingency fund except the $145.3 million.

The significance of the House and Senate committee action is that REA schedules a loan program based on regular funds—and in the past has used contingency funds only to get around the State allocation formula. This situation would not arise under the new formula enacted by the Congress last year as an amendment to the Rural Electrification Act.

Since that formula was altered by Congress in 1955, we fear that the drawdown of contingency funds would not be held justified on this basis as in the past. Indeed, between the new law and Bureau of the Budget regulations, we do not know what the status of contingency funds is.

We believe most strongly that the whole $214 million should be scheduled in the month-by-month loan allocations by REA—if and as required—or, we fear, the program will suffer.

We urge most strongly that the Senate mark the entire $214 million as regular loan funds.

We sincerely hope that our fine friends on the House and Senate committees and our friends in the House as a whole will not take this request as a reflection upon them. Our confidence and faith in our friends is complete and unshakeable, but we fear there is misunderstanding of the significance of this action.

Whether the funds authorized are regular or contingency funds, they will in neither case represent an expense to the Government until or unless they are loaned and advanced to the rural electric systems. We are urging this change in the bill only to protect the program—not to increase the cost of the program.

Please make the full $214 million available as regular funds.

Sincerely,

J. E. SMITH,
*President*
(For the board of directors).

My question to the chairman of the subcommittee is this: In the light of the change in formula, and in view of the fact that the contingency funds were frequently used to bypass limitations upon certain State allocations, the formula having been removed from the law, why should there be any necessity of having a so-called contingency fund, particularly when it might be interpreted as being so much money set aside which could not be used at all under existing law?

Mr. RUSSELL. I received a letter similar to the one which the Senator has read. Frankly, I could not understand how it could be applied to what has been done in this case.

The bill does not establish any contingency fund. It merely divides the appropriation into two parts, one of $145,300,000 which was the amount of the budget estimate, and a second item of $68,700,000, for the rural-electrification program. The bill does not say anything about a contingency. It says that the money may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions, to the extent that such additional funds are required during the fiscal year 1957, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

The action of the House merely divided the appropriation into two parts. First, it set up the fund which the Bureau of the Budget requested and then it made an additional appropriation of $68,700,000, making a total of $214 million.

So far as I can understand from a reading of this authorization, it does not put any of the money into a contingency fund. It merely divides the appropriation into two parts, and says that, if it is needed for the expeditious development of the program, the entire $214 million is available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So, as the Senator understands, for all practical purposes the $214 million is appropriated without any limitations, except as the needs of the program may require the use of such funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly. I think the $68,700,000 is just as much available to be loaned under the program as is the $145,300,000. I think the same is true of the rural-telephone program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So there is no justification for assuming the existence of a contingency fund, since it is not found in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think so. There is merely a division of the appropriation into two parts. Heretofore, the language referred to emergency contingency funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. That language had a definite meaning, because such a fund was provided for in the basic law. However, this bill merely divides the appropriation into two parts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the light of the fact that the formula and the law have been changed, the change would obviously mean that the previous understanding, or the previous definition of contingency funds, would no longer apply. For all practical purposes, this would be one appropriation, but divided into two parts.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One, to recognize the Bureau of the Budget request, and apparently the other to recognize the good judgment of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the construction I place upon it. I would have no objection to making it all one item, but I believe that this provision makes the total appropriation available. It is now in such form that it could not be changed one iota in conference.

I would ask the Senator from Minnesota to read that language very carefully, and to consider whether it does not lead him to the conclusion that no contingency fund is involved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask the Senator from Georgia whether the House committee report contains any explanatory language in respect to this item?

Mr. RUSSELL. That I cannot say.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder what the House report says in that connection.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does mention a contingency fund. I read from page 15 of the House committee report:

Loan authorizations: The budget for 1957 included the sum of $145,300,000 for rural electrification loans, together with a contingency fund of $25 million. The budget also included the sum of $49,500,000 for the rural telephone program. In view of strong representations from the REA co-ops throughout the country that total funds of $214 million will be required for rural electrification loans, instead of $170,300,000 included in the budget, the committee has increased the contingency fund by the sum of $43,700,000. Also, in view of indications that $100 million may be required for the rural telephone programs in lieu of the sum of $49,500,000 included in the budget, the committee has

included a contingency fund of $50,500,000 for loans under that program.

The figures included in the bill for loan purposes are merely limitations on the amounts which may be borrowed from the Treasury to meet loan applications approved by REA under its regulations. Money is not drawn from the Treasury until loans have been finally approved and an advance of funds has been authorized. Therefore, the authorization of amounts for this purpose in the appropriation bill does not affect Treasury balances until funds are actually required.

That seemed to be the reason for dividing it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say most respectfully that perhaps the use of the language results from habit more than anything else, inasmuch as over a long period of time we have always had two categories, one the regular loan fund and the other the contingency fund. However, last year, as the Senator from Georgia may recall, we modified the formula in the REA Act, and it is now unnecessary to have a contingency-fund allocation.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of the funds are made available for loans wherever needed under the terms of the act we passed last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the language used, it seems to me that the appropriation is divided into two parts. There is no contingency-fund provision now on the statute books. Certainly this language does not create a contingency fund, even though it is so referred to in the House report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has there been any question raised thus far with respect to this item, as reported by the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are still dealing with committee amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What I hope will happen is that in the Senate we will make one fund of the $214 million; that we will put that money into one figure or fund. Then, if there is to be a conference for any reason, the matter can be ironed out. In that way there could be a meeting of all minds. I say that because otherwise we may get into a situation in which either the Comptroller General or the REA may put a different interpretation on the language than we have in mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my judgment, it would be very difficult to make an interpretation of this language which would be taken to mean that a contingency fund had been set up, when such a fund is not even mentioned in the bill, and when such a provision was expressly repealed by Congress at the last session.

However, speaking only for myself, I would have no objection to a lumping of the appropriation. At the same time, I believe it would be better to leave the matter stand as it is, because the sum of $214 million is undoubtedly available for any loan that is approved by the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator. I will bow to his judgment, because I know of his dedication to this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator has any difference of opinion or any doubt on it, I will not resist an amendment along the line he suggests. In my opinion, however, when we get a matter that is satisfactorily taken care of and approved by both Houses of Congress, nothing can possibly happen to it. It is not in conference, and it is all buttoned up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only thing I worry about, may I say to my good friend from Georgia, is that there is in the minds of the staff of the REA and other offices in the Department of Agriculture, a long continuity of separation of this fund. Such a separation has enjoyed a long background. As we know, a large amount of money was tied up in some States, and that money could not be used. Now, under the changed formula, it has been made available for use. I do not want to see any technicality in this connection. I know it takes some lawyers a long time, sometimes, to come up with an interpretation that turns out to be the proper one. Therefore, it seems to me it would simplify matters a great deal if we could clearly express our point of view, so that there would be no doubt whatever as to what is meant by the $214 million fund.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's point of view. I would suggest that we proceed with the consideration of the committee amendments. If, later, it seems desirable to the Senator that we proceed along the line of his suggestion, I will have no objection to an amendment. I say that, even though I am not sure that that would be a wise course to follow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I shall go into the matter a little more.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia with respect to the Soil Conservation Service item, mentioned at page 4 of the committee report. I read from the report as follows:

The committee recommends that the Department complete the pilot watershed program as rapidly as local conditions permit. It understands that the planned 5-year period originally contemplated will be exceeded and the original Federal cost estimates may in some cases be slightly larger than originally estimated.

What is the present situation with regard to that program; and are sufficient funds available with which to carry on and complete the program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is familiar with the fact, of course, that in an appropriation bill at one time we authorized 60 small pilot watersheds for improvement and protection. There was no attempt at limitation in any way with respect to the time within which the program should be completed, or within which time the projects authorized should be completed, even though some members of the committee were told that the program could be completed within a 5-year period, as referred to in the committee report. It has been found that some of the projects could not be completed within the 5-year period, and not all of them within the amounts originally estimated, due to increased costs. Therefore the language to which the Senator has referred was inserted in the committee report, merely as indicating the congressional intent, and as a clarification of the original program.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state to the chairman of the committee that I think that that is very helpful, because some of the projects under construction will not be completed, and we do not want to give the impression that we do not intend to complete them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly the committee has no such intention, and it makes it perfectly clear that it has no such intention. To construe the language otherwise would seem to me to reach a rather strange construction of the original appropriation act for these projects, because that act does not refer to a 5-year period. In the discussion of the program on the floor of the Senate it was stated that the program could be completed within that period of time, but the language in the report clears up any question that may have existed on that point, particularly as to the congressional intent; and the language we put in the report will allow the construction to take longer than 5 years and, in some cases, to slightly increase the original cost estimates.

Mr. CARLSON. In the State of Kansas we have some very fine pilot projects, and I know that there are others in other States also. I sincerely hope that they can serve as pilot projects, and I should like to see this work greatly expanded. I certainly hope the committee will keep that in mind as it goes into that program.

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator knows, these programs are carried on now under three different categories. One is under the Flood Control Act of 1944. That act has 11 projects in it. Then there are the 60 pilot watersheds. In addition, there are a large number of projects which are being approved almost daily under the watershed protection program. The amounts carried in the bill are over and above the budget estimates for all three categories of projects.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia for the increases which the House and Senate committees made in the upstream projects. I refer to all three categories the Senator has described. I feel that something must be done, however, in the near future to impress not only upon the Budget Office of the President but also upon the Soil Conservation Service, which administers these programs, that the need for more adequate financing is upon us.

I know the committee has well recognized the large number of projects which are coming in under the general upstream flood control program voted by the Congress approximately 2 years ago.

Little money is available even for a comprehensive survey to get final planning so that we can put the projects in work. Certainly, the 65 pilot projects are important.

I am tremendously interested in the 11 original upstream flood control dams. While they were in the Flood Control Act of 1944, they were originally authorized in 1940. It was only because of the war and the need for conserving funds and human effort that they were delayed that long. I had hoped that the committee would see fit to advance some funds for those original projects so that we could complete them at an early date for at least 1 or 2 watersheds.

It has been recommended by the national soil conservation organization as being necessary to give a permanent demonstration of how upstream flood control can eliminate floods on many of our major river systems.

Does not the Senator from Georgia think it will be possible to secure any further funds for any of those projects during this session?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I well know the great interest of the Senator from Oklahoma in these projects; and he well might be interested in them, not only from the standpoint of conservation on a national level, but one of them is the largest and most spectacular of the projects, the Washita project, which is located in the State of Oklahoma.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has given the committee and the Senate a liberal education with reference to that project over the past several years.

The total for the 11 projects has been increased by $1,300,000, and the Senator's project receives approximately $400,000 out of the $1,300,000 increase. While I know the Senator would like to have $3 million appropriated for Washita, the committee could not approve an amendment which would make that great a disparity between these projects. But I think I can assure the Senator that his arduous labors in connection with his project have not gone for naught. I anticipate that we shall continue to increase appropriations for this work next year and the year following, and that Washita will receive substantial increases. But I could not approve of any amendment at this time that would increase the total.

Mr. MONRONEY. I fully realize the situation, and I wish to express my appreciation of the assurances the Senator has given the Senate that other increases will be most seriously considered next year and the year after that, so that we may hope that in the not too distant future we shall be able to complete one of these projects as a demonstration of what upstream flood control can accomplish.

The reason why they were originally set up was to demonstrate the practicability of holding the water where it falls, in many small reservoirs.

It is with pleasure that I have received these assurances, and we shall be around next year doing our level best to get a more adequate amount of money for all three types of upstream flood control.

At this point, Mr. President, I would ask the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget to be more realistic with reference to the money necessary to carry out the program authorized by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, under Public Law 566, of which I was a cosponsor. More funds will be needed in the program created by his bill, or it will die of starvation because of inadequate appropriations. At the present rate from 50 to 75 years will be required to get sufficient appropriations to make a substantial impact on the applications which are coming in in large numbers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe that I do not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma has inspired the directors of the conservation district involved, or whether the directors have inspired the Senator, but, certainly, no project has been more diligently prosecuted before the committee and on the floor of the Senate than has the Washita project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

---

## PERCENTAGE OF PARITY RECEIVED BY AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on April 24 the Senate was deliberating on the farm bill, and I made the statement that farm products generally were being sold by farmers on an average of not to exceed 70 percent of parity.

The statement provoked quite a little debate. The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] took issue with my statement in rather positive and vigorous language. In fact, Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana went so far as to use language which, in effect, amounted to calling the Senator from Oklahoma a liar. The Senator from Indiana said the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma was false and that the Senator from Oklahoma knew it was false.

On April 25 the Senator from Indiana introduced for the RECORD certain statements from the Department of Agriculture which purported to give the prices which farmers are receiving in relation to parity.

It is my purpose at this time to document the accuracy of the statement I made with reference to farmers selling their products for an overall average of not to exceed 70 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from a Mr. Ivan M. Druley, of Milton, Ind., dated April 26, 1956, which reads as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR KERR: During the debate on the farm bill I read where you made the statement that many farm products were selling below 70 percent of parity and that beef cattle prices are below 60 percent of parity at present and hog prices below 50 percent of parity.
>
> I was glad to learn that you had made the statement in the Senate so it could be recorded, that people take a good look at it. I produce both beef and pork on my Indiana farm and I don't care how efficient an operator you are you will most certainly lose if you sell under present prices. With the philosophy that we are getting from the White House I can see no hope for the farmer. Things will not get better until some organized program comes along to raise the products the farmer sells for consumption to 100 percent of parity.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder if the Senator will permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum without his losing the floor.

Mr. KERR. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reading from the communication of a young farmer, I find that he, having sold one-fourth of a million pounds of pork last year, certainly would be in a position, at firsthand, to know the price he was receiving for his farm products.

So I say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] that when he accuses me of making statements falsely in saying that farmers have been selling their products at an average of not to exceed 70 percent of parity, he is making the accusation against the farmers of his own State.

I have another letter, this one from Mr. Lawrence Dorrell, of Greenwood, Ind. Mr. Dorrell says:

> Congratulations on your recent skirmish with Senator CAPEHART. If he made all of his living farming, he would have a better picture of the farm situation.
>
> We sold our hogs this winter for $12; or less than 60 percent parity. Could Senator CAPEHART live on 60 percent of the cost of living?
>
> Maybe we can keep him home for the next 6 years. We sure don't need him in Washington promotin' supply and demand for farmers.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LAWRENCE DORRELL.

When the Senator from Indiana accuses me of making false statements knowingly, when I say that farmers have been selling at less than 70 percent of parity, he is branding as liars the farmers of his own home State, particularly Mr. Lawrence Dorrell, of Greenwood, Ind., who says that he has been selling at less than 60 percent of parity.

I have a letter from Esta William Theobold, dated April 27, 1956. Mr. Theobold says:

> DEAR SENATOR KERR: Your recent debate on the Senate floor was of a great deal of interest to me. Being a farmer from Indiana, I was very interested when you took our Senator CAPEHART to task. His statement that farm parity is not 70 percent leaves a great deal of room for debate.
>
> I would say that 70 percent is an optimistic estimate, as I feel it is probably lower.
>
> I am enclosing sales slips that would point conclusively to this. Maybe they will be of some help in proving your point.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> ESTA WILLIAM THEOBOLD.
>
> SHELBYVILLE, IND.

I say to the Senator from Indiana that there is another farmer from his own

home State who says that, in his judgment, the value of farm products or the price of farm products has been below 70 percent of parity; and he speaks from the standpoint of one who has had the experience of selling.

I have a letter from Mr. Philip Cole, of Pittsboro, Ind., dated April 27, 1956. He says:

I read with a great deal of interest the report in the paper of your recent debate with Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana. Of special interest to me, since I am a farmer, was Senator CAPEHART's denial that farm parity now averages 70 percent.

I am enclosing sales slips which I received from the recent sales of hogs. These slips speak for themselves in proving your point. I hope they will be of help to you in backing up your statement.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP COLE.

PITTSBORO, IND.

I do not say that the Senator from Indiana knowingly and willfully made a statement which was false. All I say is that the Senator from Indiana simply did not know what he was talking about. What I am saying is that he has permitted himself to be misled by the propaganda of the Department of Agriculture, rather than take the trouble to find out from the labors and experiences of his own Indiana farmers what the reality was.

In his burst of enthusiasm for and devotion to a department which is unworthy of either, he got himself so hypnotized with his devotion to them and their devotion to error that he made statements which not only violated the rules of the Senate, but which violated the truth. I am proving it in the RECORD by the testimony of farmers from whom I have heard by the hundreds since the date of the debate. Without a single exception, they support and approve the statement which I made on the floor of the Senate.

Under date of April 28, 1956, I received from Robert E. Wilson, director of the Parmer County Grain Sorghum Association, of Bovina, Tex., the following telegram:

Following telegram sent Secretary of Agriculture Benson on 23d:

"We request that you please give some consideration to the grain-sorghum farmer. Grain sorghum is as basic to us as corn to the corn farmer. We have no appreciable acreage for any of the basic crops. The expense of producing grain sorghums is approximately the same as for corn, and the feed-value equivalent is no less than 95 percent of corn. We cannot believe that you can consider it fair to have a national average loan on corn of $2.68 per hundred plus support prices for overplanted acres, which I understand you are now working on, and, at the same time, support grain sorghums at only $1.80 per hundred, which means only about $1.55 to the farmer in this area. The 25-percent cut on grain sorghums last year put grain sorghum down to just about the cost of production, and many farmers lost their shirts. Actually, the grain-sorghum parity is so out of line with corn parity that instead of 70 percent of parity we only received approximately 48 percent of parity last year, based on the parity for corn. Do not think I am trying to get corn down; but we do think grain sorghum should not be discriminated against as compared with any other crop. The banks are refusing to loan us the money we must have to farm with, and we consider it imperative that some relief be given. I am practically a 100-percent grain-sorghum farmer myself, Mr. Benson, and I am convinced you are receiving a lot of bad advice somewhere along the line, as I cannot believe you can be the kind of man to permit such discrimination to exist as is now the case with grain sorghums if you are totally familiar with the facts."

Under date of April 27, 1956, I received from Mangum, Okla., the following telegram from Mr. Henry W. Worthington, secretary of the Greer County Farmers' Union:

Checked with 75 farmers and businessmen. All said that prices received by farmers were 5 percent below 1955 and that all farm commodities sold by farmers including livestock was from 65 percent of parity to 70 percent of parity. The cost of living is rising daily. Prices for what farmers have to buy are 5 to 6 percent higher than year ago.

Under date of April 27, 1956, I received from Max D. Carriker, box 545 Roby, Okla., the following telegram:

Understand Senator CAPEHART belatedly seeks information on 1955 farm income. I sold my grain sorghums for $1.35 per hundredweight and beef cattle for less than 14 cents average. Realized return of one and six-tenths percent net on investment in 1955 and nothing for labor. Had begun to think of myself as Benson's and Harper's inefficient country slicker until I learned Ike thought enough of us farmers that he would give us over $110 apiece through his advance payment soil bank in exchange for our vote and a good share of next year's crop. The general still remembers how to recruit, don't he? Two days furlough for four years reenlistment.

P. S.—FHA hesitated to finance this telegram without Benson's approval, so neighbors chipped in 25-cent-a-dozen egg money.

Let the Senator from Indiana go and talk to the farmers in that part of Texas, if he is in doubt as to their receiving less than 70 percent of parity for the products they sell.

I have in my hand a telegram from Bovina, Tex., which is dated April 28, and reads as follows:

BOVINA, TEX., *April 28, 1956.*

Senator ROBERT S. KERR,
*Washington, D. C.:*

For my livelihood I farm 640 acres of grain sorghums. I have 4 irrigation wells with an average lift of about 200 feet. Last fall I received $1.54 per hundred for my crop as compared with $2.14 in the fall of 1954 and $2.31 in 1953. My loss at this $1.54 price from my farming was $12,000 for the year. This $1.54 I received figures approximately 48 percent of parity based on corn parity since both grain sorghums and corn have about the same feed value and cost about the same to produce. The 70 percent from the administration we received last fall is very misleading as the parity they are using for grain sorghums is not a true parity when compared with other crops, namely, corn. Also the so-called $1.78 they said we received only figured $1.54 to us since they say we are below the national average. It seems to me the administration is very inconsistent making their pious talks about the huge surpluses and at the same time going into the commercial-corn areas and creating a support price of $2.68 per hundred on all corn on allotted acres plus a support of $2.23 per hundred on all corn produced over their allotted acres and still leaving grain sorghums at the same $1.54. It seems to me this $2.23 per hundred price on all corn produced should also be the minimum support price for grain sorghums if there is any such thing as a semblance of justice in the thinking. In 1952 grain sorghums at our local elevator during harvest were bringing $3 per hundred. Since Mr. Eisenhower has been in office this price has declined to their $1.54 figure. We will appreciate anything you might be able to do to help us as you can see we are in quite a squeeze. I can furnish you proof of these 1952 prices if you need it.

JACK SMITH.

LAZBUDDY, TEX.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a telegram from Hereford, Tex., which reads as follows:

HEREFORD, TEX., *April 28, 1956.*

Senator ROBERT S. KERR:

On my farming operation this year I was forced to take $1.54 per hundred for my grain-sorghums crop. This is the support rate as set by Mr. Benson and is in contrast to a price of $2.85 to $3.20 received in 1952. I had 330 acres of grain sorghums and my loss for the year was $5,000. If something is not done to put grain sorghums up we are all going to have to quit farming. The so-called largest farm organization in the United States which states the farmers are in favor of the sliding scale does not represent the thinking of the farmers, in my opinion, and it should be referred to as an insurance company instead of a farm organization.

LEON GRISSOM,
*Farmer.*

FARWELL, TEX.

I now read from a letter dated April 26, 1956, which was sent from Colorado City, Tex.:

I read of your debate with Senator CAPEHART concerning the farm prices and thought these figures might be of help to you in your further debate.

Last fall I received $1.40 per hundredweight for grain sorghum and $53 per ton for cottonseed and an average of approximately 28 cents per pound for cotton.

Mr. President, the farmer does not give the degree of parity, but $1.54 was described by one farmer as 43 percent of parity.

I now read from a letter written to me by Arch Thornton, of Chalk, Tex.:

I read of your fight on Senate floor with Senator CAPEHART, who I believe is one of the big-business Republicans.

Mr. President, I want to say he is a pretty smart farmer. If the rest of his letter is as accurate as is that conclusion, it is worthy of our confidence.

I appreciate your courageous fight for us farmers. I know we don't have a chance as long as we have Ike, Benson, and the other big business boys in Washington. I thought you could use the following information: I received less than 70 percent of parity last year for the crops grown on my farm. I received $1.40 per hundredweight for grain sorghum, $12.50 for hogs, calves $13.50, cottonseed $49 per ton, cotton $25.15.

Keep up the fight against the Farm Bureau Republican farm program; it will bankrupt all of us farmers.

Thanking your for your efforts.

Very truly yours,

ARCH THORNTON.

CHALK, TEX., COTTLE COUNTY.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from Vance H. Gilbreath, county judge, Motley County, Tex., which has about the same line of information.

I read a letter from J. E. Church, Wagoner, Okla.:

There seems to be some misunderstanding as to what the farmers get for their products, other than the basic crops.

This is to advise you that I sold 1,645 bushels of No. 2 oats on November 4, 1955 for 70 cents per bushel, which I hauled approximately 50 miles and after deducting 10 cents per bushel for delivering, I received 60 cents per bushel net, which is below 70 percent of parity.

Trusting this information will be helpful to you for your fight for parity prices for farm products.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. CHURCH.

ROUTE 1.
WAGONER, OKLA.

I have a statement from Ira J. Cook, of Snyder, Okla., which reads:

I had 218 acres of milo on my farm last year and sold 600,000 pounds at $1.54 per hundredweight.

I have a statement from Ray Hill, Kiowa County, Okla., which reads:

I had 35 acres of milo on my farm last year and sold 30,000 pounds at $1.50 per hundredweight.

I have a letter from Ray E. Aldrich, of Eads, Colo., which reads:

I understand you are having a difficult time to convince some of our eastern Senators and Congressmen that the farmer sold some of his agriculture commodities at prices below 72 percent of parity.

I would like to pass on to you some of my unpleasant experience in farming last November of 1955.

We have been plagued with drought for the past 5 years. I had a light sorghum crop which I had to sell at $1.65 per 100 pounds.

I also had to sell my cattle due to drought last fall at 8 cents a pound per 100 pounds for good Hereford cows; 12 cents to 13 cents a pound for steers.

I have come to the conclusion that as long as parity is that low a farmer just can't win for losing.

Most of the farmers will have to quit unless we can get a fair price for our farm commodities. By the farmer, I mean the family-sized farmer and not large corporation type farmers.

When the Senator from Indiana made the accusation that the one making the statement that farmers were receiving less than 70 percent of parity was guilty of willful falsehood, he addressed his remarks to the Senator from Oklahoma, but, in reality, they applied to the farmers on the land, whether they are in Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Indiana, or Illinois.

I have a letter from an Illinois farmer which reads:

My attention has recently been called to a statement reportedly made by Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, that hog prices in the Midwest during the past fall and winter season did not reach a low of 70 percent of legal parity.

Then he pays me some compliments, Mr. President, which my modesty prevents me from putting into the RECORD.

Hog prices——

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit the Senator from Oregon to have them inserted into the RECORD?

Mr. KERR. Under pressure, I so permit.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

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

Since you are one of the great persons fighting both honestly and intelligently for the preservation of the farm family, I thought you would be interested in getting the real facts so that you might acquaint Mr. CAPEHART with what is going on back at and near his own home. The information is as follows:

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I now continue to read from the letter:

Hog prices (as reported by the Illinois Department of Agriculture, Crop Reporting Service) November, 1955 average price received by farmers was $12.20 hundredweight, December 1955 was $10.60 hundredweight, January 1956 was $11 hundredweight, February 1956 was $12 hundredweight, and March 1956 was $12.10 hundredweight. They report that the April figure is not available but will be soon.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture during this time the legal parity price for hogs was $21 hundredweight. The average of these 5 months, which constitute the heavy selling period of the Midwest hog market, was $11.60. Simple arithmetic—

Which I must say is not very persuasive to the Senator from Indiana. I do not know that he is allergic to it, but I do know he is either unfamiliar with it or uninfluenced by it. This farmer says:

Simple arithmetic will show this to be 55 percent of parity. These prices, I might add, were taken from the legitimate established hog markets. Many purchases were made for chain stores through small sale barns, and in many cases the price was from $1 to $2 hundredweight lower.

The Illinois hog farmer has surely taken a beating during this period, and frankly he is not taking it lying down. Many of them have lost thousands of dollars in their operations during this past year, especially those in the corn-hog farm belt.

If Mr. CAPEHART or anyone else should wish names and addresses of real farmers who have lost thousands of dollars on hogs, I can supply them upon request.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

RALPH S. BRADLEY,
*President.*

I wish to say, Mr. President, that since I was placed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], in the category of being a liar, I have found that I am in some very distinguished company. I have received a letter from an Indiana farmer by the name of John C. Raber. I wish to say that this Indiana farmer went to the trouble of going to a very respected authority on farm prices and farm conditions; he went to the great land grant agricultural college of the State of Indiana, at Purdue University. I wish the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] were on the floor, in accordance with the request made of him. I should like to see his face when he finds out that—by inference—he branded the agricultural research division of his own State university as being a liar.

I read the letter from Mr. Raber:

INDIANA FARMERS UNION,
*Indianapolis, Ind., April 26, 1956.*

Senator ROBERT S. KERR,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR KERR: I understand that Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, was quite put out with you for stating that farm prices averaged 70 percent of parity and that he disputed you on the floor of the Senate yesterday, April 25.

I don't know where Senator CAPEHART gets his figures, but the last report I have from the United States Department of Agriculture Agriculture Marketing Service at Purdue University shows farm prices in Indiana to be exactly 70 percent of parity. Those are the only official figures we have here in Indiana. I am sending the report along in case you need proof of your statement as it applies to Senator CAPEHART's own State.

It's worth noting too that corn and hogs, which are the bread-and-butter crops for Hoosiers, have been even below that. The United States Department of Agricultural Statistical Summary shows that the average price for hogs on January 15 was $10.90 a hundred pounds, which is about 50 percent of parity, and in February the average price had climbed to $12, or 57 percent of parity. The last average price I have on corn is $1.18 per bushel, or 68 percent of parity.

More recent figures may reflect a different price picture, but you can be sure that as far as parity of income—which is the thing that counts—is concerned, farmers in Indiana are not receiving anywhere near as much as 70 percent of parity.

The things a lot of Senators have been saying on the floor of the Senate have not been improving income on the farms back here in Indiana.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. RABER,
*President, Indiana Farmers Union.*

Mr. President, I now wish to submit for the RECORD a report headed "Indiana Crops and Livestock—United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Estimates Division, Cooperating With Purdue University, Agricultural Experiment Station, Department of Agricultural Statistics, West Lafayette, Ind." The portion of the report which I should like to have placed in the RECORD is that shown on the last page of the bulletin, where we find indexes and ratios for Indiana farm prices. In that connection, I wish to emphasize this statement which appears in the bulletin:

Indiana purchasing power of farm products—

In other words, showing the percentage of parity—

February 1955, 81 percent of parity.
January 1956, 70 percent of parity.
February 1956, 70 percent of parity.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit again the statement I made on the floor of the Senate on April 24, namely, that as of that time, the farm people of our country were selling their products for an average not to exceed 70 percent of parity.

I have documented the matter by letters from farmers in many States—letters which I have selected from the hundreds that have come to my office since that date, the last of the exhibits being a report by the research department of the agricultural division of Indiana's great land-grant agricultural

college at Purdue University; and the report concludes with the finding that in January and February 1956, Indiana farmers' purchasing power for the crops they produced, and figured on the basis for which the crops were sold by them, was 70 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I challenge the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to go back home and tell the Purdue University officials that they are making false statements. I challenge him to tell the farmers in his own home State—farmers who have been writing to me—that they are making false statements.

It is only in the protected sanctuary of the United States Senate, Mr. President, that ignorance can attain such heights, and stupidity promote and inspire men to make such unfounded statements as those made by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, on April 24, and again on April 25, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain information. On April 24 the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and I had quite a colloquy on the floor of the Senate in respect to a statement he made, namely, that farmers were receiving, on an average, 70 percent of parity or less for the things they sold. At the time I questioned the statement because it did not sound to me as if the able Senator from Oklahoma had been given the proper figures and the proper facts.

Today the able Senator from Oklahoma made a speech in which he took me to task, and he quoted a number of letters he had received from farmers, some of them in my State of Indiana and some in other States. Then he placed in the RECORD a report by the great Purdue University, of Indiana. He said:

> The portion of the report which I should like to have placed in the RECORD is that shown on the last page of the bulletin, where we find indexes and ratios for Indiana farm prices. In that connection, I wish to emphasize this statement which appears in the bulletin:
>
> "Indiana purchasing power of farm products"—
>
> In other words, showing the percentage of parity—
>
> "February 1955, 81 percent of parity.
> "January 1956, 70 percent of parity.
> "February 1956, 70 percent of parity."

Of course, Mr. President, I think we should be absolutely fair in this entire matter, and I intend to be fair. What the able Senator from Oklahoma placed in the RECORD was what Purdue University reported as the parity prices in January and February, whereas he and I were discussing the prices which existed as of April 24.

I referred to the parity prices as reported by the Department of Agriculture on April 15. I shall now refer to the April 15 report, and I shall read the figures for 14 items, because on April 25 I myself placed in the RECORD the figures for the same 14 items. On April 15, the prices the farmer received were as follows

Eggs, 93 percent.
Wholesale milk, 87 percent.
Barley, 71 percent.
Oats, 73 percent.
Flaxseed, 77 percent.
Grain sorghums, 75 percent.
Peanuts, 89 percent.
Cotton, 92 percent.
Butterfat, 81 percent.

Soybeans, 91 percent. That was on April 15. All of us know that since then, soybeans have risen in price possibly 50 cents a bushel.

Corn, 76 percent. All of us know that the price of corn has gone up 15 or 20 cents a bushel, I believe, since April 15.

Wheat, 85 percent.
Cattle, 70 percent.

Hogs, 67 percent. On April 15, hogs were selling for between $13 and $14 a hundred. On yesterday they sold for over $18 a hundred. So since April 15 the price of hogs has risen anywhere from 20 to 25 percent.

On April 15, the average parity price for those 14 items was approximately 81 percent, not 70 percent, and not less than 70 percent.

I shall not question the Purdue University figures for January and February, because I have not gone back and examined the prices for farm products in January and February. As a farmer, I know they were too low, because I was selling then, and I do sell almost every month. I do not know what the prices were then.

Therefore, in all fairness, I think the RECORD should show that I was speaking of the prices as of April 24 and April 25. I am certain that the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] was speaking of prices as of April 24 and 25. I think the RECORD is crystal clear that the average prices that farmers received on April 15 for these 14 major products amounted to approximately 81 percent.

Soon the report giving the parity prices the farmer received on May 15 will be out. I do not think there is any question but that the report will show a decided increase. I am only speculating now, but my best judgment is that the report will show probably as much as 84 percent, and perhaps 85 percent.

So, Mr. President, I feel that in all fairness to both myself and the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the RECORD should show that he was using figures for January and February, whereas I was using actual figures given to me by the Department of Agriculture as to the prices as of April 15. The figures I prophesy today are the ones which will be shown in the report for May 15.

I do not like to confuse the people. I do not like to confuse the RECORD. Above all, I do not want to confuse the farmers. I know that they are having enough trouble. Their prices have been entirely too low. Their prices are too low now. No one knows it any better than I do. But I do not feel that we ought further to confuse and irritate the farmers by giving them figures which, though they may not be incorrect, apply to dates which do not relate to the situation which we are discussing in this instance.

The able Senator from Oklahoma quotes a letter from Mr. Raber, of Indiana. I know Mr. Raber. He is a good friend of mine. He is president of the Indiana National Farmers' Union. As we all know, Mr. Raber has been very active in advocating 100 percent of parity. He has recently organized the State of Indiana for the National Farmers' Union. I do not happen to know the other two or three gentlemen whose letters or telegrams were placed in the RECORD. I am certain that they are all very fine farmers in the State of Indiana. However, I doubt very much if any of them knew what the parity price ought to be. Of course, they do know exactly what they are selling their products for.

I believe that in all fairness one must take into consideration, when he uses any farm price or existing parity price, the fact that farm prices vary at different elevators and different markets. In a given county, one elevator may be paying today a cent or 2 cents more a bushel for corn, wheat, or soy beans. One market may be paying a cent a pound more on a given day for certain types of livestock—for hogs or cattle. So prices vary from day to day. They vary among markets. So it is almost impossible to have the exact facts at any given time.

Also, as we all know, there are various grades of cattle. There are prime cattle, choice cattle, utility cattle, and commercial cattle. Some types of hogs bring higher prices than others. Today the hog market prefers the so-called bacon hog, weighing 200, 210, or 220 pounds. Today the bacon hog brings an average of 50 cents a hundred more.

I wish to keep the record straight. I believe that the May 15 figures will be out in a few days. When they are issued, I shall place them in the RECORD. I wish to say, in all fairness to the able Senator from Oklahoma, that I believe, as I said in my speech of April 25, someone handed him some figures and facts which were possibly true 2 or 3 months ago, but did not apply on April 25, because we all know that the farm prices are gradually working themselves up. For example, in Indiana today the farmer can get $3.12 for his beans. He can get something like $2.15 for wheat. As I stated a moment ago, in Indiana hogs were selling yesterday at better than 18 cents a pound. The price of cattle is off a little. It is too low, particularly as relates to choice and prime cattle. At the moment the prices of cattle are dragging.

With respect to corn, in Indiana an elevator in my county of Daviess, which was paying as low as 97 cents a bushel last December, is now paying $1.47 a bushel for corn. So the price of corn has risen, along with the prices of soybeans and hogs. The prices of cattle are dragging at the moment, but, generally speaking, the general average of farm prices is going up. My best judgment is that they will continue to go up. I believe that before the end of the year we shall find farm prices, considering all the items, will be up to 90 percent of parity, or better. That is my judgment, based upon the present trends. They ought to be 90 percent of parity. In fact, they ought to be 100 percent of parity. The farmer ought to receive 100 percent of parity, but we would like to have him receive it in the market place if he possibly can.

The only way he will receive it in the market place, in my opinion—and I

shall speak at greater length on that subject later—is through finding new uses for farm products. Along with many other Senators, I have introduced a bill on this subject. We must find new uses for agricultural products in industry. We must find new markets for the farmer.

Over the past many years we have literally spent billions of dollars teaching the farmer how to grow more and more and more. We have a county agricultural agent in every county in the United States. We have our great universities. We have our Department of Agriculture. We have industry searching for chemicals to kill weeds, in order that the farmer may grow more. We have our 4-H Clubs. I am glad that we have them. I am not complaining on that score. I am simply pointing out that over the years we have spent millions of dollars teaching the farmer how to produce more. The result is that farm production is high, and the farmer's market is low. In other words, the farmer's market is below the level of his production ability.

This is not a political question at all. It is an economic problem. What we should do is to spend whatever money is necessary, and whatever man-hours are necessary, to find new uses for farm products and new markets, thereby bringing the farmer's market up to the level of his productive ability. When we do that, we shall do something real for the American farmer. We shall make him prosperous. We shall never make American farmers prosperous by cutting back their production.

In my opinion, we should attack this problem from a business standpoint, from an economic standpoint. We ought to pass the bill which I have introduced, calling for $100 million for research in the next 12 months. I understand that the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] will begin hearings on the proposed legislation about June 1.

I know many agricultural college people who wish to testify on that bill. It offers the only permanent solution to the farm problem. I hope we can make progress on that program, and that we can find new uses and new markets for the farmer's products, so that he may receive 100 percent or more of parity, but receive it in the open market, because there is a demand for his products. We should make the demand so great that he can produce more per acre, and produce on all his acres, rather than being restricted.

Instead of continually getting into arguments over parity, which fray our tempers, let us do something real for the farmer. Let us find new uses for his products and new markets for that which he grows.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have enjoyed listening to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I wish to commend him for the moderation of his approach today. If his approach on April 24 had been as moderate, the speech of the Senator from Oklahoma today would not have been made. What caused the Senator from Oklahoma to make the speech that he made today, aside from documenting in the RECORD the facts as to what the parity actually was prior to the time of the speech on April 24, was the statement made by the Senator from Indiana that the Senator from Oklahoma had made a false statement on the floor of the Senate, and that the Senator from Oklahoma knew it was a false statement when it was made.

Mr. President, those statements were not accurate. The Senator from Oklahoma made statements which he not only sincerely believed to be true, but which he had abundant evidence to support, and which he supported with evidence that he placed in the RECORD today.

For instance, at that time, the Senator from Indiana, as recorded on page 6868 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said:

> The Senator from Oklahoma made the statement, and he knew when he made it that he was not telling the truth.

I do not believe that statement was justified. I deeply regret that the Senator from Indiana made it on the basis on which he founded it. When he did make it, the Senator from Oklahoma had no recourse other than to place in the RECORD the facts which substantiated the statement the Senator from Oklahoma had made at the time.

On April 25, the distinguished Senator from Indiana, as recorded at page 6906 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, made the statement to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]:

> Mr. CAPEHART. No; I did not say that. I say that the general average of all farm products, even during the depression days of the 1930's, never went below 70 percent.

The thesis of the Senator's statement at that time was that prices then were above 70 percent, and that never, not even in the depression, had they gone below 70 percent. The Senator was mistaken, just as he was mistaken a little while ago when he referred to a farmer from Indiana as being the president of the National Farmers Union.

I know that the Senator from Indiana gets enthusiastic in his statements. However, I do not feel that that should justify attacks by him on the integrity of another Senator, when the Senator himself, in his calmer moments, I believe, would be glad to acknowledge—although he has not done so as yet—that the Senator from Oklahoma not only sincerely believed what he said on the date in question, but had a basis in fact for saying it.

The Senator gave the average overall parity figures for that time. In the first place, his average is based on information given to him by the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe that any Senator is poverty stricken for information if he depends upon the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, for information. I believe a man is crippled who is armed only with statistics provided by Ezra Taft Benson or his Department of Agriculture. The Department is not realistic. It is not accurate. I do not believe it is sincere. I believe it publishes statistics seeking to justify a position taken and seeking to confuse the record, instead of reporting the record. For that reason I say that the statistics depended upon by the Senator from Indiana were undependable and inaccurate. I remind him that he who leans on such a broken reed is surely doomed to a heavy fall.

In the next place, the Senator from Indiana averages the figures without regard to the quantity of the products sold at the price. He admits in his statement on April 25 that hogs were at 74 percent of parity and cattle at 74 percent of parity. Those were his own figures, based upon the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for that date. I presume it was for the date of April 25, because that is the date on which the distinguished Senator from Indiana inserted the figures in the RECORD.

The fact is that neither hogs nor cattle, on an overall average on that date, were bringing to the farmer 74 percent of parity at the place where the farmer was compelled to sell either.

However, even if they were, and if the distinguished Senator had given effect to the quantities of hogs and cattle sold at that percentage of parity, he would have realized that he could not have added 74 for hogs and 74 for cattle and 97 for eggs, and divided the total by 3 and obtained the average percent of parity received by the farmer for his products. I say that because the farmer sells so much more in quantity of hogs and cattle than he does in eggs.

It reminds me of the story of Mutt and Jeff entering into a partnership on a 50-50 basis. One of them came forth with a horse, and the other came forth with a rabbit. The one with the rabbit insisted upon a 50 percent interest in the combined assets of the two. It is impossible to average them on that basis and get accurate information with reference to a situation which, so far as the farmer is concerned, is a reality, not a theory; is a condition, not a hoped for or assumed state of facts, as speculated about or as talked about on an unrealistic and unfounded basis by the Department of Agriculture.

I did not seek this controversy with the Senator from Indiana. I have enjoyed a relationship with him which I have cherished. While not agreeing with him on many issues, it had never occurred to me that the necessity would arise for me to defend before the United States Senate my integrity of purpose under the slashing and infuriated attacks of the Senator from Indiana, alleging that the Senator from Oklahoma had made a false statement, and knew it was false.

I was persuaded then, and I am persuaded now, that the Senator from Indiana, being short on facts, resorted to abuse, and that the Senator, being unable to justify the position he had taken by the realities and the facts as they applied at the grassroots, in anger took refuge in accusations against the character and purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma.

I resented it then, and I resent it now.

For the sake of the RECORD, Mr. President, I have established today the basis upon which I made my statement. In my judgment, what I have submitted proves beyond a shadow of a doubt, by the words of the farmers themselves,

that the statements made by the Senator from Oklahoma on the 24th day of April were correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I should like to have the RECORD straight.

I intended to say that Mr. Raber was president of the Farmers Union of Indiana. If I did not say "Indiana" I wish the RECORD to show that I meant Indiana. I am sure the able Senator from Oklahoma agrees with me that Mr. Raber is president of the Farmers Union of Indiana.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman of whom the Senator speaks is the president of the Farmers Union of Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the figures which the able Senator from Oklahoma placed in the RECORD and which he used as authority I understand were for the months of January and February, and not for the month of April which he and I were discussing on April 25. I am not going to vouch for their correctness, because I have not looked at them, but I must stand on the facts.

I do not know where else we can get information on this subject than from the Department of Agriculture. I have an idea that Secretary Benson does not see any of the figures. They are worked out by statisticians in the Department who have been there for years. They are civil-service employees. Until the figures are published, I do not suppose Mr. Benson or any of his assistants would have the slightest idea what the figures were going to be. I suspect that, if the truth were known, the persons who figure out the statistics are men and women who have been in the Department for many years. The Secretary of Agriculture does not make the figures; he does compile the statistics; he does not make the record in that respect.

If the Senator from Oklahoma had stated on April 25 that he was talking about parity figures of last January and February I would never have questioned him at all. But we were speaking on April 24 and 25, and I knew, or at least I thought I knew, what I was talking about, and the figures bore me out.

I placed the figures in the RECORD on April 25, and again today. I not only placed them in the RECORD, but I placed them in the RECORD by categories. There was but one which was less than 70 percent on April 17. We know that today hogs are up to possibly 80 percent or more. On April 15 the figures were available to the Senator from Oklahoma. The only place I know of to get the figures is the Department of Agriculture. There was only one item in all the categories which was below 70 percent. There was one which was 70 percent, and that was cattle. Hogs were 67 percent. All the others were above 70 percent, the highest item being eggs at 93 percent and the next highest being cotton, at 92 percent. Wheat was 95 percent.

If we cannot rely upon figures of the Department of Agriculture, I do not know where to go to get more accurate figures. I do not suppose there is one farmer out of a thousand who can tell us what the parity price should be. I do not wish to embarass the able Senator from Oklahoma by asking him what the parity is on cotton, corn, or any of the other items. I could look it up, but I do not know from memory. I doubt that there is any Senator who knows what the parity should be.

The able Senator from Oklahoma said a moment ago that I was all wrong when I said that during the depression parity prices never got below 70 percent. I still stand on that statement. It is a true statement. But that does not mean that corn did not get down to 20 cents or 25 cents a bushel. It did. But, at the same time, labor, and everything else on which parity is based, was equally low.

If we take the same formula we have today for figuring parity, and figure on the prices during that period, I think the Senator from Oklahoma will find that my statement that even during the depression prices did not get below 70 percent of parity was correct. They got way down, and everything the farmer bought was down.

Mr. President, I believe my statement to be a true statement. At least, I was told by reliable sources that it was correct. I have no way of figuring everything the farmer bought. In those days we did not have a parity formula. It seems to me that the entire debate, Mr. President, stems from dates rather than from figures or from facts. I was thinking in terms of April 25 as reported by the Department of Agriculture on April 15, and the Senator from Oklahoma was thinking in terms of the facts in January and February. So, Mr. President, we may both have been right.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the last statement of the Senator from Indiana illustrates his capacity for confusion. The Senator says he was thinking in terms of parity figures as they were on April 25 as disclosed by reports of the Secretary of Agriculture on April 15. That illustrates the Senator's difficulty.

He says, "Where can we get the facts except from the Secretary of Agriculture?" Almost any place in the world would be a better place to get the facts than to get them from the Secretary of Agriculture. If the Senator is really sincere, I can tell him that he can get the facts from the farmers of Indiana. The facts are available to them. The farmers of Oklahoma gave me the facts. If I were to say to them, "I do not know what you are talking about; I take my facts from the Secretary of Agriculture," I know I could not get back within the boundaries of Oklahoma.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, one of the reasons why I made my statement on April 25 is that I deal in farm products every day. I am a farmer. I sell hogs practically every month in the year, and I buy and sell cattle. I raise corn. I do not suppose there is ever a time when I do not have corn on my farm. I pay all the bills on my farm. I sign the checks, and deposit checks for that which is sold. So I was basing my position on April 25 on what I actually knew, because I had just recently sold soybeans, wheat, and hogs, and had recently bought some cattle. So I am one of those Indiana farmers about whom the able Senator from Oklahoma has spoken. If I know anything, I know that much.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is the bill to amend the Retirement Act. I wish to make a very brief statement on the bill tonight, and to place in the RECORD certain information for the benefit of the Senate tomorrow. Before doing so, I wish to say something to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], not as a mediator, because I well appreciate the fact that when one seeks to step into such a role he is usually the one who becomes the victim of his intercession.

But I know both Senators very well, and I have listened to the altercation between them. I say most kindly and most respectfully that it seems to me the Senator from Indiana has not touched upon the real cause of the difference. I think it is a cause which we ought to take into account in our relationships with one another in the Senate.

I refuse to believe that the Senator from Indiana really believed what he said in the language he used on April 24 to the Senator from Oklahoma. I know the Senator from Oklahoma very well. I do not know of anyone for whom I could have a greater respect when it comes to the matter of integrity. The word of the Senator from Oklahoma, in my judgment, can always be relied upon, so far as his intentions and his motivations are concerned. I have found him at all times to be exceedingly intellectually honest. I have found him to be a man of great morality. I may say, without, I hope, causing him any embarrassment, that since the two of us have been Members of the Senate, I have had the opportunity to be associated with him as a Member of a group in the Senate which devotes itself once a week, at a breakfast meeting, to a discussion of spiritual values and the relationship of those values to our work in the Senate. Therefore, I know him to be a deeply religious man. The RECORD will show that I have disagreed with him on some issues in the Senate, but our disagreements have been on the merits of the issues.

What pains me in this discussion is that it seems to me my friend from Indiana still has not faced up to the cause of the hurt which he inflicted on the Senator from Oklahoma, when he said, in effect, on April 24, that the Senator from Oklahoma made a false statement, and knew it was false. The Senator from Indiana, in my judgment, has presented no evidence whatsoever which supports that evaluation of the motivation of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The Senator from Indiana and I have been in hot debates in the Senate in our terms here. He and I know that sometimes in the heat of debate one says things which he immediately regrets, and he proceeds to make amends for the statements made in the heat of debate. I think the entire matter could have been cleared up if the Senator from Indiana had said, as I think he should have said, on the basis of the integrity of the Senator from Oklahoma, that he regretted that he left the implication that he thought the Senator from Oklahoma was deliberately, knowingly, and intentionally falsifying to the Senate in any statement he made on the floor.

The Senator from Indiana could very well disagree with the conclusions reached by the Senator from Oklahoma; but I think it is regrettable, in our relationships in the Senate, on either side of the aisle, or between Members on opposite sides of the aisle, if we reflect upon the integrity and the honesty of our colleagues. I think that is what this is all about; and knowing the Senator from Indiana as I do, knowing that he does not ordinarily, so far as I know from my experiences with him, desire intentionally to hurt anyone, I still wish that I could hear from his lips a statement to the effect that he did not mean to reflect upon the integrity, the honesty, and the truthfulness of the Senator from Oklahoma.

It is one thing to say, "I think my colleague is mistaken. I think he has presented information which further analysis will show does not measure up to a sound analysis of the fact." But it is a quite different thing to leave in the historic RECORD of this body a charge that one believes a colleague has knowingly and intentionally made a false statement.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Oregon has said some kind things about the Senator from Oklahoma. I presume that, in all fairness, he has not made such comments about the Senator from Indiana——

Mr. MORSE. I have not finished.

Mr. CAPEHART. In the last hour, the able Senator from Oklahoma made a statement about the Secretary of Agriculture from which one could draw the inference that the figures supplied by the Secretary could not be believed; that they were unreliable. That statement means only one thing to me, because I think I have commonsense. It means that the Secretary of Agriculture puts out dishonest figures. If one can read anything else into what the able Senator from Oklahoma said—if the able Senator from Oregon can read anything else into his statement—he is perfectly at liberty to do so.

All I can read into his comment is that anyone who relies upon the figures published by the Department of Agriculture had better beware, because those figures are dishonest. If anyone can make anything else out of the statement by the Senator from Oklahoma than that the figures given by the Secretary of Agriculture are dishonest, let him do so.

Let me say about the able Senator from Oklahoma that he can dish it out on the floor of the Senate. He has a great habit of dishing it out. He makes very cutting and unkind statements about his colleagues. I am not complaining about that. I merely say that he can dish it out here; and he has been dishing it out in the last hour against the Secretary of Agriculture.

No one in his right mind could come to any other conclusion than that the able Senator from Oklahoma wanted to leave in the RECORD and leave with the persons who listened to him the inference that one could not believe the figures published by the Department of Agriculture; that the officials of that Department were a bunch of misguided crooks; and that they are putting out a lot of figures designed to fool the American farmer.

If anyone can make anything else out of it, Mr. President, let him go ahead, because I am standing on the record. I will continue to stand on the record.

Mr. MORSE. I want to finish what I was going to say about the Senator from Indiana, and I give him my word that I am still going to say what I was going to say, without a word changed as a result of anything he has said in the last 2 minutes.

I was going to say, before he interrupted me, that I served with the Senator from Indiana on the Banking and Currency Committee, and I served on that committee with great pleasure in my relationships with the Senator from Indiana. On that committee, he and I did not agree on some issues, although on some other issues we worked shoulder to shoulder. We have had some very hot debates in the committee, as well as on the floor of the Senate. In none of our relations, no matter how warm those debates may have been, have I heard the Senator from Indiana reflect on the integrity of any of his colleagues on the committee; and some of the sessions were very warm ones. That is why it pains me to have the Senator leave the record with the personal attack on the Senator from Oklahoma, which caused the altercation in the first place. The Senator has made it clear he intends to leave the record stand that way. I am sorry. I think it is regrettable. I hope the time will come when he will change his mind about that record.

As to what the Senator from Oklahoma said about the Department of Agriculture this afternoon, my interpretation of what he said is that, on the basis of his experience, as he has compared the reports of the Department of Agriculture under Secretary Benson with reports he has obtained from other sources, he has reached the conclusion that the Department of Agriculture under this administration is presenting statistical reports and is presenting substantive reports to bear out an agricultural policy.

I want to say that has been my experience, too. I find great difficulty in reconciling reports of the Department of Agriculture with reports on agriculture which come from scientific bureaus and agricultural colleges. I think the Senator from Oklahoma was quite right in pointing out that was the conclusion he had reached or to reports being put out by the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield in a moment. What I have stated is the conclusion I have reached, I desire to say, to my great disappointment. I have found, as I have read these agricultural reports from the Department of Agriculture, that I have needed to ask myself the question, "What have they left out? How much of the story are they not telling?" because too frequently what they put in the reports is not the full story.

That is the interpretation I made of the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, and I think the interpretation can be borne out by a comparison of the reports put out by the Department of Agriculture with reports on the same subject put out by scientific and agricultural bureaus in this country.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, first I wish to thank my distinguished friend for his very kind and generous remarks about the senior Senator from Oklahoma. I shall cherish them as one of the finest experiences I have had in the United States Senate.

Secondly, I should like to ask the Senator if he is familiar with the report put out by Purdue University which the Senator from Oklahoma introduced into the RECORD this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, after he introduced it into the RECORD, I asked to have the privilege of reading it, and I sat at my desk and read it.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator recall that for January and February the overall average price Indiana farmers were receiving for their products was 70 percent of parity?

Mr. MORSE. That is what the report stated.

Mr. KERR. I do not know what the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture would indicate for the same period of time, but I wonder if the Senator from Oregon shares my belief that the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture would indicate that farmers in the country were receiving an overall average of more than 70 percent of parity during the months of January and February.

Mr. MORSE. I intend to make that comparison, in light of the debate this afternoon, to see whether or not a suspicion of mine will be borne out.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is going to do likewise. If it should develop, as I think it will, that the reports of the Department of Agriculture would indicate that farmers in the country were getting more than 70 percent of parity in January and February 1956, then it would seem there are other authorities than the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Oklahoma who do not agree with the statements made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MORSE. That would be the inescapable conclusion.

---

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 3, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$22,594,000" and insert "$25,165,000"; and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,965,000."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have advised the distinguished chairman

of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that I have amendments which apply to three different portions of the bill, the first being the committee amendment which has just been stated. If my amendments are acceptable to him, I believe this would be the appropriate time for us to consider them. If acceptable to him, I ask that my amendments be reported en bloc. They are submitted by me on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendments of the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, in line 17, in lieu of "$25,165,000," it is proposed to insert "$26,665,000."

On page 3, line 17, in lieu of "$2,965,000" it is proposed to insert "$4,465,000."

On page 3, line 24, after "conditions", it is proposed to insert *"Provided further*, That $1,250,000 of such $4,465,000 shall be immediately available for expenditure for control and eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first instance, I should like to repeat that these amendments are proposed by me on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. President, this item has come forward from the Bureau of the Budget and the President in a communication shown as Document No. 407, dated May 19, as a supplementary budget request. It amounts to $1,500,000. It is for an emergency fund for the treatment of the Mediterranean fruitfly infestation in the neighborhood of Miami.

It would appear that the scientists of the Federal and State governments have decided that much money will be saved in the final analysis, in their opinion, if a kind of blitz program be conducted at this time, not only consisting of the ordinary ground operations, but also supplemented by air dusting operations while the infested area is relatively small. Evidently the Bureau of the Budget has agreed with the scientists, because it has approved the item in the shortest time in which any such item that I can recall since I have been in the Senate has been approved; and the President has supported the finding of the Bureau of the Budget by sending the item to Congress.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I enthusiastically support the Senator's amendment, and if he will yield to me briefly I should like to say why.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I point out that this is not a Florida problem at all. It is a national problem. The first infestation has affected certain acreage in Florida, but it could spread, as the Senator from Florida and other Senators well know, very quickly to other fruit-growing areas of the United States, in California, Oregon, Washington, and the Middle West.

This is a problem which confronts us all. The threat should be stamped out as quickly as possible. We should immediately go to the assistance, not of Florida, but of the entire agricultural economy of the country. Such an amendment as this, if it receives our approval, will make possible a frontal attack on the Mediterranean fruitfly, which is now affecting Florida.

By way of analogy, I recall what we did a few years ago when, in my judgment, we had a similar problem. In that case, we did not even spend our money in our own country, but in Mexico. Senators will recall that there was a serious threat of the hoof-and-mouth disease. There waited upon us in the Senate—and rightly so—representatives of the entire cattle industry. I well remember the argument which they presented to us, that if that disease got started in Texas, or in any of the other States on this side of the Mexican boundary, in no time it would spread from coast to coast.

What did we do? Immediately, as we should have done, on an emergency basis we appropriated a large sum of money to be spent in Mexico, on Mexican herds, both by way of confiscation and extermination, and payment to the Mexican owners of the herds for the cattle exterminated. It was money well spent. We stopped the threat of the hoof-and-mouth disease to the cattle farms of America.

In my judgment, the analogy is complete. We had better get busy in the Senate and give the two Senators from Florida a unanimous vote, in the public interest, in favor of their amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

As Senators know, the Mediterranean fruitfly is a scourge which attacks many fruits and vegetables. It travels with great speed, and is highly destructive. It is so greatly feared that one could not overstate the damage which it could do if it ever got out of hand.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I intend to support the amendment of the distinguished Senators from Florida.

My experience has taught me that insect damage or plant disease cannot be limited to a narrow area. I have seen the chestnut blight strike chestnut trees in New York State and parts of New England, and wipe out all the trees in that area. It spread to many other sections of the country. The Dutch elm disease has destroyed a great many trees. The white pine blister rust has spread. Many insect infestations and plant diseases have spread.

I believe fully in what the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oregon have said. It is not possible, without a concerted national effort, to keep in check some of these very devastating plant diseases and insect infestations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from New York, who has spoken with his customary generosity and national-mindedness.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not desire to interfere with the statements being made in behalf of this very important estimate. I do not think its importance could be exaggerated. The subject was discussed in committee, and I was authorized to accept the amendment on the floor of the Senate. I am glad to accept it in all three of its phases.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. It is true that, because we thought this estimate would reach us shortly, the subject was discussed in the committee. I am glad to hear that the Senator from Georgia will accept the amendment.

I should like briefly to describe a certain feature of the amendment which is unusual. The amount to be appropriated is $1,500,000, but $1,250,000 will be funds to be spent in the remaining part of this fiscal year, under the wording of the amendment. I want that to be clearly in the minds of Senators. That is the reason I am stating that fact. The other quarter of a million is to be spent shortly after July 1. There are already some funds in the bill now pending applicable to the period after July 1.

Without speaking longer, I ask unanimous consent that a communication to the President from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, setting forth the facts in this matter rather clearly, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington, D. C., May 18, 1956.*

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House.*

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations in the amount of $1,250,000 for the fiscal year 1956 and $250,000 for the fiscal year 1957 for the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

*"Salaries and expenses*

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1956, for 'Salaries and expenses' for plant and animal disease and pest control, $1,250,000.

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1957, for 'Salaries and expenses' for plant and animal disease and pest control, $250,000."

In the 1957 supplemental now pending before the Congress (H. Doc. No. 403) an amount of $1 million is included for this item, of which $675,000 was provided for the Mediterranean fruitfly work in Florida. However, within the past few days it has been ascertained that the situation is critical and that a vigorous eradication program should be started as quickly as possible.

The current proposal of $1,500,000 would finance the eradication work needed to be done at once on approximately 250,000 acres in the Miami area, the program to be developed under the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), and the act of August 13, 1954 (7 U. S. C. 148). It is believed that treatment of these acres immediately could easily save the treatment of

several times that amount a few weeks from now.

Of the total amount of funds being recommended of $1,500,000, $1,250,000 would become available in fiscal year 1956 and the remaining $250,000 would become available in 1957 in addition to the funds proposed in House Document No. 403.

I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriations be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

PERCIVAL BRUNDAGE,
*Director of the Bureau of the Budget.*

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to take one moment to say how pleased I am to be able to join with my distinguished senior colleague from Florida in offering this amendment. I do not know of any appropriation which could mean more to our State at this particular time than the provision incorporated in this amendment.

As the senior Senator from Florida has so well pointed out, the Mediterranean fruitfly is the greatest scourge we confront. If it is not quarantined and stamped out immediately, it may destroy our entire agricultural economy.

This provision not only means a great deal to our State, but it means a great deal to the Nation. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] have so well pointed out, insects of this type do not recognize State lines. If we do not stamp out the infestation now, it is conceivable that it may affect other Southern States, and possible Western States, thereby destroying the agricultural economy and harming the economy of the Nation.

So I am pleased that the President of the United States, the Bureau of the Budget, and now the very able chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], have all been willing to join hands and appropriate this money in order that we may stamp out this very great evil.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It would be appropriate for the RECORD to show that the Governor of Florida and the regulatory authorities of Florida have been in telephone communication with the Senators from Florida today, assuring us, and giving us the authority to assure the Senate, that the State is not only spending very freely of its own funds at this time, but will continue to do so, and that a special session of the legislature is to be called, either for the 1st of June or shortly thereafter—not later than July 1—as soon as the facts are clearly apparent, so that the State may do its fair share in meeting this emergency.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. That demonstrates again the wholeheartedness and unanimity with which this problem is being met, not only in our State, but by the officials of the Federal Government as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for himself and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], to committee amendments on page 3, lines 17 and 24.

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 17, after the word "butter", to strike out "$15,500,000" and insert "$15,745,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 24, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "$29,003,708" and insert "$30,253,708", and on page 5, line 2, after the word "all", to strike out "$29,503,708" and insert "$30,753,708."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 16, to strike out:

ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Animal disease laboratory facilities", for establishment of such facilities, including construction, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has indicated to me that he wishes to be heard on this amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if it is in order, I should like to touch briefly on this question a little further.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am perfectly willing to consider the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota now.

Mr. THYE. I will not press for the acceptance of my amendment, because I recognize that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has made a very careful study of the entire question. If we make the funds available in this appropriation bill, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is very much concerned lest we lose control over the decision as to where the research laboratory should be located.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, I am much more concerned about its being located in Beltsville than anywhere else. I want the Department to consult with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to the location of the laboratory. If they will come into agreement, I am certain that no Member of the Senate will fight more strenuously to provide the necessary funds than I will; and I am sure those funds will be provided in the first supplemental appropriation bill that comes before the Senate. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that that is not only my own view, but that it is the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee which considered this question at some length.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in view of the strong conviction the chairman of the subcommittee has on this question, and with the positive assurance that we can have funds added to the bill, perhaps even before it comes out of conference, if need be, if the Department of Agriculture can come before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and justify its request, or make known to us where the laboratory should be located, and provided that is acceptable to the Committee on Appropriations, I shall not press my amendment. With that assurance, I shall not press my amendment, but shall urge the Department of Agriculture to make known to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry its recommendation.

I definitely share the conviction of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that Beltsville is not the proper location for the laboratory. Beltsville is a very densely populated area. In the first place, it would be very expensive to acquire the necessary property. In the second place, there would be the danger of contamination to the livestock in the research center.

Furthermore, in that densely populated area, there would be the danger of disease communication, because livestock diseases can be communicated to human beings. Therefore, I share the chairman's conviction, and I shall withdraw my amendment, in the hope that we can get an expression of opinion from the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I concur in the opinion voiced by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I, too, agree that it would be very inadvisable to locate the laboratory in Beltsville.

I am a little concerned about the legislative situation. If I understand correctly, the maximum amount the committee could insert in conference for this item would be $10 million, not the total budget request of $18,400,000.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct. It could add only $10 million. However, the full obligation would not be entered into during the first calendar year. Therefore, we could authorize it and, if necessary, we could add the necessary funds in a supplemental bill or other appropriation bill before the end of the year. I agree with the Senator that in conference we could not raise the figure above $10 million, because that is all the conferees would have before them. However, we could authorize the item and the amount could be appropriated in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. BARRETT. I hope the Department will proceed expeditiously in this matter, and that they will come before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and before the Committee on Appropriations with a recommendation that is acceptable, so that we may proceed with this work during the next fiscal year.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I received from the American National Cattlemen's Association.

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

DENVER, COLO., *May 21, 1956.*

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

We understand that you are considering making an effort to reinstate the $19 million appropriation for a livestock research laboratory in the agriculture appropriation bill

with provision for a five-man committee to study and select a satisfactory location for it. We believe the early construction of this laboratory to be of utmost importance to the livestock industry. Delay will be costly and we therefore hope you will do everything possible toward a start on the construction of this laboratory this year. The following is a resolution approved at our 1956 convention:

"Whereas, our research committee has determined a critical need for expanded research in the field of livestock diseases: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we urge Congress to appropriate and make available to the Department of Agriculture adequate funds for the establishment and operation of a livestock disease research laboratory someplace in the range cattle producing area of the United States."

Regards.

AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the justification of the need of the research laboratory and a report of distribution and estimated annual losses due to the diseases on which research work would be conducted in the proposed animal disease laboratory facility.

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

JUSTIFICATION

New facilities are urgently needed for the animal disease research and control programs.

In June 1955 three widely known research workers from outside the Department were asked to inspect animal disease research and control facilities located at Washington, D. C.; Beltsville, Md.; Auburn, Ala.; and Denver, Colo., to determine whether (1) the facilities and procedures were adequate for proper safeguarding of working personnel from the hazards of infection; (2) safeguards were sufficient to protect workers in other parts of the building and the public utilizing the corridors; and (3) facilities were adequate to protect experiments from cross contamination. Many of the diseases under study at these points were transmissible to man, including tuberculosis, brucellosis, anthrax, erysipelas, rabies, equine encephalomyelitis, Newcastle disease, and others.

The committee reported that facilities in use were not adequate to safeguard workers and other persons in the buildings from exposure to disease or the experimental work from cross contamination. Moreover, the committee reported that in most cases basic building structures were not adaptable to the modifications which would be necessary to provide modern safety measures, and also that they were inadequate for the fundamental disease research program underway. Following this report it was necessary to discontinue all research in Washington, D. C., and all that portion at Auburn, Ala., and Denver, Colo., on animal diseases infectious for man. This has resulted in curtailment of much important work and the suspension of other lines of research because of a lack of suitable space. Overcrowded quarters at Beltsville have been temporarily made available for certain of the work discontinued at other points. Provision for adequate laboratory facilities is essential not only to the conduct of a comprehensive animal disease research program but also to animal disease control programs.

The new facilities would provide space for comprehensive research on animal diseases and for diagnostic and testing work for control and regulatory activities. These facilities have been designed for experimental work with safety to the livestock industry and the health of workers.

Investigations would cover methods for diagnosis, cause, mode of transmission, and methods of prevention, treatment, and control of infectious diseases of all classes of livestock, including poultry, which exist in this country. Bacteriological, serological, pathological, immunological, and animal inoculation studies would be made. Research would cover diseases caused by bacteria, fungi, viruses, rickettsia, and pathological conditions.

Diagnoses of diseases would be made as they are encountered in animal disease control and eradication work in the field and in meatpacking plants. Tests would be made of animal biologics produced commercially to determine their purity and potency as required under the Virus-Serum-Toxin Act. The laboratory would contain facilities for pilot-plant development of production methods for biologics and diagnostic agents based on research findings. Chemical analyses and bacteriological examinations would be made of dips and disinfectants to determine their efficacy and reliability for use in control and eradication programs, and of germicides to determine conformity with the Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

---

REPORT OF DISTRIBUTION AND ESTIMATED ANNUAL LOSSES DUE TO THE DISEASES ON WHICH RESEARCH WORK WOULD BE CONDUCTED IN THE PROPOSED ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITY

Anaplasmosis: Cattle, $9,500,000.

Prevalent in most Southern and some Northern States—includes all States of the southern half of the United States. Incidence higher than previously supposed.

Anthrax: Cattle, $104,000; horses, $1,000; swine, $9,000; sheep, $1,000.

Tends to appear in river valleys. San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys of California, southeastern North Dakota, northeastern Nebraska, delta region of lower Mississippi, and Mississippi Valley in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Tranmissible to man—occupational disease among individuals working with animal hides, skin, or hair.

Atrophic rhinitis: Swine, $14,058,000.

Disease is spreading, particularly in major swine-producing States. Increased incidence in 10 States last year.

Bluetongue: Sheep, no estimate available.

Primarily in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Texas. Also diagnosed in Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. Cattle are carriers of this disease.

Brucellosis: Cattle, $87 million; swine, $10 million; and goats, $100,000.

Prevails wherever domestic animals and man cohabit. B. abortus, throughout United States; B. melitensis, primarily southwestern United States; B. suis, endemic in Midwest swine-raising States. Transmissible to man, prevalence depending on prevalence of disease in animals.

Chronic respiratory disease (air sac infection): Poultry, $10 million.

In all major poultry-producing areas, deaths in excess of 14 million birds annually. Affects all ages.

Ecthyma: Sheep, swine, cattle; no estimate available.

Primarily in sheep-raising areas of the West, with sporadic outbreaks in Eastern States. Man infected at rare intervals.

Encephalitis: Horses, $50,000.

Mortality rate in United States has increased recently. Diagnosed equine encephalomyelitis in 30 States last year, particularly Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Idaho, Nebraska, Illinois, and Florida.

Erysipelas: Swine, $24 million; turkeys, $1,687,000.

Generalized throughout United States, particularly in swine- and poultry-producing areas. Disease in swine has increased to 15 States last year, particularly in swine-producing States.

Foot rot: Cattle, $195,000; sheep, $13,000.

Recent survey indicates this condition to be a definite problem in 17 States, principally in Southern and range States.

Hog cholera: Swine, $48,628,000.

Generalized in United States. Incidence greatest in major swine-producing States. Incidence of disease has remained unchanged in 20 States and decreased in 22 States. No increases in past year.

Infectious bronchitis: Poultry, $7,055,000.

First diagnosed in North Dakota. Affects primarily susceptible growing and laying stock. Infection throughout United States, particularly in poultry-producing areas.

Infectious keratitis: Cattle, no estimate available.

Common ailment of cattle, especially in the range country. Sporadic outbreaks occur among dairy herds. Recent survey indicates disease to be a real problem in 11 States, particularly range States.

Infectious sinusitis: Turkeys, $3,034,000.

Disease found in all turkey-raising areas, runs a chronic course, and while death rates are low, failure to gain weight causes great losses.

Johnes' disease: Cattle, $194,000.

Reported incidence of 2.5 percent among cattle, found in both beef and dairy cattle throughout United States. Tests indicate that incidence is much greater than previously thought. Particularly high incidence in Southeastern United States.

Leptospirosis: Cattle, $112 million.

Has been diagnosed in all States; areas of greatest concentration are the warm, humid Southern and Southeastern States and the Corn Belt States. Concentration of human cases appears to be in California, Michigan, Ohio, Louisiana, and Washington, D. C.

Listerellosis: Cattle, $85,000; sheep, no estimate available.

Widespread distribution, sporadic outbreaks in recent years, particularly Illinois, Colorado, Wyoming, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Ohio.

Mastitis: Cattle, $225 million.

An extremely serious problem among dairy cattle. Economically the most important disease of cattle. Losses are great in all States, particularly those with greatest concentrations of dairy cattle.

Mucosal disease: Cattle, no estimate available.

Includes extensive outbreaks in New York, Indiana, Iowa, California, and Colorado. Several forms of this disease have been diagnosed in at least 20 States. Disease on the increase over the past 8 years.

Mycotic infections: Cattle, no estimate available; turkeys, $494,000.

Includes mycotic infections of skin, such as ringworm, and mycotic infections of the internal organs and aspergillosis of turkeys. Mycotic infections are more extensive than previously supposed and are identified throughout the United States.

Newcastle disease: Poultry, $24,012,000.

Disease is found in all States—a major problem among poultry producers, encountered at any time during the year. Particularly serious where poultry is concentrated—as broiler raising.

Ornithosis: Poultry, no estimate available.

Sources of infection include psittacine birds, pigeons, chickens, and turkeys. As a disease of domestic fowls, has been diagnosed in 11 States—Texas, New Jersey, Michigan, Minnesota, California, Oregon, Arizona, Massachusetts, Colorado, Iowa, and New York. Outbreaks have occurred in Texas, California, and Oregon. A hazard to human health.

Pasteurellosis: Cattle, $25 million; swine, $258,000.

A major problem in the cattle industry; results in high losses during shipping of livestock; appears in all parts of United

States. Losses greatest among young animals. Pasteurella infections produce infectious abortion in sheep which causes considerable economic losses.

Pox: Poultry, $1,400,000.

Uncontrolled outbreaks of fowl pox result in large economic losses to poultry producers. Disease more prevalent in areas of heavy poultry production.

Rabies: Cattle, $62,000; swine, $304,000; sheep, $5,000.

Knows no geographic boundaries; general throughout United States; eradication complicated by infection being present in foxes, skunks, bats, and other wild animals. Fatal disease in man.

Salmonellosis: Poultry, $16,494,000.

S. pullorum primarily results in high mortality among chicks. Areas of greatest incidence in poultry-producing areas. Incidence has decreased in recent years; decrease of 2.4 to 0.38 percent reactors from 1943 to 1953.

Swine influenza: No estimate available.

Disease is widespread in United States, but more prevalent in the Midwest, generally occurring in fall and winter.

Tuberculosis: Cattle, $1,914,000; swine, $801,000; poultry, $3 million.

In United States extensive eradication program has resulted in disease in cattle becoming a relatively uncommon disease. It is less than 1 percent in cattle now. Infection is general throughout United States and as long as any cases exist, the disease remains a hazard to human health.

Vesicular exanthema: Swine, $887,000.

Low incidence of disease at present, but extensive outbreak in 1952 resulted in spread of infection to nearly all States. Primarily a disease of swine fed raw garbage. Eradication program has been quite successful.

Vesicular stomatitis: Cattle, $44,000; swine, $50,000.

Disease appears to spread from a reservoir of infection in the Southeastern States, particularly Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Louisiana. Apparently more widespread than previously thought. Extensive outbreaks have occurred throughout United States. Transmissible to man.

Vibriosis: Cattle, $137,734,000; sheep, $8,350,000.

Widespread among cattle and sheep. Greater awareness of problem has resulted in an increase in numbers of reported cases. Incidence is highest where movement of cattle is great. May be transmitted to man.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 6, after line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I have received from the Wyoming Livestock Sanitary Board on the matter of the location of the laboratory.

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

CHEYENNE, WYO., *May 21, 1956.*

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Urge your support passage $18,915,000 new laboratory for protection livestock industry. Congress determine site for construction later.

THE WYOMING LIVESTOCK
SANITARY BOARD,
G. H. GOOD, *State Veterinarian.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are a large number of additional committee amendments, all dealing with changes made by the committee in amounts to be appropriated for various items in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered and approved en bloc, with the understanding that if any Senator wishes to offer an amendment to any one of them, the committee will consent to have such committee amendment reconsidered for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Without objection, the remaining committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc were as follows:

Under the subhead "Extension Service—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico," on page 7, line 2, after "(69 Stat. 683–4)", to strike out "$48,120,000" and insert "$48,620,000", and in line 5, after the word "all", to strike out "$49,615,000" and insert "$50,115,000."

Under the subhead "Federal Extension Service", on page 7, line 19, after the word "possessions", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,035,000."

Under the subhead "Agricultural Conservation Program Service", on page 11, line 22, after the word "States", to strike out "$217,500,000" and insert "$250,000,000"; on page 12, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$24,500,000" and insert "$24,698,000", and in line 9, after the word "than", to strike out "$4,600,000" and insert "$4,773,800."

Under the subhead "Agricultural Marketing Service—Marketing Research and Service", on page 16, line 9, after the word "estimates", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$13,265,000."

On page 16, line 22, after the word "States", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$13,020,000."

On page 17, line 11, after "(7 U. S. C. 1623 (b))", to strike out "$1,100,000" and insert "$1,200,000."

Under the subhead "Foreign Agricultural Service", on page 18, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$25,000"; at the beginning of line 2, to insert "and for extending courtesies to representatives of foreign countries"; in line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$3,600,000" and insert "$3,750,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That not less than $400,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis."

Under the subhead "Commodity Exchange Authority", on page 18, line 12, after "(7 U. S. C. 1–17a)", to strike out "$780,000" and insert "$787,400."

Under the subhead "Commodity Stabilization Service—Agricultural Adjustment Programs", on page 18, line 18, after "(7 U. S. C. 1301–1393)", to strike out "$41,000,000" and insert "$41,200,000", and in line 19, after the word "than", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$6,343,100."

Under the subhead "Sugar Act Program", on page 19, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$62,600,000" and insert "$67,600,000", and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$1,873,000."

Under the subhead "Rural Electrification Administration—Salaries and Expenses", on page 20, line 7, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$8,500,000" and insert "$8,700,000."

Under the subhead "Farmers' Home Administration—Loan Authorizations", on page 21, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "$19,000,000" and insert "$24,000,000"; in line 20, after the word "amended", to strike out "$140,000,000" and insert "$180,000,000", and in line 21, after the word "amended", to strike out "$5,500,000; and additional amounts, not to exceed $50,000,000, may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1957, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly conduct of these programs" and insert "$10,500,000."

Under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 22, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "$26,405,000" and insert "$26,805,000."

Under the subhead "Office of the General Counsel," on page 22, line 20, after the word "service", to strike out "$2,700,000" and insert "$2,762,700."

Under the subhead "Library," on page 24, line 10, after the word "members", to strike out "$725,000" and insert "$773,000."

Under the heading "Title V—General Provisions," on page 30, line 18, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which 622 shall be."

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to strike out the figure "$49,676,400" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$49,736,400."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I discussed this amendment with Representative CHARLES GUBSER, who represents the 10th District of California, and I received a letter from him, in which he says:

The California prune advisory board, San Francisco, advises me that the prune industry is vitally interested in obtaining funds to develop mechanical harvesting equipment. I have also been informed that the sum of $584,375, included in the House version of the Agriculture appropriation bill, includes funds for a number of research projects to develop mechanical harvesters for apples and cherries.

The board estimates that about $100,000 would be required over a 3-year period to carry out the research in this field. Although I recognize that time is short, I should appreciate anything you could do to insert at least a token payment allocation for the prune harvester research in the Agriculture appropriation bill.

It is for that reason that I am offering the amendment, to add $60,000 to the item in the bill. I hope the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there seems to be considerable merit to the contention that mechanical harvesters should be applied to the harvesting of prunes. I have no objection to accepting the amendment and taking it to conference, to try to get an appropriation for it in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the action of the Senate by which the committee amendment on page 3, lines 7 and 8 was agreed to, is reconsidered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to strike out the figure "$49,676,-

400" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$49,736,400."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, as shown on pages 22 and 23, amounts to $2½ million. During the past 2 years the President has asked for certain appropriations to enable the Department of Agriculture to carry out a rural development program. There seems to be no general objection to the program being carried out. However, the House has substantially cut the appropriation for that purpose. As I understand, the Senate Committee on Appropriations has restored all of the cuts except $10,500 for an assistant to the Secretary, who would direct the rural development program.

I would move, Mr. President, that $10,500 be added to the $2,500,000 which is now in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Vermont send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no written amendment, Mr. President, but in line 8, page 23, of the bill, I would add $10,500 to the $2,500,000 provided for in the bill. We have appropriated enough for the Secretary's office to hire half a man as an assistant in charge of the rural development program. I am simply asking that we add $10,500 to that appropriation.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I concur in the proposal submitted by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think there is a need for us constantly to develop in the field of research in agriculture. It is through research that we shall broaden the scope of our agricultural economy and also broaden the opportunity of farm families. If we assist farm families to broaden their income, we shall do a great deal for agriculture.

For that reason, Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague from Vermont in favor of the proposed increase.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has been a long time since an appropriation of $10,500 has been discussed on the floor of the Senate. In the old days that sum of money might have justified a few minutes talk. I would not quibble with the distinguished Senator from Vermont about the amount of $10,500, but it so happens that the Committee on Appropriations went into this subject. The House committee allowed an increase of $10,195 for the Office of the Secretary. The total amount appropriated for the Office of the Secretary is $2,500,000. That is a considerable sum, Mr. President.

The committee, however, after considering the matter, placed this language in the committee report:

The committee believes that the increase allowed by the House should make it possible to provide leadership for the rural development program.

The committee is in favor of the rural development program. We have allowed increases throughout the bill, running into a substantial sum, I would say, of several million dollars for the rural program. But it seemed to the committee, Mr. President, that an efficient Secretary of Agriculture, a man who was able to save money and to place much stress upon economical administration, should be able to absorb $10,500 out of an appropriation of $2,500,000. I am, therefore, committed to oppose this proposed increase, small though it may be, because the committee has considered the question, and it does seem that we should not feel constrained in every case to allow the full amount of the budget estimate, even though it be for the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under the instructions of the committee, and after considering the matter and discussing it in the committee, I would say that I hope the Senator from Vermont will not press his amendment. He was in the committee when the matter was discussed. The Secretary of Agriculture can certainly find some way to save $10,500. If he would cut down on the number of subscriptions to newspapers, which, doubtless, he does not have time to read thoroughly, he could save $10,500 and hire a man who would be his liaison man with the rural development program. It is an important program, it is true. We have appropriated money where requested for several subdivisions of the Department of Agriculture. We have given money to research, to extension, and to the marketing service which used to be the BAE, and all the committee asks is that the Secretary cooperate by saving a few dollars here and there out of a $2,500,000 appropriation so as to hire this man for $10,500, if he feels he has to have one. Personally, I do not think it is absolutely necessary to have a man of that kind in the office of the Secretary. But if it is necessary, the Secretary can hire him out of this large appropriation.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to correct one statement of the Senator from Georgia. This item is doubtless the only one taken up when the Senator from Vermont was not present. He was called out at that time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I apologize to the Senator from Vermont. I should have known better, because having seen how valiantly the Senator has followed the Secretary of Agriculture in every course he has pursued, I would have known that if the Senator had been present, he would have made a Herculean fight for the item.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Georgia satisfied that any of the $2½ million appropriated to the Office of the Secretary is available for the purpose of employing an assistant to be in charge of the rural-development program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know there is no legislative authority necessary for the Secretary to hire an assistant. All the Secretary has to do is to save $10,500 out of the $2,500,000 appropriated, and employ a man.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator is satisfied that the Secretary can use that money out of the appropriation, I will withdraw my suggested amendment. I simply did not want to make an appropriation for a program without being sure the Secretary has the means of hiring someone to head it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment of the Senator from Vermont has been withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I have discussed earlier with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations. It relates merely to the reallocation of funds under the rural-electrification loan authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, in lines 17 through 24, it is proposed to strike out the following: "$145,300,000; and rural telephone program, $49,500,000; and additional amounts, not to exceed $68,700,000 for the rural electrification program and $50,500,000 for the rural telephone program may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1957 under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program" and to insert in lieu thereof "$214 million; and rural telephone program, $100 million."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as stated earlier in the day when this matter was brought up, I think it is merely a play on figures. It does not affect the total amount available for the purpose. I accept the amendment.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have vast respect for the judgment of the Senator from Georgia, but I believe there is a question on these REA funds as to what the Bureau of the Budget would do. The regular appropriation has to be budgeted at the beginning of each year, and if REA needs more than the regular budget later, it has to get consent from the Bureau of the Budget to use these other funds. There really appears to be no necessity now, since the formula has been changed, to have a contingent fund at all. I appreciate the Senator's accepting this amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no contingent fund. The words "contingent fund" do not appear in the bill.

I have accepted the amendment, but it is wholly unnecessary. It is my opinion that these loan funds are not divided into 12 equal installments. Sometimes they may loan $30 million in one month and $5 million in another month. This is merely a play on figures. But I have accepted the amendment.

If the Senator will read the language on page 19 he will see that the words "contingent fund" are not used at all.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was only because of the language in the House committee report that I was concerned about it, and also because of the fact that the association was concerned about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota is agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the Senate considered House bill 11177, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that just prior to the passage of the bill, there be printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report of the House committee; I refer to page 9 of the report, the part relating to the Soil Conservation Service. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in that report on the bill, the following appears:

In the opinion of the committee, most of these additional responsibilities should be handled by this organization—

In other words, the Soil Conservation Service; and in this instance the committee was referring to the soil bank—

to assure satisfactory results. It is apparent that this organization must be strengthened to handle this additional responsibility.

Mr. President, the State Foresters' Association has drawn my attention to that statement. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD section 118 of the Soil Bank Act as it has been passed by both Houses of Congress and which states quite clearly the intention of Congress as to how these responsibilities shall be handled.

Section 118 of the Soil Bank Act outlines the manner in which the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the conservation aspects of the soil-bank program, the Secretary is required to adhere to these guidelines contained in it and make the fullest possible use of all available technical resources. For example, in the field of forestry and tree planting, the resources of both the United States Forest Service and the State foresters should be used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2148, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) and section 118 of H. R. 10875 were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service assists soil conservation districts and other cooperators in bringing about physical adjustments in land use that will conserve soil and water resources, provide economic production on a sustained basis, and reduce damages from floods and sedimentation. The Service also develops and carries out special drainage, irrigation, flood prevention, and watershed protection programs in cooperation with soil conservation districts, watershed groups, and other Federal and State agencies having related responsibility. It is expected that the new soil-bank legislation will increase the work of this agency in these fields.

Conservation operations: The committee recommends an appropriation of $67,500,000 for 1957, an increase of $4,557,255 over the 1956 appropriation and an increase of $2,285,000 in the budget estimate.

The committee has substantially increased funds for soil conservation technicians to enable this organization to meet the additional responsibilities which will result from the new soil-bank program. In the opinion of the committee, most of these additional responsibilities should be handled by this organization to assure satisfactory results. It is apparent that this organization must be strengthened to handle this additional responsibility.

It has come to the committee's attention that the soil technicians in this agency are frequently required to devote a considerable amount of time to routine clerical duties. The committee recommends that a portion of the increase provided for the next year be used to employ clerical personnel to relieve these technicians of clerical work so as to better use their technical training and abilities.

In view of the terrific demand for vegetative covering and seedlings which will develop from the new soil-bank program, the Soil Conservation Service should take proper steps to see that this need is met. Since the total supply of such seedlings apparently will be far short of that necessary to meet the full demand which will grow out of the expanded program, it is apparent that the combined efforts of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, State and local agencies, and private nurseries will be called upon to the fullest extent. Therefore, the committee feels that this organization should review its conservation nursery program to make certain that all of the nurseries formerly operated by this Service are available to meet this need. These nurseries should either be operated directly by the Soil Conservation Service, or should be handled on a cooperative or contract basis with State, local, or private organizations.

UTILIZATION OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 118. With respect to conservation aspects of any program under this title, the Secretary shall consult with the soil conservation districts, State foresters, State game and fish agencies, land-grant colleges, and other appropriate agencies of State governments, and with the Fish and Wildlife Service, in the formulation of program provisions at the State and county levels. The technical resources of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the land-grant colleges, the State foresters, State game and fish agencies, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other appropriate technical services shall be utilized, so far as practicable, to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 11177) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Frederick G. Hamley, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice Homer T. Bone, retired, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. 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. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 11, 36, 46, and 48.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, and 51; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 8, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April 15" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"STUDY OF PRICE TRENDS FOR FOREST PRODUCTS

"SEC. 402. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood and within one year from the date of enactment of this Act shall submit a report thereon to the Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very much pleased to state that the conferees on H. R. 10875 met yesterday afternoon and this morning and unanimously agreed to the report just read by the clerk. I shall not go into details about the report, but shall merely give a summary of the report's provisions.

First, the acreage reserve program would become effective in 1956. The Senate amendment, which had provided for a 1956 program to the extent deemed practicable by the Secretary, was rejected by the House, and the Senate receded from its amendments in this respect. In connection with this amendment, it was agreed that the House would have in its report the following statement:

The conference agreed to make the soil bank effective immediately as provided in the House bill. It was recognized, however, the larger part of this year's plantings have already taken place and it is not expected that any large part of the crop planted will be plowed up or otherwise removed from production as authorized by section 103. The committee recognizes that the Secretary cannot be expected to accomplish the impracticable or to secure any large part of the beneficial results hoped for the soil bank in 1956, but it also recognizes that certain farmers have heretofore planned to participate this year and it is felt that they should be assured of the opportunity to do so.

I understand that the distinguished Senator from Vermont has received from the Secretary of Agriculture a letter which he wishes to place at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
*Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.*

DEAR GEORGE: This is in response to your request for my comments on the possibility of getting a soil bank into operation on the 1956 crops.

H. R. 10875 contains the following language in section 103: "* * * the Secretary of Agriculture * * * is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out an acreage reserve program for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops * * *"

Section 103 further provides that "Reserve acreage of a commodity may include acreage whether or not planted to the production of the 1956 crop of the commodity prior to the announcement of the acreage reserve program for the 1956 crop if the crop thereon, if any, shall be plowed under or otherwise physically incorporated into the soil, or clipped, mowed, or cut to prevent maturing so that the reduction in acreage of the commodity below the acreage allotment occurs within 21 days after the enactment of this title, or by such later date as may be fixed by the Secretary."

It is now the second week of May. Wheat will soon be ready for harvest in the Southern Great Plains. Winter oats and barley in the southern half of the country will soon be ripening. Much of the cotton is planted. Spring grains are mostly seeded. Corn is being planted. By the end of May, 1956 plantings will be virtually completed.

I would not be discharging my responsibility if I failed to point out the grave difficulties associated with trying, at this late date, to get a soil bank operating on 1956 spring seeded crops.

Inclusion of feed grains in the acreage reserve requires the establishment of base acreages for these crops: oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, and corn in the noncommercial area. This means the assembling of data and the determination of bases on 100 million acres. We presently operate programs on 170 million acres. This provision would require an expansion of almost 60 percent in the scope of our operations. It would be necessary for local committeemen to establish for every farm a normal yield for every crop in the acreage reserve. In order to be equitable, one farm with another and one area with another, these yields would have to weigh out to county check yields.

Even though we would do our utmost, we could not have this tremendous task accomplished, together with the necessary writing of contracts and checking of compliance, prior to the harvest date for many of these feed crops.

We have gone as far as we could go in making ready for the administration of this program, taking into account the many uncertainties as to its eventual form. But obviously we cannot write procedures before the law is passed, and questions of major importance regarding the legislation are still being debated.

Some may contend that we should omit the established procedure of determining bases and proceed on the basis of unverified data. Our experience is that unless historical data are used, the reported acreage figures may be in error by as much as 30 or 40 percent.

To launch a program like the soil bank at this late date, for 1956 spring seeded crops, with inadequate data and hastily developed administrative machinery, would have these adverse effects:

1. Participation would be low. Farmers, with their crops already planted and with their investment already made in seed, fertilizer, and labor, would be reluctant to enter the program.

2. The intended reduction in production would not be accomplished. Since participation would be low and since the farmers most likely to come into the program would be those whose crops were likely to turn out below average in yield, the intended purpose of the program—reduction of surpluses—would not be satisfactorily achieved.

3. Costs would be excessive. The inducement necessary to cause a farmer to enter the program would be greater after he has made his outlay of money for production expenses than it would be if contracts could be made before planting.

4. It would be difficult to make the program properly effective in later years. If the program is launched hastily, precedents are established which prevent proper administration for the following years.

5. The program would be discredited in the minds of farmers and the public generally. The soil bank has much promise if it can be properly operated. If, in the first year of its operation, farmers do not participate fully and the program is demonstrably ineffective and expensive, then the program may be erroneously judged a failure. This would be especially true if it becomes a plow-up program. This program should be given a fair chance to operate.

On several occasions, the critical time element in this program has been referred to.

In his discussion before the Senate committee on February 6, Under Secretary Morse submitted a summary which contained this statement: "If legislative action is not taken prior to April 15 it will be extremely difficult to get a program this year except for wheat seeded in the fall of 1956." This statement was made with respect to the program recommended by the administration, which embodied an acreage reserve program intended to apply only to wheat, corn, cotton, and rice. Since then the program has been made more complex and has been extended to feed grains, tobacco, and peanuts, thereby adding substantially to the workload. Grazing lands are added in the House bill.

In his April 16 message regarding his action on H. R. 12, the President said: "The long delay in getting this bill makes it too late for most farmers to participate in the soil bank on this year's crops."

In my appearance before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on April 19 I said: "Farmers should know as promptly as possible the terms of the acreage reserve so as to plan for fall crops. Plowing will be underway within 90 days—then comes liming, fertilizing, and seeding in rapid succession."

It will take all the time available to prepare properly for a program on crops planted in the fall of 1956. Farmers would be helped far more, in my opinion, by a constructive program beginning on fall crops than by a hasty, ineffective program on 1956 spring crops.

In view of the impracticability of getting a program into operation this year for both spring seeded and fall seeding crops, it is recommended that this bill be amended so that the soil bank program will commence with the crops planted in the fall of 1956.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary.*

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the second agreement reached was on the Senate amendments which eliminated the acreage-reserve programs for corn outside the commercial area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, field crops to be designated by the Secretary, and grazing lands. No acreage allotments are in effect for any of these commodities, or for grazing lands, so that acreage-reserve programs for them would have caused serious administrative problems, particularly in 1956. Consistent with this agreement, the conferees agreed to leave the overall limit on the acreage-reserve program at $750 million, as provided by the Senate amendments.

Third, the feed-grain provisions of the Senate amendments were adopted with one minor technical change. The 1956 support prices would be fixed on the basis of the May 1 parity price instead of the April 15 parity price. This was the original intention of the amendment, and the change was designed to make that purpose clear. As amended by the Senate and agreed to by the conferees, the bill provides for (A) support of the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats at 76 percent of parity as of

May 1, (B) support—in any year in which base acreages are applicable for corn—for corn in the noncommercial area at 82½ percent of the level applicable in the commercial area, and (C) support for the 1957 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and corn outside the commercial area at not less than 70 percent of parity as of the beginning of the marketing year, if price support is made available to corn producers not complying with acreage and soil-bank participation requirements. Support for feed grains would not be dependent in either 1956 or 1957 upon compliance with acreage or soil bank participation requirements, or upon whether there is an acreage-reserve program for corn.

In other words, what the conference did was to adopt the so-called Holland amendment, with one exception, in that we changed the date from April 15 to May 1.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The minor change just mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who was also chairman of the conference committee, came about in this way: The data is to be brought together as of the 15th of the month. But the figure compiled and based upon that data will govern the next calendar month, which in this case would be the month of May, or the month beginning May 1. So the change is, as described by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, a purely technical one, and not one of meaning in any way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Fourth, the Senate amendment assuring that a base acreage of 51 million acres would be established for corn for 1956 was agreed to and remains in the bill.

Fifth, the Senate amendment imposing price support forfeiture as an additional penalty for grazing lands in the acreage reserve—that was the so-called O'Mahoney amendment—was rejected, the conferees being of the opinion that adequate penalties were provided by sections 103 (a) (i), 103 (a) (ii), and 123. The Senate amendment specifically including the prohibition of grazing on conservation acreages in section 107 (a) (6) (A)—that was the second O'Mahoney amendment—was agreed to. That prohibition would have been covered by that section whether the additional language had been inserted or not. The specific inclusion of that language in section 107 (a) (6) (A) should not be taken to indicate in any way that the violation of grazing prohibitions are not included in other penalty provisions of the bill just because they are not specifically mentioned in those provisions.

It will be recalled that when the first bill was considered by the conferees, we struck from the bill the amendments introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and several other western Senators. There was a provision in the original bill which was vetoed by the President, that would have imposed an additional penalty for violation of grazing rights equal to 50 percent of a year's acreage reserve compensation. That provision was retained in the bill. It appears now in section 123 as it was in the original bill.

Sixth, the Senate amendments which made the prohibition of section 125 on the leasing of lands for agricultural production applicable to "price supported crops" instead of "agricultural commodities," and which specifically exempted wildlife refuges in certain cases, were adopted. The first of these amendments made it clear that grazing lands were not covered by section 125.

Seventh, the Senate amendment providing for the sale by Commodity Credit Corporation of cotton, for export, at world prices or, during the 1956 marketing year, at the minimum prices accepted under the August 12, 1955 program, if lower, was agreed to.

The conferees agreed to the following language to be inserted in the report to be submitted by the House:

Section 203 directs the CCC to use its existing powers and authorities to encourage the exportation of cotton by offering to make it available at prices based on sales under the so-called million-bale program (announced August 12, 1955), and even lower if necessary, in order to be competitive with foreign countries exporting cotton in substantial quantities. The principal difference in the program required by this provision as contrasted with the million-bale program and the program now in effect (announced on February 28, 1956) will be in the price level at which bids are accepted.

This provision directs that such quantities of cotton be offered and sold as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton, the quantity to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary has indicated that he considers 5 million bales to be the fair historical share based on the present level of world trade in cotton. This committee believes this to be reasonable in view of the history of United States exports.

It is hoped that the Secretary can regain the historical American share of the world market without unnecessarily lowering the level of world prices for cotton, and it is not intended that he shall be required to drastically reduce the price of cotton far below the level of prices received at the sale announced August 12, 1955. On the other hand it is intended that he shall have ample authority to reduce prices to whatever level he finds necessary to accomplish this result.

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

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

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the committee of conference accepted section 203 of the farm bill, H. R. 10875, in the form added by the Senate. As indicated in the conference report and statement of managers on the part of the House, the committee of conference was in complete agreement as to the intent and purpose of this section. The legislative history as developed in the Senate and the statement contained in the conference report clearly expresses the intent of the legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Eighth, the Senate amendments providing for the sale of 100 million bushels of wheat annually for feed at feed prices, and exempting wheat grown for feed or seed on the farm where produced from marketing penalties, were rejected by the House and omitted from the bill.

Ninth, the Senate amendments providing for minimum National and State cotton and rice acreage allotments for 1957 and 1958 were agreed to.

Tenth, except for subsection (d), the section added by the Senate to provide for forest products price reporting and research was rejected. Subsection (d), which remains in the bill, provides for a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products. The conferees also agreed to an amendment to this subsection to require the Secretary to report on his study within 1 year after the enactment of this bill, instead of 2 years.

I wish to say to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the conferees on the part of the Senate did their best to retain his provision. I brought it to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, Mr. COOLEY, who had indicated he no longer had any objection to the amendment. Unfortunately, Mr. COOLEY stated to the conferees he had received many objections to it, and that the House conferees could not agree to the amendment in full, but agreed to retain subsection (d).

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to thank the chairman of the committee for his diligence in this matter. I regret exceedingly that the full text of that section of the bill was not included in the final conference report. I am grateful for the tidbits of accomplishments of progress. I realize that the importance of the study has been recognized, and that the time for reporting has been reduced from a 2-year period to a 1-year period, which would give us a great deal of factual information that would be of vital help and important assistance, not only to Congress, but to the timber farmers.

I think it ought to be noted that the main opposition, insofar as the junior Senator from Minnesota knows, to the so-called price reporting section on timber, comes from the Lumbermen's Manufacturers Association, from the large manufacturers or processors of timber products, and from the large owners of forest lands and purchasers of timber from the small timber farmers. For the life of me, I cannot understand this opposition except on the basis that some persons like to have an opportunity to purchase in a market which was beclouded by a lack of information.

Mr. President, I shall be very persistent. I intend to ask the committee to process the amendment in terms of a bill. There are more and more timber farmers all over the United States, and they are growing an important part of our agricultural production. I want the RECORD to be clear that they are the only producers of food and fiber in the United States of America who are today excluded from the price reporting services of the Department of Agriculture. They are set apart by exclusion, and it appears to me we are confronted by a powerful lobby on the part of the large timber barons. I shall call them that because I know of them in my State. They have

taken out the best timber in Minnesota, and in many other States they have taken out the best timber.

I regret that we have had to lose this amendment. But again I wish to commend the Senate conferees. I know they supported me in the committee and I know they supported the proposal here on the floor. I am very grateful for what they have done.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I also wish to refer to what the committee did regarding this matter. I endorse every word our chairman has said. The Senate conferees urged the inclusion of this amendment, and tried their best to have it included. We ran against a solid brick wall, so far as the House conferees were concerned. They would not yield on this point.

This matter was one of the very last ones we had to handle in the conference. I was the one who offered the compromise, in an effort to get the House conferees at least to agree to such reporting 1 year from now; and finally they agreed to that.

I wish to say, further, that they argued with us that at the present time the Department has a right to have these reports made. However, they are not being made at the present time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who has been exceedingly helpful all the way along in connection with this agricultural program, and has been very helpful to me, personally. So I am duly grateful.

It is true that the Department could do this reporting. In view of the fact that twice the Senate has voted in favor of such a provision, I hope the Department will proceed to do the reporting.

A few minutes ago the Senate passed the agricultural appropriation bill, which carries ample funds for this service. In fact, if the Department wishes to do so, it can transfer some of the funds from its propaganda branch—which, believe me, has been overloaded with funds—to this informational work for the benefit of the farmers. I think that would help.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it will also be found that the Department opposed this amendment, as other Senators know. I cannot understand why the Department opposed it, for in the next breath the Department does not deny that it has the right to make such investigations. Why it does not make them, I cannot understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is interesting that the Department opposes this particular provision, when the Department spends substantial sums of money in gathering information of much less merit than this information, in terms of the economics of the producers of fiber in the United States. In fact, the Department spends considerable sums of money in gathering information on foreign production of items not even in competition with American products.

I regret that the Department opposes this item. However, to my mind, at times opposition by the Department is almost an asset, rather than a liability.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for his very able attempt to be of assistance to those of us who are so vitally concerned with the Humphrey amendment, and I wish to thank him for the progress which has been made.

I regard the compromise amendment the Senator has brought back to us as a step forward.

But for the RECORD I wish to say that the failure to obtain acceptance by the House of Representatives of the Humphrey amendment is a serious blow to the small lumber operators in my State and, in my judgment, to the small lumber operators in all the other States. I wish the RECORD to show why that is so.

Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am not surprised that the Department is opposed to his amendment, because the policies of this Department under the administration have been the policies of the big lumber operators, not those of the small lumber operators. What his amendment sought to do was to give the small lumber operators the information they need regarding the value of their timber. That is what the "big boys" do not want the small lumber operators to have. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has pointed out, the large operators want to keep this situation a confused one.

I think this administration is clearly guilty of a serious dereliction in the performance of its public duty, when it does not have the Department carry out the power it really has in respect to this price reporting.

I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, we have just begun the fight on this matter; and at every opportunity we shall offer again the Humphrey proposal, because the small lumber operators are entitled to this price-reporting service from their government. In my judgment, they pay taxes for it, just as the recipients of other price-reporting services pay taxes for them. There is no sense in our trying to fool ourselves about this situation; it is a serious blow to the small lumber operators of this country, and it is a great favor to the designs of the big lumber operators.

Mr. President, what I am saying is in no way a criticism of our conferees, because I have been a conferee, too, and I know that there are times, after conferees have put up the best possible fight, when it is necessary that there be some give and take.

I wish to compliment the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for saving as much as he did by way of his compromise proposal.

But I wish to serve notice on the big lumber operators in my State that I am not going to stop my fight to have the small lumber operators receive the service to which they clearly are entitled.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to join the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and my colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in urging the necessity if instituting price-reporting in regard to timber. Actually, Mr. President, such reporting is even more important in the case of timber than it is in the case of cotton or similar field crops which are grown and harvested each year, because timber takes many years to mature; and when a timber owner fails to receive a fair price for his timber, that certainly means more to him and to his family than failure to receive a fair price for a crop of cotton or some other crop, which matures more rapidly than does a crop of fir timber or a crop of pine timber. It requires 60 or 80 years for timber to mature to commercial size and quality.

In my opinion, one of the main groups to suffer as a result of the failure to include the Humphrey amendment in the conference report is the group of 3,400,000 American farmers who own farm woodlots, because they do not have the necessary resources or facilities of their own to enable them to find out what their timber is worth. They will be the chief victims if such a Federal price-supporting system is not established.

I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his very valiant efforts to bring back the compromise amendment which all of us hope may in the next year or so produce a bona fide, genuine Government price-supporting system within the field of timber products.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to add my word of appreciation to those of the Senator from Minnesota regarding the Senators who have worked so hard on this matter. I desire to state that I shall join the Senator in his efforts to get some such measure as this one written into law. In fact, I think the Congress will be derelict in the performance of its duty and will be in direct violation of its oath if it fails to make this provision for the producers of pulpwood and other wood on the farms. It is tragic that they are left without the benefit of this service, in the case of the timber that is grown on family-sized tracts and on

other woodlands which such farmers own.

I come from a State which once was a great timber-producing State, and some day it will again be a great timber-producing State, although it is not at the present time. I know that in the past, when the timber produced in my State was sold, those who sold it received far, far less than its actual value.

At the present time, piecemeal, and in places, they are learning how to market their product, which requires so long to grow. In my area it grows faster than it does in the area of Minnesota. I know that the producer has obtained 2 or 3 or 4 or 5, or even 6 or 7 times as much in certain areas after he has learned how to value and market his product.

I hope we shall not allow another session to pass without an effective bill of the right kind being included as permanent policy and a permanent activity of our Department of Agriculture, which is capable of doing such a fine job in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure my good friend from Minnesota and all other Senators who are interested in the subject that, if and when the bill comes before the Senate the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am chairman, I shall make every effort to see that such a bill is reported to the Senate and enacted into law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Continuing with the items of agreement:

Eleventh. The Senate amendments providing for a discretionary two-price plan for rice, redefining "normal yield" for rice, providing competitive support levels for cottonseed and soybeans, and freezing the transitional parity price for corn, wheat, and peanuts were agreed to by the conferees.

I do not know that I wish to go further into detail. However, I believe that the agreements reached in conference are fair, and I hope the Senate will adopt the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although I do not blieve that the bill as reported from the conference, and which is covered by the conference report which is now before us, will be nearly as effective as some of its advocates hoped, I believe it is probably the best bill which could be obtained during this session of Congress. There are some things in the bill which I would have preferred to leave out. There are other things, which have been left out, which I would have preferred to see remain in the bill. However, that is now water over the dam. We have the best result which the conferees were able to obtain.

We have included provisions in the bill for a soil bank. I believe that probably too much is expected from the acreage-reserve program, and that in the long run the conservation reserve program, which would take marginal land out of production to build up its fertility, or put it to producing that for which it is best suited, will probably prove to be the most beneficial part of the bill. There will not be so much in the form of immediate returns from it. however.

The provisions of the bill relating to feed grains are the best upon which we could reach agreement. I believe that the four feed grains, noncompliance corn, and corn grown in noncommercial areas, are on as equitable a basis as possible.

The part of the bill which relates to the reforestation program is left intact. That may prove to be very beneficial, indeed.

Mr. President, I had no objection to the Humphrey amendment, which was stricken out at the instance of the House conferees. I should have been very glad to see it remain in the bill. I agree that a great many small landowners do not receive anywhere near the price for their timber that they ought to receive. However, when any Member of Congress says that the fact that the Department is authorized to issue market reports on forest products, but does not do so, is something which should be charged against the present Department of Agriculture. I must point out that in not issuing such market reports on forest products the Department of Agriculture is simply carrying out the policy which has been in existence for many years. I also point out that no appropriations committee during my service in this body has ever recommended an appropriation for that purpose. The Department does have the authority, but such market reports have never been issued during my term of service and neither has an appropriation been made for that purpose.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is entirely correct. I am pleased that he has corrected the RECORD in those terms, because it is true that this situation has gone unnoticed—if not unnoticed, at least uncared for. I hope that as a result of the discussion relating to this subject, we can proceed, in due order, to get what seems to be the objective of both the Senator from Vermont and myself, as well as of other Senators who have spoken.

I am very grateful and pleased that the section in the bill relating to reforestation was continued. I think this will be one of the truly great contributions to our long-term agricultural program.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont with respect to the conservation reserve program. He has referred to two long-range programs which will mean a great deal to the country. Acreage reserve has its short-term duration as a means of correcting production problems, and at the same time providing some replacement income where production cutbacks must take place.

The efforts which have been made to strengthen our forestry program have cut across the aisle. I hope we shall continue to make efforts on that basis.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I am glad he appreciates, as I do, that the conservation reserve part of the bill is, in the long run, by far the most important part of the bill. The other provisions are temporary. Some may never go into effect at all. Some may last 1 year, some 2 years, and some 3 or 4 years, but the conservation reserve program is something to which we must pay attention if we are to preserve our soil, water, and forest resources, as they should be preserved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his contribution to the conservation program. Many times I have expressed my appreciation for the conservation work he has done. In my judgment, he has acted in accordance with the highest traditions of Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, the great forerunners in the conservation movement. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his conservation record.

I hope the Senator from Vermont will see his way clear, in due time, to be of assistance to us on the point we were discussing a few moments ago, namely, the need for price reporting on timber prices. I happen to believe that that is also a part of a sound conservation program. We shall conserve our timber better, and make better use of that timber, when producers of the timber are given the facts which I think they need in the matter of prices. That is why I think the price-reporting service is so essential.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter under date of May 22, addressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, dealing with the matter of price reporting on our timber resources.

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

MAY 22, 1956.

The Honorable ALLEN ELLENDER,
*Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is just a short note to give you my views concerning the importance of the forest products price reporting provisions of the farm bill, H. R. 10875, as it was reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee. Section 402 relative to such price reporting would provide a service to timber growers and tree farmers. There is one thing that is going to get better forestry on our farm woodlands—real knowledge that raising timber pays.

The Federal Government spends almost $15 million a year to help fight forest fires, plant trees, and give timber-cutting advice to small woodland owners under the Clarke-McNary Act. The States spend double this amount in matching funds. These are sound programs but I feel something has been lacking in getting better forestry on our farm woodlands. They are in bad shape, as the recent timber resources review of the Forest Service points out.

Our farmers do not have a real dollar incentive to grow trees. The price reporting section of H. R. 10875 will provide this incentive. If our farmers can get up-to-date information on what stumpage, logs, and pulpwood are worth, they will quickly see the value of growing trees.

The lumber associations have been lobbying against this section. They talk about better forestry but they overlook the fact that better forestry will come only when the man who owns timber can get a fair deal when he sells his trees. In the South, for example, 74 percent of the timberland is in the hands of farmers and small landowners while only 13 percent is owned by the

forest industries. These small owners often do not know the value of their timber, making it possible for the sawmill to take advantage of them. The small income the farmer gets from the timber does not encourage him to grow trees.

We can help the farmers, the small landowners and the forests of our country if we retain section 402 in the bill that is now in conference. Senator HUMPHREY has done a grand job in providing a measure of real value to the farmer. We all come from timbered States that will benefit from this section and if it is retained in the bill we can tell the people of our States about another real accomplishment by Democratic leadership in the Congress.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks. I know how keenly he feels, not only about our forests, but the conservation of our natural resources generally. I feel that there is nothing more important that we could do and bear in mind at all times than the preservation of the wonderful natural resources which we possess.

My own State is a small State. We have made a great deal of progress, I think, in the right direction. Every county in the State has an extension forester. I believe my State was the first State to inaugurate such a program. We can operate such a program because there are only 14 counties in the State. I hope the time will come when every county in the country which has any appreciable amount of forest will be able to give full service to the farmers and forest owners, in a manner comparable to what we are able to do in my State at present.

I realize the need for forest landowners to be properly informed as to the value of what they may have to sell. At the present time only five States perform this service. I do not remember the names of all of them. There is New Hampshire, in the East; Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and I believe one of the States in the Northwest—possibly Washington. At any rate, it is some State in another part of the country. Those States already perform this service.

It could be a valuable service. I can also appreciate the difficulties involved in getting up quarterly reports, because all of us must realize that trees in one place may have an entirely different value from trees located only 2 miles away. There may be a mountain ridge between them, for example. Therefore, I appreciate the difficulties which the Forest Service might have in publishing these reports. However, we have left in the bill a mandate for the Department to determine what can be done in that respect and to report on their investigations to Congress within the next year.

I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont merits all the praise he has received in connection with the conservation reserve program. However, I should like to ask him one question. I ask him if it is not true that it is completely accurate, as the Senator from Vermont has stated, that there has been no timber price reporting in the past, regardless of the administration in office.

Mr. AIKEN. Not on a Federal basis.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Not on a Federal basis. However, there has been no appropriation made for that purpose. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But is it not also a fact that never before has this service been so urgent, because few natural resources have had such perilous and dangerous inroads made upon it in recent years as is the case with our timber resources?

I say that because timber resources are now so threatened and so much in danger of diminution that I know of areas in the Pacific Northwest, for example, where fir timber is being sold for from $30 to $45 a thousand board-feet, which only a relatively few years ago brought $3 or $4 a thousand board-feet.

When a man sells a substantial amount of timber for $4 a thousand board-feet, which might, under proper competitive bidding, if he were advised by his Government of prices, yield him as much as $30 or $45 a thousand board-feet—and there is a substantial amount of timber involved—it is a serious thing, indeed.

Therefore, although a Federal price-reporting system might not have been needed 8 or 10 years ago, it is urgently required today, in view of the diminution of our timber resources.

I am sure that the Senator from Vermont, with his background in forestry and farming, surely must realize that fact.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I realize that the conservation of our natural resources was of extreme importance even before the Senator from Vermont was born. Our failure to recognize that fact years ago now is one of the reasons that we have a reduction in our resources today.

I believe that Members of the Senate will be interested to know that only this winter Canadians have been coming over the border into Vermont and buying logs out of our mill yards and paying $10 a thousand board-feet more than some of our local purchasers were willing or able to pay. I do not say that all of them were able to pay that much more, and probably not all of them were, but, at any rate, the price was boosted by about $10 a thousand for our softwood lumber. That is a considerable amount. It is due, of course, to the rapidity with which the Canadian economy is expanding. Therefore, we have had a substantial increase in the price of forest products.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota was detained in a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations this afternoon, and therefore did not hear the report of the chairman of the committee or of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I should like to ask him whether the O'Mahoney amendment was retained in the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. The second O'Mahoney amendment was retained. The first O'Mahoney amendment was stricken out. Judging from the telephone conversation with the Senator from Wyoming, I got the impression that it was the second O'Mahoney amendment which he was particularly eager to have retained in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. The amendment deals with livestock, as I understand.

Mr. AIKEN. It deals with livestock and grazing. The first amendment provided that in the case of violation of acreage reserve contracts, the Secretary could deny price supports if he determined such violations warranted such a penalty.

Mr. LANGER. Which amendment was retained?

Mr. AIKEN. The second one, the short amendment. I do not recall on which page of the bill it was.

Mr. LANGER. It dealt with livestock, however; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. It is the one which the junior Senator from Wyoming particularly wanted to have retained in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Are there any limits applied on the amount of money?

Mr. AIKEN. No; because there was no limit on soil-bank payments to an individual contained in either bill, and the matter did not come into conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, did the Chair announce that the conference report had been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced that, without objection, the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Chair to withdraw that announcement. I have not finished my statement.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Vermont has not completed his statement. He has not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator from Vermont had yielded the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. No; I have not yielded the floor. I hope the Chair will withhold the announcement until I have concluded my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair withdraws the announcement.

Mr. AIKEN. I will be able to complete my statement in a few minutes.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas. I do not wish to have the conference report agreed to until I have had an opportunity to complete my statement.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if there is anything contained in the conference report which would permit farmers to take advantage of the acreage reserve program by taking land out of production, in a wheat or corn area, by plowing under acreage.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill requires an acreage reserve program for 1956, but the committee report states that the Secretary is not expected to do what is impracticable; and if he finds that he can put acreage reserve programs into

effect this year in any part of the country, he has full authority and direction to do so now.

However, we do not expect him to do the impossible. We also do not expect to have much acreage of growing crops plowed under for the purpose of getting into the acreage reserve program. I believe there would be widespread public resentment if that were done.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate that there are areas in this country, particularly in the Middle West, where corn has not been planted. Would farmers in such areas be eligible to enter the acreage reserve program, provided the Secretary placed it into effect and provided Congress voted the funds for that purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. Technically, they would be eligible, provided it is physically possible for the Secretary to get the program working in time.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the conferees for retaining the amendment I had sponsored on the floor, which continues the practice, in our national wildlife refuges, wherever we can continue it, for sharecroppers to raise on Federal land price-supported crops, provided a part of it is left standing for bird feed. I have checked the matter with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and he has told me that that amendment has been retained. I appreciate the fact that it has been retained. I wish to mention it at this point in the RECORD primarily because yesterday I saw on the news ticker in the Senate lobby an item suggesting—and it did not say specifically—that the Department of Agriculture was about to order that practice discontinued.

Therefore I wish to have it clear in the RECORD, and to have it buttoned down, that the report on the legislation before the Senate and the action of the conference committee make it clear that Congress intends that the present practice shall prevail with respect to wildlife refuges.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, the Department does not contemplate any such action.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure it does not.

Mr. AIKEN. The President yesterday issued an order to the various departments to stop leasing great acreages of publicly owned land for the production of price supported crops which are in surplus. I understand that it may result in about a million acres being taken out of production.

I may say that the small farmers who have traditionally depended upon some of that land to complement their own holdings will not be deprived of that land, and that the present leases will not be canceled. However, it is believed that there are about a million acres, which are now used by—shall I call them promoters?—who do a good business by raising crops on Government lands and turning them over to the Government. That is what we are trying to stop. There is a provision contained in the conference report which is designed to prevent such a practice.

Mr. MUNDT. It is perfectly sound legislation to get away from that kind of practice. I merely wish to be sure that the record is clear and that there is no conflict between the action of Congress and the order issued yesterday, because otherwise the result would be either to eliminate the usefulness of our wildlife refuges altogether, or to impose upon the taxpayers of our country the additional burden of approximately $5 million a year in order to secure what we are now getting without any charge at all.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the statement issued yesterday carries out the intent of the bill on which we are working today. As a matter of fact, the question was taken up with the administration some weeks ago, and it has been worked out. I believe the language which is in the bill was suggested by either the Department of Agriculture or by the White House.

Mr. MUNDT. By the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no intention on the part of the committee to do away with the production of feed for wildlife on public lands.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Following the same thought which the Senator from South Dakota expressed regarding the use of land which the Government owns and operates, that is, which is leased out to private individuals, I think the Presidential order was certainly timely. I have received complaints from persons in my own State not only in connection with the production of crops, but as to whether the land comes under the soil-conservation provisions. I think it is something to which we should give some thought, because there are millions of acres of such land, and a farmer can be seriously damaged by some of the land adjoining his farm. The Government does not pay any attention to the handling of the soil or the impounding of water. I think the Department should not only follow through on that part, but should give some consideration to the soil-conservation part of it. A farmer may have his land completely spoiled by adjacent Government land.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Watershed Act which is now on the books but which needs implementing, extension of the Water Facilities Act to the entire country, and now the bill which we are putting through the Senate today should take care of the situation. There should be ample authority on the books for the Government not only to discontinue the production of surplus crops on its lands, but actually to put them into soil-conserving crops, or, at least, to take action to make the facilities available for future use.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not like to let this opportunity pass, as we are about to conclude action on the farm bill, without paying my sincere respects to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the members of the committee for the fine work they have done. I know some of the problems which confronted them. In fact, I have been responsible for some of the problems. I am indebted to the committee. I am very pleased that the bill contains a provision for domestic parity on one commodity. I think it is a program which we must come to in the course of time. I should have liked to see it tried out. There are problems connected with it, but I wish to advise the chairman and the Members of the Senate that I do not think we have solved the wheat problem. I think it must be solved on a domestic parity basis. We cannot ask the farmers of this Nation to produce wheat and sell it on the world market at world market prices when they have to buy their commodities, pay their taxes, pay labor, and buy farm machinery on a domestic market.

I am indebted to the committee for bringing forth what I would call a pilot program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank my good friend from Kansas and to say that I hope he will talk to the Secretary and try to have him initiate a program, because what we have in the bill is only discretionary.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks.

Mr. President, I should like to make one last statement in order to make clear one point in the bill which has not been referred to so far, so far as I know.

The bill approved by the conferees with respect to the soil bank program makes it clear that the reason for the program is that excessive supplies of agricultural products which have been built up over the years are depressing farm prices and incomes. Accordingly it authorizes programs to assist farmers to retire cropland from the production of excessive supplies in order to cut down on the burdensome surpluses. It is clearly the intention of the conferees and of the Congress that this bill should be administered in such a manner as to cut down on the surpluses which are the main factor in keeping farmers from more fully participating in this country's unprecedented prosperity.

I wish specifically to invite attention to the fact that while the acreage reserve program can be entered into on the basis of a 1-year contract, nevertheless the bill provides, on page 12, line 19 to 21, as follows:

> The rates of payment offered under this section—

Which is the payment section of the acreage reserve program—

> shall be such as to encourage producers to underplant their allotments for more than 1 year.

The reason why this provision is in the bill is that 1-year contracts could result in increased rather than decreased production. Accordingly it is provided that the rates of payment may be adjusted so as to encourage withdrawal of acreage for a number of years rather than for 1 year only.

Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] agrees that we do not want to get into a program to reduce production which would have the effect of increasing production. That is why we have placed this provision in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from Kansas in his remarks, and I wish to thank the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER] most sincerely for the great assistance he has been to us throughout the many weeks in which the farm bill has been under consideration.

I particularly wish to thank him for the assistance he has been to the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Oregon with respect to the domestic parity program for wheat. I wish the RECORD to show that, in my judgment, the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Oregon were successful in the inclusion of the domestic parity program for wheat in the first farm bill as it passed the Senate because of the sympathetic understanding of the Senator from Louisiana. I am glad there is a domestic parity program, because it can be a pilot-plant operation, so to speak.

Mr. President, I certainly think those of us who supported the domestic parity program for wheat owe it to the Senator from Louisiana to use our good offices in urging the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise the discretion which the final bill has given to him to try out a domestic parity program.

On the record, I should like to refresh the recollection of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to the statement he made in Portland some months ago in speaking before the Oregon Wheat League. The question was raised as to a domestic parity program for wheat, and he, for the first time, indicated that it had great merit to it but that he felt consideration should be postponed for a year. He, in effect, said to the Oregon Wheat League that he hoped they would continue to present their views in regard to it so that the fullest consideration could be given to the subject during the coming year.

I think the Senator from Kansas certainly would have no objection to my saying for the RECORD this afternoon that when the original bill was vetoed and we came to the problem of considering the second bill and what we, as representing two great wheat States, should do in respect to the wheat problem, we consulted with our colleagues in the Senate, including the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and other Senators representing great wheat constituencies.

So far as I am concerned, I consulted with the representatives of the Oregon Wheat League and the National Grange. It was their judgment that, so far as this particular bill was concerned, we should not attempt, by way of amendment, to include a domestic parity program for wheat.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The senior Senator from Oregon has stated correctly the fact that we consulted with one another and discussed the question. It was our general understanding and agreement that this was not an opportune time to try again to include domestic parity for wheat in the farm bill.

We were very much pleased by the cooperation and results we had received from other Members in the previous effort, in view of the situation that developed in connection with the farm bill as a whole.

The senior Senator from Oregon is entirely correct in his statement that we mutually agreed not to take action at this time.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I joined with my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon in consulting with the groups which supported the domestic parity plan for wheat and in asking them for the benefit of their counsel as to what should be done about the so-called second time around with the farm bill.

They seemed to think, almost unanimously, that, despite their disappointment over the veto of the original bill, another effort should not be made at this particular time to include the domestic parity plan for wheat. However, I know that they take some slight degree of satisfaction in the fact that a so-called two-price plan will be given a fair trial—at least, we hope it will be a fair trial—with respect to rice, and that it will perhaps furnish a precedent which will hasten the adoption of a domestic parity plan for wheat.

I must admit in all candor that the Oregon wheatgrowers have waited a long time, because many of them were active in the 1920's, when the late Senator Charles McNary sponsored the McNary-Haugen bill, which was passed in 1927 and vetoed by President Coolidge. It must be conceded that those people have waited a long time for the trial of a domestic parity plan for wheat; and if they have to wait much longer, the normal span of life may run out.

I join with the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Kansas in expressing the very fervent hope that by next year, at the very latest, the great American staple basic, wheat, will receive a fair trial under the domestic parity program.

Mr. MORSE. I thank my colleague. I say through the RECORD today to my entire constituency that his statement on this matter is but additional evidence of the consistent support which he has always given since he has been in the Senate to the interests of the Oregon wheat producers.

I wish to complete the record by saying that in the last few days I have received communications from some wheat producers in Oregon, who are not, apparently, fully aware of the legislative policy which we have followed in regard to this matter, and who are not aware of the fact that the two Senators from Oregon have been in close and, I may say, almost constant contact with representatives of the Oregon Wheat League, particularly Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Floyd Root. I say to them on the record today that I communicated with Mr. Taylor when he was here, and also with Mr. Root in long-distance telephone conversations on several occasions, while the second farm bill was pending; and on the basis of their advice we decided upon a course of action of not offering the domestic parity program for wheat as an amendment to this bill. I say quite frankly that I think by not doing so we will probably demonstrate that we are in a stronger position for the support of such legislation independently next year.

Some of the letters have raised the question why I supported the domestic parity program for rice, but did not insist, in this bill, upon such a program for wheat. I want to say, good naturedly, because I am very objective in the performance of my duties in the Senate, that I think by supporting a domestic parity program for rice I performed a good service for the Oregon wheat producers, and for this reason:

We were satisfied that we would not be successful in offering as an amendment to this bill a two-price wheat program. I must exercise discretionary judgment as to how best I can serve my constituency in a matter such as this. I am satisfied that by giving support to the principle of a domestic parity program as applied to rice, and giving it an opportunity to work—and I feel certain that the result of its working will be successful—I have greatly enhanced the likelihood of the final success of a domestic parity program for wheat.

To my constituency on this matter, I say they can be certain that I will continue to press in the future, as I have in the past, for the domestic parity principle, which, as my colleague has just pointed out, was one of the objectives of the great Charles McNary, of Oregon, and was written into the McNary-Haugen bill.

I agree with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] that we will not do economic justice to the wheat growers, justice to which I think they are entitled, until we adopt, at least in some form, the principle of the old McNary-Haugen bill in respect to the domestic parity program for wheat.

In closing, I wish to thank not only the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and his colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but also the representatives of the Grange and the Oregon Wheat League, who have come to Washington, sat down with us, and presented us with the information, the facts, and the evidence we have needed in order to present for the approval of the Senate a program for a domestic parity-price system for wheat, and the Senate approved it when the first farm bill was before it.

We hear so much criticism of legislative representatives who come to Washington to lobby, so-called, the elected representatives of the people. I wish to raise my voice in the Senate again in support of honest, legitimate lobbying, because there is not a Senator in this body, in my judgment, who could perform the services for his constituency which they are entitled to receive from

him unless he obtained the information from legitimate and honest legislative representatives of the various economic groups in this country which are vitally concerned with the legislative policy of Congress.

It is not a question of whether we are lobbying; it is a question of what we do, as honest men and women in the Senate, with the facts which are presented to us from the different sources from which we receive them. In the last analysis, the facts speak for themselves.

I say again, as I said when I was discussing the domestic-parity program, that I was functioning as a legislative counsel for the wheat producers of my State. I thought they were entitled to my counseling service. I presented to the Senate the evidence which they had presented to me, on the basis of which I had become convinced that they had a sound legislative proposal. That evidence stood up. As a result, we passed their program in the first bill.

I serve notice now that, come the next session of Congress, I intend to press again for the adoption of a domestic parity program for wheat, because I think it will bring economic justice to the wheat producers not only of my State, but of the Nation.

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

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, but before doing so, I wish to thank him for the great service which he, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has performed for the American farmers, and also for the many fine services he has performed for the farmers of my State.

As he knows, I always go to him for advice and counsel on agricultural problems, and he has never let me down. I have found that I could rely upon the advice and counsel which he has given me, just as I have been able to rely upon the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in connection with the wheat problem. We have worked together in a cooperative effort to reach a common objective and have tried to do justice to the wheat producers of the country.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the senior Senator from Oregon for his very kind comments. He has always maintained a sincere and sympathetic interest in the problems of farmers. It has been a pleasure to work with the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Kansas, and also with the representatives of the Oregon Wheat League, the Grange, and other organizations on the domestic parity plan for wheat. To me, such a plan represents a far better program than the flexible price-support program.

Although we lost this year, we will continue to fight another year.

There is another matter which I think is very important. We are going to have to have a better parity formula. The modernized parity formula is completely wrong in principle. I think by continuing transitional parity, as provided in the bill, we shall have a chance next year to enact a fair parity formula.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and I cannot make a too long-term commitment on the farm program, because of certain events which will take place later this year. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. We shall have to take out chances on that.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish again to thank the Senator from Kansas, and I wish to say to the wheat growers of my State that they need only read the statements in the RECORD today to be doubly reassured that they can count at the next session on a continued fight for a domestic parity program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

---

## PART-TIME UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the evidence is growing almost every day that we are witnessing the administration of a part-time foreign policy by Mr. Dulles and his aides in the State Department. Only today two of the administration's most friendly and distinguished newspaper correspondents, Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, and Mr. Joseph Alsop, a columnist for the New York Herald Tribune and other newspapers, in separate articles, have declared that there is little inspiration, little original thinking, and little recognition of the need for a vitalized foreign policy, a policy brought up to date and changed in the face of the Communist peace-and-smile offensive.

Mr. Alsop's article states rather clearly that our lack of policy, our lack of unity, our lack of decision in many of the incidents which are occurring in the Middle East have caused our friends to be undermined and undercut by the propaganda offensive which is being waged throughout the Middle East by the Prime Minister of Egypt, Mr. Nasser. Mr. Alsop is most critical of the administration's failure to have a strong policy in the Middle East.

Mr. Reston's article, entitled "Confusion in Capital," was published in the New York Times of today. He summarizes the reactions which have occurred to the Soviet arms cut. Mr. Reston, in all possible charity, points out that, although the United States was well advised of the announcement of a reduction of 1,200,000 men in the Communist Army, no attempt was made by the State Department to coordinate those reactions, and that the leaders in three separate groups have published, for the benefit of the diplomats of the world who are stationed here, their reactions to it.

If American foreign policy is to be conducted on such a part-time basis and is to be so confusing to our friends, I think it is time for the Nation, and especially the Senate, to take a long look at the leadership of the administration on this most important phase of our world policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times of May 22, 1956]

### CONFUSION IN CAPITAL—A SUMMARY OF INCIDENTS THAT HAVE LED TO THREE UNITED STATES REACTIONS ON SOVIET ARMS CUTS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 21.—It is now 6 days since the Soviet Union announced that it planned to cut its armed forces by 1,200,000 men, but the official reaction in the Capital is still confused.

James C. Hagerty, the President's Press Secretary, and Secretary of State Dulles took a skeptical and broadly negative attitude of the announcement as soon as it was made. Mr. Dulles expressed doubt as to its value and said he would rather have the 1,200,000 Soviet soldiers standing around doing guard duty than making atomic weapons.

Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, described the Moscow announcement as "a step in the right direction." He conceded he did not know precisely what it meant, but in general he was positive rather than negative.

Last Friday, however, Harold E. Stassen, President Eisenhower's assistant in charge of disarmament questions, was much more hopeful about the announcement than either Secretary Dulles or Secretary Wilson. He said the Soviet decision indicated that Moscow wanted to proceed with disarmament talks and that it was "an initiative we wanted them to take." The talks have been held by the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee consisting of representatives of the United States, Britain, France, Canada, and the Soviet Union.

#### WHITE HOUSE CHECK MADE

There is reason for saying that Mr. Stassen went before the public 3 days after the 2 Cabinet Secretaries because he thought the official reaction had been unnecessarily negative. Also, he did not move until he had checked at the White House. He then announced that a Government committee was being assigned to the task of analyzing what the Moscow announcement did mean.

As a result of these three different reactions, the diplomatic corps in Washington, representing most of the nations in the world, has been reporting back to the various capitals that the United States Government is divided on the meaning of the Soviet move.

Oddly enough the administration set out to avoid precisely this kind of reaction by establishing 3 weeks ago a committee for the specific purpose of coordinating the Washington reaction.

This was an unusual situation. By a fluke, the administration had ample warning that the Moscow announcement was coming. The Soviet leaders told Mr. Stassen during a party in London, April 24, that they were going to make the move. Mr. Stassen reported this at once to the President.

It was realized here that such an announcement out of Moscow would bolster the Soviet disarmament line, and if not handled adroitly in Washington would appear to put the United States in the position of opposing a reduction in armies.

It was also realized that advance knowledge of the Moscow decision gave the United States a chance to discount the Soviet propaganda by cataloging Washington's far more dramatic postwar troop reductions before Moscow made its announcement.

#### THREE REACTIONS DEVELOPED

The Washington interdepartmental committee worked on all this to no avail, however. Every member of the committee was supposed to get the same signals, but the result was not 1 reaction, but 3.

This gave the Soviet Union the opportunity, which it immediately seized, not only to charge Mr. Dulles with being against re-

ducing the size of armies but to contrast the differences within the Eisenhower Cabinet on the Soviet move.

Meanwhile, the Voice of America was left in the embarrassing position of having to send out to the world the conflicting estimates of the Cabinet officials.

It was quoting Mr. Dulles, Thursday, as having said that the proposed Soviet troop reduction "might very well result, not in a weakening but in a strengthening of the Soviet military capacity." Later it was broadcasting Mr. Stassen's much more optimistic views.

All kinds of moves have been made here in the past to avoid this sort of thing. The National Security Council was intended to help coordinate policies. Theodore C. Streibert, head of the United States Information Agency, was put on the Operations Coordinating Board to see that the Voice of America made policy questions clear. Nevertheless, the generals, the admirals, and the airmen go on squabbling in public, and the Cabinet members take different lines on the same subject.

---

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of May 22, 1956]

IRAQ'S STRONG MAN

(By Joseph Alsop)

BAGHDAD, IRAQ.—When this reporter called on the famous Nu Al Said, the strong man and perennial prime minister of Iraq, it was rather alarmingly like disturbing an owl in the daylight hours.

Forty-odd years have passed since this remarkable man became one of the founders of the Arab independence movement as a young officer in the Turkish imperial army. He has lived hard through all the subsequent decades. He is 67. That morning he sat huddled in his dressing gown, his piercing eyes hooded as though against the light, and really looking remarkably owlish.

One sensed at once, too, that he was quite justifiably embittered by the fantastic choppings and changings of American policy toward the Baghdad Pact, on which he has gambled Iraq's future. Hence he was cynical about the usefulness of any message he might address to the United States. So he came to life only once, when he was asked about the venomous propaganda aimed at him and his government by Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, who is Nuri's presently successful rival for leadership of the Arab world.

Then the deep eyes flashed, and Nuri declared firmly that he had been risking his life for the cause of Arab independence before Nasser was out of swaddling clothes. For the rest: No, he was not disturbed by Syria's closeness to Egypt; no, he was not disturbed either because most of the other Arab States stayed out of the Baghdad Pact.

In a way, the situation here in Iraq rather resembled this curious meeting, so reassuring on the surface, yet not without its disquieting side. On the surface all is well in Iraq. Nuri's government is strong. The Iraqi development program is bringing a bustling new prosperity.

Even today, moreover, the dictatorship here is far less severe than in Egypt. From the social welfare standpoint, this is Utopia compared to Egypt's strange ally, Saudi Arabia, whose oil dollars finance Egypt's policy. Outwardly, therefore, it seems perfectly reasonable to hope that pro-Western Iraq will serve as an example and a magnet to attract the other Arab States toward a policy less hostile to the West.

This theory of Iraq's magnetism is important, because it is held in many quarters in Washington and is the declared basis of British Middle Eastern policy. But the theory is not working out in practice. Iraq's virtual isolation from the rest of the Arab world is in truth increasing with every passing week.

Furthermore, the failure of the theory is having serious effects within Iraq.

The truth is that all the nationalist emotions that have gripped the rest of the Arab world are powerfully surging beneath the surface here in Iraq. The impulse toward Arab unity is only one of these emotions, but it is particularly strong here because so many Iraqis blame the western-sponsored Baghdad Pact for Iraq's isolation. In the Middle East pure emotion is often decisive.

If present trends continue, one can predict rather positively that the theory of Iraq's magnetism will never become valid. If present trends continue, in truth, one can predict eventual and bad internal trouble here in Iraq—and if Iraq abandons her present prowestern orientation, nothing but naked force will cure the situation in the Middle East.

The point is, however, that present trends do not need to continue unless the American Government is permanently wedded to its present line of blandly hoping for the best and blindly refusing to prepare for the worst. In the Middle East as in the Far East, strength is respected, and nothing succeeds like success.

What is needed to reverse present trends is simply a firm, clear and united American-British policy, and immeasurably more positive and determined than the curious mixture of aimless drift and adman's slogans that now passes for a Middle Eastern policy in Washington.

---

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the majority leader wishes to have announced the program for the Senate tomorrow. Since we shall not conclude action this evening on the civil service retirement bill, we shall continue work on it tomorrow, and, if it is then completed, take up Calendar No. 2022, S. 3855, the housing bill, for discussion. It is expected that the housing bill will be completed on Thursday, and that on Friday the Senate will take up Calendar No. 2056, H. R. 10721, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, and the Judiciary.

In addition, it is possible that Calendar No. 1975, S. 746, returning mineral rights to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project, and Calendar No. 2040, S. 3275, to create a United States Fisheries Commission and establish a comprehensive national policy for fisheries resources, will be taken up on Wednesday.

Mr. BUTLER. What was the last measure to which the Senator from Florida referred?

Mr. SMATHERS. I said it is possible that the fisheries bill may be taken up on Wednesday. It is Senate bill 3275.

Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, relating to the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels—and a measure in which the Senator from Maryland also is interested—has been scheduled for several days now, and that bill may also be considered on Wednesday, if time permits.

---

## TRADING IN ONION FUTURES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER AND OTHER EVIDENCE BEFORE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUTURES TRADING

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this morning, May 22, 1956, I appeared before the House Agriculture Committee to testify in support of members of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association who favor H. R. 7920, as well as a companion Senate bill.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that my statement to the committee; a telegram from George Schmidt, onion broker in the Labish area of Marion County; a statement of Clarence Lee, of Ontario, Oreg., representing the Malheur County Onion Growers Association; a statement from the National Onion Association; two letters from Mr. Joe Y. Saito, president of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association; a letter from Mr. C. H. Burns, of Nampa, Idaho, with his statement entitled, "Trading Onion Futures Versus Sale of Physical Onions"; a resolution of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association; a letter from Mr. Lawern King, vice president of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association; a letter from Mr. Roger R. Kauffman, Administrator, Commodity Exchange Authority, commenting on Mr. King's letter; and a copy of a letter from Paul T. Rowell, chief of the division of market development, Oregon State Department of Agriculture, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These documents will help to demonstrate effectively why trading in onion futures should be forbidden, in order to serve the best interests of the families who grow onions for a livelihood.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 7920 BEFORE THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, MAY 22, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I want to say the privilege that has been extended to me to present my brief statement in person is, indeed, appreciated. I know you have already heard from a great many, and there are quite a few more to be heard from, so I will take but 2 or 3 minutes of your time.

You heard this past week from representatives of the onion growers of my State when Mr. Clarence Lee, of Ontario, Oreg., testified for the Malheur County Onion Growers Association.

Mr. Chairman, Oregon has a greatly diversified agriculture. Onions, one of the many small row crops grown in the State, are produced in a volume to be considered a major crop in Malheur and Marion Counties. There is no need to repeat statistics previously given before the committee to emphasize that fact.

I want to go on record in support of my constituents in their request that trading in onion futures be stopped.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the farmer who prepares his land, plants the onions, and at last harvests them is the one who should have the deciding voice in ending or continuing a system of trading in futures. I am informed, however, by the National Onion Association that onion growers have no voice and are denied any part or influence in formulating rules and regulations to govern futures trading. This is a strange anomally, Mr. Chairman, at a time when farmers have taken an ever-increasing part, through their own marketing organizations, in the trading and processing of more and more commodities.

The onion growers have observed the results of this business of trading in futures since it began in 1942. If, after all these

years, their verdict is one of condemnation, I am willing to accept that verdict.

A great deal of criticism in recent months has been leveled at anything tending to stimulate the production of surpluses.

I would like to quote Mr. Joe Y. Saito, president of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association. In a letter written to me May 8, 1956, he said, "Our first objection is to the fact that over-planting of onions results from sales on the futures market. The November contract is opened almost a full year ahead of delivery time, and in order to sell onions the trader goes out and contracts acreage to give him something to trade." Mr. Saito goes on to point out how the plantings for futures trading can always be over and above the acreage that would be planted to move into regular market channels.

Last year growers in Malheur County lost 50 cents to $1 per 50-pound bag on all their medium onions. Mr. Chairman, we shouldn't expect the onion grower to subsidize the middleman and the consumer.

The National Onion Association condems the futures trading on the commodity with this statement: "By artificially produced situations, possible only with onion futures, unscrupulous, professional speculators with large pocketbooks and small consciences have bled the industry of millions of dollars yearly while contributing only financial disaster and ruin to growers."

Some may suggest that regulation is the solution. The growers tell me that as of May 1 there was no law or regulation in effect to control adequately the manipulation and wild fluctuation of onion futures. They say manipulation is a strong word, probably impossible to prove in a court of law, but they insist it does exist and is being done today. They believe, and refer to Administrator Kauffman's reference to the limited authority of the Commodity Exchange Authority to support their belief, that the manipulation, or whatever you may please to call it, can and will be stopped permanently only when futures trading in onions is permanently stopped.

Again, I say, Mr. Chairman, I will accept the verdict of the grower. That is why I urge the approval by your committee of H. R. 7920. Along with my statement I would like to include a supporting telegram received May 16 from one of the biggest shippers in the rich Lake Labish area of Marion County, Mr. George Schmidt of Brooks, Oreg. Also, Mr. Chairman, I would submit the May 8, 1956, letter from Mr. Saito, whom I previously quoted, and a letter to Mr. Rodger Kauffman, administrator of the Commodity Exchange Authority from Mr. Paul T. Rowell, Chief of Division of Market Development for the Oregon State Department of Agriculture.

Let me just say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that when we enjoy those delicious rings of crisp french fried onions with our top sirloin we like to think that the onion grower and the cattleman who have contributed so much to our pleasure, receive their fair share of the payment that completes the transaction.

---

STOCKTON, CALIF., *May 16, 1956.*

Senator NEUBERGER,

*Senate Office Building:*

Am sending wire in reference to onion hearing now going on. I grow 150 acres and ship 8 to 9 hundred cars per year and in talking to growers in our area feel it very important to do away with onion futures.

LABISH BROKERAGE CO.,
GEORGE SCHMIDT.

BROOKS, OREG.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE LEE, ONTARIO, OREG., REPRESENTING MALHEUR COUNTY ONION GROWERS ASSOCIATION, TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUTURES TRADING, MAY 16, 1956

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am Clarence Lee of Ontario, Oreg. It is with a profound sense of responsibility that I appear before this committee today in behalf of the onion growers in my district. I bring the message of growers in Malheur County, Oreg., a message which has been heartily endorsed also by onion growers of districts in western Oregon. Growers in these parts of Oregon, along with the part of our producing district that is located in southwestern Idaho, produce about one-eighth of all the late summer and storage onions grown in the United States.

These growers feel that trading of futures in a perishable crop such as onions can add nothing to the industry, but instead creates difficulties that are harder to overcome than any of the natural hazards of growing a crop of onions.

One major difficulty is the excess acreage that is planted year after year at the instigation of speculators, for trading on the futures board. The trades are made far ahead of planting time, and the trader then contracts to get onions grown to meet his commitments. A grower holding a contract from a speculator, or one who has hedged his onions directly, is commonly thought to be protected on his production risks. He is, to the extent of the contract onions. But for the industry as a whole these contracts encourage excess acreage because the grower does not have to look to the consuming market to dispose of this part of his commodity. So he plants both contract onions, and his normal acreage for fresh market.

How do I know this happens? Twenty-five years' experience as an onion grower has taught me that when an onion producer can make sure of a little profit through contracting, he assumes that there will be more profit through greater volume, so he just increases his acreage by the amount of the contract.

Then when the time comes to dispose of these onions committed on the futures, what happens? Many are never delivered on the board. The contracts are bought in by the speculator who probably is in some other business than onions, and he has already either made or lost his money and is through with the onions, but they still have to find their way into produce channels on top of the normal supply grown for the consuming market.

Some are delivered to the board speculators. These are the real jokers.

They arrive in bunches, all at one terminal, at the close of each trading month. They can't be anything but salvage. There's no place in the produce trade channels for them, because these channels are kept supplied by regular commercial deliveries.

The don't even belong to people who know how to sell onions. They are not governed in price by the need to meet packing and shipping expenses, because these have been met as a part of the speculative deal before they were delivered.

Our growers couldn't compete in the markets last season with these futures deliveries of onions. Such onions supplied a good part of our usual markets for medium onions in the Midwest at prices about the same as our freight cost.

But I think these facts are pretty generally recognized, and have been supported by substantial testimony in previous hearings of this committee. So I won't belabor them further; but what to do?

It has been suggested that regulation of the futures trading practices could correct these and the many other difficulties. Let's see what the record is so far on regulations, and what further ones might be possible.

In February the Exchange put in certain rules. They fixed a limit of 300 contracts a trader could hold at one time, presumably to keep anyone from controlling enough contracts to engage in price manipulation. Does the Exchange believe these traders aren't smart enough to work together, or that any trader couldn't rustle up enough relatives to become traders so he could control as many contracts as he wanted?

Then the Exchange fixed a 25-cent markoff for any onions delivered from storage in Chicago, I'm not quite sure why. But if these onions were distress merchandise and demoralized the cash market when the holder had some choice as to when he sold them, what will they do when all receivers are forced to dispose of their delivered onions at once by this markoff?

There were some regulations imposed to help maintain quality, but I'd say on the whole the score for regulation up to now is pretty low. We might think of what further regulations could be imposed.

One regulation that would help, our association proposed to the Commodity Exchange Authority last fall. We felt that delaying opening of trading in futures contracts until onion planting was completed would stop the planting of excess onions just for speculation. The answer we got from Administrator Kauffman was that it was beyond the legal authority of the CEA to impose such a regulation.

If the law won't allow realistic regulation, and if the piecemeal ones that are imposed haven't a chance to change anything for the better, why experiment with regulation and leave the onion grower still saddled with the problems created by the futures?

The futures market doesn't market any onions. I'd like to read you a quote—

"Speculators trade to make a profit from price changes and in most cases would find it costly and troublesome to become involved in the delivery process. Merchants and processors use the futures markets as a means of hedging price risks and usually do not look upon the futures markets as a source of supply or as a merchandising outlet for cash commodities. The reason, of course, is that in buying and selling cash commodities merchants and processors prefer to deal in the cash markets, contracting for the specific grades and quantities required for their needs and for the preferences of their customers. Since deliveries on futures contracts in most commodities may be made in a variety of grades, and at seller's option, merchants and processors with long hedging positions in futures usually do not wish to run the risk of receiving unwanted grades that might be involved in standing for delivery."

Do you know who makes those statements that futures speculators can't and don't want want to market onions? That was from the 1954–55 report of the Commodity Exchange Authority, legal godfather of trading operations on the Mercantile Exchange.

As long as this thing serves no purpose to the onion industry, but instead acts as a millstone around the grower's neck, we respectfully ask you people as our representatives if you won't take steps to legislate it out of existence.

---

THE CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF FUTURES OF THE ONION INDUSTRY—COMPILED BY THE NATIONAL ONION ASSOCIATION

There is probably no problem in agriculture today so serious, certainly there is none so difficult to control, as futures trading of onions. Continuance poses a great threat to the future of fruit and vegetable agriculture, and presents very real and hidden dangers. If the onion industry fails to rid itself of this parasite, merchantile exchanges may very well list other commodities for future trading. As in the case of onions, this can and

will be done without consent or approval of producers and handlers of these commodities. While there is no positive confirmation, there have been rumors that Texas onions, Washington apples and Florida and California citrus are being considered as futures trading possibilities. Not a pleasant prospect for those engaged in the production and marketing of those commodities.

In the case of onion futures, the industry is being forced against its will to play another man's game, by his rules, on his field. He furnishes the ball and hires the umpire and permits no objection or complaints. That hardly qualifies either as a "democratic process" or "free enterprise."

There are several basic reasons why onion futures trading is opposed. Listed below are major points of objection with detailed explanations of each. It will be noted that each point of objection to futures trading has a variety of causes and complaints, many of which are closely interrelated. The following summary explains and clarifies each in its cause and effect on the onion industry.

1. Onion growers have no voice and are denied any part or influence in formulating rules and regulations to govern futures trading.

2. Onions, a small, perishable crop, do not lend themselves to futures trading.

3. No laws or regulations adequately cover or control futures trading of perishables.

4. Any rule or benefit of futures is designed for the trader and speculator with onion growers never considered.

5. Normal marketing on the basis of supply and demand is impossible.

6. Futures "benefits" are really detriments which further complicate onion marketing.

Point 1. In the case of every commodity produced in agriculture, the grower is, and rightly should be, the primary and major concern. The commodity he produces provides every excuse and reason for the existence of all related and connected phases of the industry. Obviously there can be no industry without the grower, but futures disregards that fact and ignores the onion grower. Instead of running his industry, the grower has become the victim who no longer controls either production or marketing of his own commodity.

In 1942 officials of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange met with National Onion Association members in Kenton, Ohio to discuss the merits of onion futures. A large majority of National Onion Association members and most of those in the industry rejected futures as detrimental and vigorously opposed listing onions on the Board. Despite this opposition and because no law prevents it, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange listed onions; and trading in onion futures began in September, 1942. The years since have not altered industry opinion but, instead, have only broadened and intensified opposition. It has been clearly demonstrated how unnecessary futures are.

The industry, particularly growers, denied any voice and influence in either operation or regulation of futures, are powerless to prevent or control this evil which has been forced upon them. Yet there is no law to assist the grower in the case of futures. Even though many have been driven out of business by disastrous years caused by futures trading and many are even now near bankruptcy, there is not one thing the grower can do to correct this intolerable situation.

People in the onion industry neither ask for nor want marketing agreements, subsidies or supports. They want only to be left alone to operate on the sane and solid principles of supply and demand. That, the industry believes, is true free enterprise.

Point 2. Perishable fruits and vegetables, particularly onions, are not logical or reasonable items for futures trading. The history of onion futures clearly demonstrates that fact for all to see. The crop is too small and too perishable and has neither manufacturing value nor storage stability. These facts make it an ideal commodity for manipulation and enforced false fluctuation.

Being a small crop, supply and demand are delicately balanced and easily upset by overproduction, false rumors and manipulation. Also contributing is the practice of opening the November contract 11 months before delivery, 4 months before planting and 8 months before harvest. The high opening price causes growers to become falsely optimistic and overplant. Increased planting causes futures price declines which lead to cash market declines. Growers dislike to sell on a falling market and as a result hold stocks too long, waiting for price recovery. Movement and disappearance is curtailed and orderly marketing disrupted. A surplus is created, and this drives the cash price down still further. This is only one way futures causes overproduction.

Professional speculators have developed a theory and system of trading in onions to guarantee themselves profit. With the small crop, sensitive and maneuverable and with no limitation or enforceable regulation to control manipulation, the system is almost guaranteed successful. The whole theory is based on heavy short selling on a created oversupply. Applying the fact that markets decline easier than they advance, the professional speculator is almost always on the short side.

To insure their success, some professional speculators finance huge acreages only for delivery to the board. Some maintain offices and buying agents in producing sections to contract and buy crops of onions. These onions, contracted for by the professional speculator, or rather manipulator, are not intended for market and consumption. They are intended only for delivery to the board, with the planned intent to break the market and force prices down. Thus the manipulator guarantees himself profit on extensive short speculations. During contract months these heavy deliveries hit Chicago with terrific impact. A gigantic accumulation on track and in storage is the result. That accumulation, ranging from 350 to 800 cars, creates a chaotic condition and utterly destroys any semblance of normal marketing. Many traders, doctors, dentists, etc., forced to take delivery of these cars, offer them at prices far below current cash levels in a desperate effort to be rid of them. This causes lowering of prices. Most of the cars are either poor quality or borderline stock and this further damages markets because the fresh trade will not buy them. Many are consigned to terminal markets where, because of quality and condition, they sell far below normal market prices. Thus having demoralized the market, started a trend of declining prices, caused heavy holding of poor quality and created an artificial oversupply, the professional futures speculator is happy. His operation has fouled up the deal for weeks, but this was necessary. How else can he guarantee his own profit?

This is possible only because of futures and because of the nature and size of the onion crop. The Chicago Mercantile futures contract designates Yellow Globes, U. S. No. 1, 1½" min., 65 percent 2" or larger, not more than 15 percent may be 3" or larger. The late summer onion crop averages only about 30 million sacks a year. The crop is broken down to show approximate volume eligible for futures trading. Numbers indicate 50-pound sacks.

| | *Million* |
|---|---|
| Shrink and handling loss | 4.5 |
| Variety disqualification | 6.0 |
| Prohibitive grade and size | 2.0 |
| Prohibitive locality | 3.5 |
| Shipments prior to Nov. 1 | 11.0 |
| Total | 27.0 |

Obviously the remaining 3 million sacks could be reduced by possibly half for other reasons. However, we allow a conservative 2.5 million sacks, about 4,000 cars, as being eligible and possibly involved in futures deals. That is less than 10 percent of the total late summer crop. However, Commodity Exchange Authority officially records Chicago Mercantile onion transactions average almost 80,000 yearly, for the past 7 years, indicating that eligible cars for trading average 20 transactions each during the year. With a brokerage fee of $22.00 per car the return to Mercantile Exchange brokers is a considerable sum. It is entirely possible that accumulated brokerage was as much as $400 on some of the very March contract cars which sold at 10 cents per 50-lb. sack on March 15, 1956. By artificially produced situations, possibly only with onions futures, unscrupulous, professional speculators with large pocketbooks and small consciences have bled the industry of millions of dollars yearly while contributing only financial disaster and ruin to growers.

Point 3. There is no law or regulation in effect today, May 1, which will adequately control the manipulation and wild fluctuation of onion futures. Manipulation is a strong word. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to prove in a court of law; but there is no question that it does exist and is being done today. Manipulation can and will be stopped permanently only when futures trading in onions is permanently stopped.

Mr. Douglas B. Bagnell, Deputy Administrator of the Commodity Exchange Authority, admitted publicly at the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association convention in New Orleans, January 30, that CEA is powerless to prevent manipulation. As a regulatory agency CEA has power to act only in cases of actual violation. Even so, it may take several years to convict and punish a guilty operator, but they have no authority to prevent it before it happens. In the meantime these speculators are free to continue raids on onion growers' pocketbooks.

Obviously Mercantile Exchange operators know these conditions have existed all along even though they have denied it for years. It is just as obvious they will not take action against the guilty persons because those individuals are, of course, exchange members. Any disciplinary action would be an admission of shortcomings in onion futures. They do not like that kind of publicity.

A survey indicates the onion industry is composed of approximately the following divisions: growers, 12,000; shippers, 1,500; receivers, 5,000; others, 1,500; a total of 20,000. However, there are additional thousands who are directly touched by the onion industry and whose lives are affected. It would be difficult to place the number exactly, but it would be near 100,000. If everyone connected with futures were included, the total could hardly exceed around 2,500 persons. The comparison indicated complete unbalance relative to influence and effect.

Figures and details of the CEA report, as of September 30, 1955, indicate a total of 813 futures traders on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. This includes all groups of traders, large and small. Only 15 men, 2 percent of all futures traders, held 47 percent of all positions: long, short, speculative and hedges. Ten held 200 contracts or more. Seven hundred and ninety-eight persons, 98 percent of all futures traders, held the remaining 53 percent of all contracts. Considering numbers involved and the great influence and effect of futures on the onion industry that is not many traders. It rather conclusively shows how easily a few men control the market and proves manipulation.

Much has been made of that point in the report which shows onion growers the largest group of speculators. It should be asked

what other group should be? Should onion growers stay out and let those in other fields operate onion futures? Aren't futures for the onion industry? If so, who has a better right to speculate than the producer? Just what is expected of the grower in this case?

The report reveals only 141 actual onion growers were involved, 71 speculators and 70 hedgers. However, one thing the CEA report does not show, despite arguments to the contrary, is that the 15 men who held all these contracts are not growers. They are professional speculators who financed and contracted onion acreage and so called themselves growers. Ordinary hedging operations could hardly justify any grower, regardless of size, holding 100 to 200 contracts. Further proof of manipulation.

Point 4. For years, leaders of the industry have bombarded the Merchantile Exchange with requests and pleas for rule changes to alleviate futures evils and equalize the imbalance between futures and cash markets. There have been several conferences of industry and exchange representatives in the last few years. However, no constructive or corrective changes came as a result. The repeated requests for rule changes have been answered by such statements as "You've got it and you've got to learn to live with it." "Growers need an education in the economic functions of a commodity market." The attitude of future operators has been "To hell with growers, let 'em squawk. We're making plenty of money. Why doctor a healthy horse?"

In December 1955 the National Onion Association overwhelmingly passed a resolution asking for national legislation to prohibit futures trading in onions. For the first time a national organization took action in an open and public stand. Support of that move has been overwhelming throughout every phase of the industry. Repercussions from mercantile operators were expected and were not surprising. However, the attitude of injured innocence of some is reminiscent of the kid caught in the cookie jar, who said, "I didn't take 'em and besides I put them back."

With so much strong, unfavorable, national publicity and pressure of pending legislation in Congress, mercantile exchanges were forced to make concessions and institute some changes. Drastic changes, for them, in view of previous attitude. A study of these changes, however, will disclose no real, constructive improvements. Nothing has been accomplished with regard to protecting growers. The real effort has been to protect futures operators and brokers and to stimulate and extend trading volume while making concessions to pacify the industry. The industry is neither satisfied nor fooled. There is no confidence that commodity exchanges can or will satisfactorily regulate their business or enforce their regulations. For one thing, the exchanges have no control over nonmembers. It should be emphasized that exchanges were forced to make changes. It was not voluntary. Ninety-five percent of the industry remain firmly convinced the only real solution to the intolerable situation is to eliminate and abolish futures trading in onions permanently.

Point 5. Mercantile exchange operators claim futures do not make, but only reflect markets and price levels. Last September March futures reflected March prices at around $2.65 to $2.70. Texas onions generally start to move in late March and that is big money for Texas onions. On that reflection Texas acreage increased and only weather prevented even heavier planting. On March 15, 1956, the March futures contract closed at 15 cents, which is a ridiculous reflection. Onion bags cost more than that. The Texas onion market is, today, just beginning to be normal. Actually onion futures markets neither reflect nor make markets, they only destroy.

Terminal markets are seriously affected by futures. When futures prices are higher than cash markets, terminal buyers act cautiously to avoid the uncertainty of declines which occur rather violently through futures fluctuations. A futures decline kills demand because buyers, to avoid being caught with high-priced cash merchandise, hold off. When cash markets are above futures levels, buyers try to buy at the lower futures price. This suppresses demand and results in more uncertainty and chaos. The repeated, falsely induced, rapid declines and advances in futures markets destroy cash market stability and buyer confidence.

Statistics furnished by the Department of Agriculture indicate per capita consumption of commercial dry onions averaged almost 12 pounds per person per year since 1940. Bureau of Census figures show population in 1955 was 10 percent greater than in 1940. Yet for the first time in history a late summer onion crop of less than 30 million bags failed to bring a profit to growers. In fact, the season ended disastrously for most.

Supply and demand are no longer factors because supply and demand cannot function in the futures controlled markets of today. Futures trading invites the gamble of professional speculators who stop at nothing to prove the guaranty their judgment is correct. As a result there is increased acreage and production. Distribution is unbalanced with unnecessary accumulation of tremendous stocks. Price fluctuations are so violent, the entire industry is in a state of shock for weeks after a price break.

This is what growers are faced with today. They can no longer simply plan to grow onions for a supply and demand market.

Point 6. Futures operators have long preached the great benefits of futures to growers. College professors have even visited growing areas to preach it, but analysis proves it is the grower who pays for everything, takes the risk and all the loss. Only the futures broker really profits. In past years when onion speculators speculated on the actual onions, they moved through onion areas buying and contracting onions from growers. The grower held the onions in his storage until ordered to deliver. To bind the contract the speculator advanced a standard sum, generally $300 per car, which gave growers operating cash. In the future system the beneficial hedge deal of futures is different. To hedge a crop on the board the grower must post $300 per car plus $22 brokerage for the privilege. If the market advances beyond his hedge level, he is required to post additional money for margin calls. There have been cases where growers were sold out at great loss; and, in some cases, actually put out of business when they could no longer meet required margins. Of course, growers can finance their hedging. In such instances the broker provides money to cover all margins, etc. However, the broker controls all movement, etc. For this great benefit and insurance growers must pay 10 cents per sack, or $60 per car. That is a considerable sum for so little.

Some brokers who provide financed hedging developed a system to protect themselves in case of grower default. When the grower sells on a financed hedge deal, the broker, through his agent, buys a car. If the grower lifts his hedge, the broker sells a car. However the market moves the broker, being right on the floor, is protected; and, in most cases, has insured himself of a profit in any position in which the market moves. This protection costs futures brokers a very small fee per car while the grower must pay $22 per car. By financing hedges through mercantile brokers the grower actually places himself at the tender mercies of manipulators who use every method to maneuver the market to their advantage and the grower's detriment.

The progressive features of futures trading do not simplify but really complicate unreasonably the already complicated problems of marketing onions. To use futures is complicated in itself and it takes time and money. The grower actually is paying outrageously for this great protection and insurance which is wrecking his industry. It should be noted that this association knows of no banks, building and loan or other financial institutions which will loan onion growers money to finance a hedge on his crop. In every case the grower must either finance his own hedges or finance through a brokerage house which provides that service.

History proves the real profit in futures is made by speculators and in practically every case these profits were made in a declining market. That being true, futures can never benefit the onion industry because it is ridiculous to assume the industry can make money on a constantly declining market. Futures can never benefit the onion industry because most growers are small. Those producing one to ten cars obviously can only hedge one to five cars. To hedge more would be outright speculation. Very few growers are able to finance their own hedges and so must be financed by brokers or such organizations performing that service. They pay for this and the cost is 10 cents per bag which comes off the top of the onion's cash value. The cost of financing protective hedges is in many cases the difference between profit and loss to the grower.

Because it requires more money to trade high the bull or high side is always vulnerable to the bear or low side attack. Bull markets never become as strong advancing as bear markets declining. Thus by the constant pressure of bear attacks, the bull is made overcautious. He attempts to cover and protect his position by selling and so contributes to his own downfall, and the deal goes into another bear or decline cycle with short selling prevailing throughout. the only sure thing is that the onion grower takes the loss again.

For 8 months CEA has accumulated statistics and data on onions and potato futures trading. Recent letters indicate they do not feel they yet have sufficient evidence to ask for or recommend passage of H. R. 7920 and S. 3204, bills which would eliminate onion futures entirely. On April 10 CEA held a hearing in Chicago to determine limitations on the number of speculative contracts in onions. Many of their statistics were presented there. That hearing brought out interesting statistics and opinions by CEA's own economists.

Onion growers do not have the mountainous data and statistics to prove each point of their contentions beyond question. The industry is scattered throughout 75 sections in 26 States of this Nation. Some areas are rather isolated, and some are quite small. It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to secure detailed statistics of the same technical nature as those collected by CEA. Growers do not have this, but they do have 14 years' practical experience, and they do have empty pockets. No person or group is better qualified to state the growers' case better than they, and no one knows better what they need. Such statistics as have been collected, prove beyond doubt that growers are overwhelmingly, at least 95 percent, opposed to futures and want futures abolished. No technical tabulations or data can change that fact. If onion growers, as a part of this Nation's agriculture, are to be served fairly, then there can be little question of the final result. A point of great importance is the United States Department of Agriculture letter of April 3, which recommended deferment of congressional action on bills H. R. 7920 and S. 3204. Such action ignores and opposes the established opinion of the onion grower and the onion industry in

favor of a few futures operators, persons who are not really a part of agriculture. Upon close examination it will be found the futures operator is neither flora nor fauna, neither fish nor fowl. He does not grow, ship, receive, buy, sell or package onions. He does not qualify for a Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act license as a produce man. It is difficult to find a word, but parasite seems to fit adequately.

Should there arise the question of an invasion of free enterprise in eliminating onion futures, it must be remembered the onion industry did not and never has wanted futures trading. Futures were forced on them against their will and judgment. Since that time, having no other recourse, they have tried to live with them. The results are plain for all to see. The years have only strengthened the opinion that futures trading in onions should be prohibited permanently.

Another important factor to be considered is this: The record clearly establishes that the onion industry is not alone in the fight. Other related agriculture industries have given their support willingly. The American Farm Bureau Federation, Vegetable Growers Association of America, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, Texas Citrus & Vegetable Growers & Shippers Association, Western Growers Association and numberless other agricultural organizations have joined the attack spearheaded by the National Onion Assocation. Voluntarily they have formally passed resolutions and gone on record as opposing onion futures and advocating immediate and permanent elimination of trading in this community. Many banks in onion areas, chambers of commerce and civic groups have taken similar action. By way of contrast not one agricultural organization, either national or local, large or small, or other group for that matter, has approved, endorsed or supported onion futures trading. This, in itself, clearly indicates the overwhelming opinion and belief that the onion industry must be freed of this evil.

The foregoing statements have been assembled by the National Onion Association to cover the entire situation in brief points. A complete statement would be much too long. For detailed supplements it is suggested records of subcommittee hearings at Presque Isle, Maine, December 6 and 7, 1955, the Chicago hearing March 24, 1956, and the CEA hearing in Chicago April 10, 1956, be consulted.

---

MALHEUR COUNTY ONION
GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
*Ontario, Oreg., March 12, 1956.*

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senate Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I believe that Lawern King, of Ontario, who is vice president of our local onion growers association, has had some correspondence with you regarding the trading in onion futures and wishes of growers here in regard to it. He has asked if I would write you with some background on this matter, inasmuch as Senate bill 3204 has been introduced to prohibit futures trading in onions.

The trading in onion futures is a long way from Malheur County, and the Sweet Spanish onion, which is the chief variety here, is not even traded on futures contracts. The fact that these things are true, and that the futures market still depresses the price on onions in this district, constitutes the major reason for growers here wanting the futures trading eliminated.

Several things take place as a result of speculation in onion futures that work to the detriment of the industry at the grower level. In the first place, there is the matter of the time of contracting delivery on the futures board. November 1956 onions could be bought or sold on the board in December of last year, 11 months ahead of delivery. This time interval is explained as giving growers a chance to hedge against price drops ahead of any of the current year's growing expenses. The actual effect is for speculators, with more funds than onion growers have in the spring, to enter into these November contracts, and then contract in turn with growers to plant the acreage for delivery.

The onion market is very sensitive to total supply, and it is always necessary for each grower to watch the national picture on plantings, and for all growers to attempt to plant so the total production can move to market. Consider the effect, then, of a few thousand, or tens of thousands, of acres of onions planted for the sole purpose of being sold on the board, and somebody else being stuck with their delivery into consuming channels. The effect invariably is plantings above the potential use of the product, as the onions for futures contract delivery are planted with no consideration of outlet other than the price that can be written into the futures contract.

Then consider the effect of onions contracted on the futures board when they are delivered. Only about 1½ percent of onions traded on the futures are ever delivered, but when trading runs to 150,000 carlots on 1 crop, even this small percentage becomes a sizable total.

Onions are not bought or sold on the futures board for delivery. They are bought and sold for the profit that can be derived from buying and selling contracts as prices change prior to delivery date. But the delivery time eventually comes, and some unwary investor holds the purchase contract and must take delivery of the onions. Does he have outlets in the produce trade to move onions into consumption channels? Probably not, because people in the onion business rather than the speculating business usually keep these channels pretty well located and supplied. So he is stuck with the onions. One guess as to what will be done with them will hit right on the nose. Salvage. Take a loss, but get what you can. Sell enough below the onion market to get them sold. And so the market price to the producer who tries to make his living by selling onions is cut in half by a mere byproduct of an operation to make profits from speculation. This situation is not theoretical. Medium onions from our district have been unable to move into many of our customary markets in the Midwest this season. Why? Medium Yellow Globe onions delivered on futures contracts to Chicago were selling in these markets at a price slightly above what our freight cost would be to deliver onions there.

The total onion crop is a perishable, with supplies varying greatly at different times during the marketing season. The total crop is not so large but what a few investors can buy or sell a large enough percentage of the crop to actually manipulate prices. We feel that these factors make onions unsuited to futures trading practices that might be all right for a stable, high-volume crop such as cotton or wheat.

We could enumerate further, but we believe these points will show why we wish to see the onion futures trading abolished, and why we hope you will support for us the bills introduced to accomplish this result. We have only given you one side of the futures trading story, and in doing this we have not meant to be biased. However, it is likely you will hear the pro side of the case of futures trading from persons interested in the Mercantile Exchange, as the onion trading over the last season or two has meant about $3½ million annually in brokerages and exchange fees.

If we can discuss this further, or furnish any information that will be helpful to you in considering the merit of abolishing onion futures trading, we will be glad to do so. In the meantime, we express the wish of our 175 onion-growing association members that you help us get rid of the influence of futures trading on the onion-growing industry.

Sincerely yours,

JOE Y. SAITO,
*President, Malheur County Onion Growers Association.*

---

MALHEUR COUNTY ONION
GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
*Ontario, Oreg., May 8, 1956.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Onion growers of Malheur County are concerned that the bills in the House and Senate that would prohibit futures trading in onions are having slow going in committee, and apparently are felt to be premature by the Department of Agriculture.

The House bill (H. R. 7920) is the subject of a hearing before a subcommittee of the House on May 16, and we would like to have your help at this hearing if possible. We are asking Representative COON if he could help also. If time would permit, we would appreciate your stating our case at this hearing, or if you could not make the hearing, a letter in support of the prohibition of futures trading in onions sent to the subcommittee would be most helpful.

The matter of futures trading in onions and its effect on marketing the fresh crop is a complicated one. As a quick reference on the problem, we would like to outline the thinking of growers and shippers here as to how we feel the futures trading affects this district.

Our first objection is to the fact that overplanting of onions results from sales on the futures market. The November contract is opened almost a full year ahead of delivery time, and in order to sell onions the trader goes out and contracts acreage to give him something to trade. Commercial onion growers continually watch the total plantings in relation to outlets, and keep their plantings as large as they think they can sell. The speculators watch nothing except the prices November futures will bring, and the contract operator who grows the onions is concerned only with his contract price. You can well see how these plantings for futures trading can always be over and above the onion acreage that commercial growers, or even these same contract growers, would plant to move into regular market channels.

The Commodity Exchange Authority has been considering regulations of the futures market to stop abuses, but when we suggested to Administrator Kauffman that one of the most necessary regulations would be to hold off the opening of futures contracts until onion planting was completed, he informed us this was beyond the authority of CEA. Thus, it appears if regulation is the answer, there will have to be broader powers given the Authority.

Another result of the futures trading that has been a detriment to our marketing is the sale of onions delivered on futures contracts. These have been delivered in batches of anywhere from 100 to 500 carlots, rolled into Chicago at one time at the close of each option month. Attempt has then been made to work these into produce channels along with the normal supply of commercial onions. The result has been surplus track holdings and reduction in prices, because these onions were packed and on wheels and had to be delivered somewhere. The CEA, in attempting to regulate against this difficulty, has assessed a penalty of 25 cents a sack on onions held in cold storage in Chicago after futures board delivery. We fail to see how this can in any way help the

situation. Instead, it appears to us this markdown will make these onions even more of a distress item by forcing quicker liquidation.

Last year growers here lost from 50 cents to $1 per 50-pound bag on all their medium onions because the Yellow Globe variety delivered to the future were sold into the Midwest markets at salvage prices. Malheur growers or those of any other district must get packing, loading, and shipping costs out of their onions or they will not even send them to market. These futures onions are under no such limitation, as these costs are paid by the speculative holder, in anticipation of profits from speculation. Thus, onions delivered on futures contract will sell and be delivered for as little as 10 cents a 50-pound bag, because after delivery the distribution becomes a salvage deal rather than an economic one.

We have no quarrel with the principle of futures markets. We feel in a storable commodity where stocks can be held over from year to year that such markets can have a stabilizing effect. We had no quarrel with onion futures either—because trading is done at such great distance from us, and the Sweet Spanish variety grown here is not traded as futures—until the economic effects we mention recurred season after season after season to the detriment of our own marketing.

Attempts are being made at regulation of futures trading, and no doubt further restrictions will be proposed as means to let futures trading continue with less serious effects on the industry. Because of the basic perishable nature of onions, and the delicate balance that must be maintained between production and markets, we do not believe that even severe regulation can cure disruptions to the cash market. We believe onions should be removed entirely from futures trading.

We will appreciate anything you can do through this hearing or later to bring the Senate measure S. 3204 on this matter to vote and get it passed.

Sincerely yours,

JOE Y. SAITO,
*President.*

---

BURNS BAY IDAHO,
*Nampa, Idaho, March 12, 1956.*

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senator,*
*Senate Building, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing herewith copy of information that I have gathered with reference to this trading of onion futures on the Chicago and New York Merchantile Exchanges. I have taken the liberty of sending this same information to all members of the House Agriculture Committee, the Senate Agriculture Committee, in addition to all Representatives and Senators from the various onion-growing States, such as Oregon.

Oregon has become one of the most important States in the country during the past few years as far as growing onions is concerned. Western Oregon, of course, has grown onions for many years which are eligible for delivery on the future exchange and have been traded at times to considerable extent. Eastern Oregon, of course, generally grows the Spanish-type onions which are not eligible for trading on the mercantile exchange. However, regardless these Spanish onions are seriously affected by prices on the future exchange. Due to the extremely low prices on this future exchange at this time it is quite possible that many of the medium sized onions will have to be dumped in western Oregon as well as eastern Oregon. We feel sure that the effect that this trading has had on prices is solely responsible for this tragic situation.

Wish to mention that since writing the enclosed information that the onion market is more demoralized than ever. In fact Friday, March 9, they were able to drive March futures down to a new season low of the ridiculous low price of 25 cents, closing at 30 cents. This means only additional disaster for those onion growers who still have onions in parts of Oregon as well as throughout the entire Nation.

Track holdings in Chicago have been averaging well over 100 cars a day since February 27 at which time they started to arrive in Chicago to be delivered on March contracts March 1.

I understand that the mercantile exchange is in the process of making certain changes in their contracts for future trading, but this is not what the onion growers want. They want this onion trading completely abolished, which is in line with the King House bill 7920 which was introduced in the House January 2, 1956, and Dworshak-Welker Senate bill 3204 which was introduced in the Senate February 16, 1956. In order to help the onion growers of your State, as well as onion growers and the industry throughout the United States, we urge your support of these two bills when they come before the Senate. If this future trading is allowed to continue, it will mean only further disaster for the onion growers of the Nation. We are sure that the passage of these two bills will help tremendously in stopping this decline in farmers' income.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. BURNS.

---

TRADING ONION FUTURES VERSUS SALE OF PHYSICAL ONIONS

As you know, Hon. Congressman KING introduced House bill 7920 in the House January 3, 1956, which would abolish the trading in future onions on any board of trade in the United States, which would include the Chicago and New York Mercantile Exchanges. Also, on February 16, 1956, the Honorable Senators DWORSHAK and WELKER introduced Senate bill 3204 in the Senate asking for the abolishment of this future trading, or a very similar bill to the one introduced by KING.

This future trading was established some 14 or 15 years ago, and during the war years this trading was more or less limited due to ceiling prices. After the war we had 2 or 3 short crop years throughout the United States and this future trading did not cause any serious trouble. However, during the past 3 years the onion growers and the entire industry have been greatly affected because of heavy trading in onion futures.

In 1953, 113,143 cars of onions were traded, while the actual deliveries of these commitments throughout that year only amounted to 1,300 cars, or only about 1½ percent. In 1954 there were 136,885 cars traded, while there were only 1,475 cars actual deliveries, or just a fraction over 1 percent. In 1955 there were 147,835 cars traded with 2,397 cars actual deliveries, or about 1½ percent. During January 1956 there were 16,612 cars traded with only 173 delivered. We do not have the figures yet for the entire month of February trading. During the first 10 days of February there were 6,875 cars of onions traded, while there were actually only 100 cars delivered. It will be noted from these figures that this trading has increased immensely during the past 3 years. It is ridiculous to think that this many onions could be traded in 1 year, whereas statistics will show that there are only 15,000 to 16,000 cars of onions grown in the United States that are eligible for delivery on the exchange. This heavy trading can mean nothing but heavy track holdings during each option or delivery month, causing a very demoralized market.

Delivery months have been November, January, February, and March of each year. These heavy commitments, as mentioned, mean nothing but heavy track holdings during these delivery months. For example, November being a delivery month, for 18 days, taken from the United States Government track holdings report, there was an average of 104½ cars on track every day through those days. December was not an option or delivery month, and for 20 days during December the track holdings averaged 26½ cars per day. Through January 1956, this being a delivery month, the track holdings averaged 71⅓ cars per day throughout the entire month. February again being a delivery month, through February 10 track holdings averaged 70½ cars per day. On February 10 all February commitments had been cleaned up, so starting February 13 and through February 24 our track holdings immediately dropped materially and for the 9 days reported by the Market News Service during that period, track holdings averaged slightly under 30 cars per day. March, being another delivery month with heavy commitments, track holdings immediately started building up on February 27 to 29, averaging 96½ cars per day.

March 1 showed 107 cars on track. These track holdings were all on the Chicago market. The general trade figures that around 30 cars on track in Chicago is normal track holdings, but, when track holdings double and triple, it can mean nothing but a depressed and demoralized market. The Chicago market is a key market for the United States as cars can be diverted to most any market in the United States out of there on through rates. It is easy to understand that these heavy commitments on this future trading are entirely responsible for these heavy track holdings in the key market of the United States. Abnormal supplies mean only one thing—a demoralized market with disastrous prices.

The National Onion Association, which consists of many growers and members of the onion industry who were suffering greatly from effects of this unscrupulous trading on the future board, passed a resolution on December 2, 1955, at their annual meeting in Chicago, against the trading of onion futures and went on record asking that steps be taken to have this future trading abolished. The resolution was passed unanimously except for 24 votes against, which were by association members who were also members of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. It was expected that these would vote against it. Since then, several other associations have passed similar resolutions such as the Malheur Oregon Onion Growers Association, the Southwest Idaho Growers Association, the New York State Farm Bureau, Owego Vegetable Growers Association, Oakfield & Elba Growers, the Colorado Potato Growers, Empire State Potato Club, and the Genesee-Orleans Vegetable Growers Cooperative Association. These associations represent 95 to 99 percent of the actual onion growers that have been growing onions for many years for a livelihood.

We feel sure that it can be proven that trading members or brokers on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange have financed growers or had onions grown by many new growers as well as additional acreage by old growers strictly for hedging purposes. These extra onions planted for hedging only have caused large surpluses of onion acreage to be planted during the past few years. The Chicago Mercantile Exchange and the New York Mercantile Exchange of course do not consume the actual onions. They have to be eventually consumed by the public.

We believe it developed in one investigation that they found 813 traders, both long and short positions, and it was found that only 15 traders, or 2 percent of the 813 traders, held 47 percent of all speculative hedges. Of these 15 traders, we understand 10 held over 200 contracts each, 5 of them held over 100 contracts each, and the remaining 798 traders, or 98 percent, held only 53 percent of all positions. Might mention that there are approximately 18,000 persons who are actually growing, packing, shipping, and selling onions, yet the commodity ex-

change authorities have found only 813 traders of which 15 traders, or 2 percent of them, controlled 47 percent of the trading. It is a sad story when 15 individuals can hold almost half of these contracts and destroy the efforts of the entire industry.

It has been the practice of the exchange to open trading on future onions several months in advance of delivery time and several months ahead of planting time. For instance, November futures for 1956 were opened for future trading December 1, 1955, which is 11 months ahead of delivery time and 4 to 5 months ahead of planting time.

It has been the practice in previous years to open January trading for the next year on February 1. However, this year as far as we know, this trading has not been opened. These contracts opening up for the following year so far ahead of planting time encourages extra acreages and this is especially true by those board members who have onions grown strictly for hedging purposes and large acreages mean surplus crops. We are sure that this hedging has not proven of any value whatsoever to the actual onion grower who has been growing onions for a livelihood.

It is the opinion of many that the exchange has resorted to fictitious advertising in trying to encourage the trading on this future trading on this future board. We point out as an illustration an ad which appeared in the Packer (a national trade and growers paper) and placed there by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange in the issue of January 28, 1956, quoting a grower by the name of John R. Jones, of the Jones Onion Farms, Smithville, N. Y. On investigation it developed that Smithville, N. Y., was a crossroads post office in the mountainous country in Jefferson County, New York State. It further developed that there was no such person as John R. Jones or the Jones Onion Farms in or around Smithville or in Jefferson County. This grower, according to the ad, was praising the use of the exchange for profits he had made by being able to hedge his onions, later selling his hedges and still sell the physical onions through market channels. Apparently the exchange was questioned about the correctness of the ad and A. M. Harris, of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange came out with a rebuttal statement in the next issue of the Packer stating that he simply used the name of Jones as a symbolic figure, the same as Santa Claus or Paul Bunyon and that he thought that anyone reading it would not figure it was an actual grower or actual transaction. We are sure that the average person reading the ad would think that it was taken from an actual transaction. The ad, of course, should have so stated, but it seems that they have had to stoop pretty low to resort to this kind of false and misleading information in order to bolster trading of onions on the exchange. It has been shown that statistics mean nothing as far as trading on future exchanges are concerned. In the year 1955 there was a surplus of onions planted in the United States, but due to heavy damage to the onion crop growing in Orange County, N. Y., flood and rain damage in western Oregon, and freezing damage in western Colorado, our actual production on this large acreage turned out to be considerably less than normal production. Yet by operations on the board, prices have been driven down to disastrously low levels and to a point much below production costs.

The National Onion Association has at various times during the past several years asked the exchange to make certain rules and changes whereby they thought the growers and industry might be able to survive and live with its existence. The exchange has at various times admitted that there were changes that should be made but they failed to make such changes.

Onions are a perishable item and since it has been proven that the future trading of these onions on the future board has been a great detriment to the onion grower and the onion industry as a whole, the growers of the Nation are requesting that this future trading be abolished. It has been found that it has no value whatsoever to the onion growers and the onion industry and, instead, it has disrupted orderly marketing causing a wide fluctuation in prices.

At this time the destiny of the onion grower lies in the hands of our Congress in passing legislation that will prohibit what is called vicious, unscrupulous trading by a comparatively few professional gamblers and manipulators. It is felt certain that additional hearings by the Agriculture Committee will demonstrate that this trading has been very disastrous for the onion growers throughout the United States. It is the earnest wish of the onion grower and members of the industry that King's House bill 7920 and the Dworshak-Welker Senate bill 3204 be expediently passed, both through the House and Senate without any amendments. It is a very serious problem now facing the onion growers. We sincerely urge all of our Senators and Representatives to support this legislation. We are sure that this will be one big way to help this gradual decrease in the farmer's income which has been declining at an alarming pace during the past couple of years.

Respectfully submitted in order that you may have some condensed facts with reference to the evils and effect that this future trading has on the onion growers of the Nation.

BURNS & BAY,
C. H. BURNS.

NAMPA, IDAHO.

---

RESOLUTION OF MALHEUR COUNTY ONION GROWERS ASSOCIATION

1. Whereas onions to be delivered on the mercantile exchange are permitted to be traded 5 months ahead of planting (11 months before delivery); and

2. Whereas this early trading tends to increase plantings which lead to increased production and depressing prices at harvesttime; and

3. Whereas most onion growers cannot use the futures market for hedging because they do not have sufficient funds available to put up the original margin and meet possible margin calls; and

4. Whereas it has been possible for a trader on the exchange to corner practically all physical onions delivered on the exchange, thus creating a depressing effect on the market; and

5. Whereas these practices in the futures trading of onions has disrupted the orderly marketing of the crops and resulted in financial loss to growers: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Malheur County (Oreg.) Onion Growers Association take immediate action for national legislation to secure permanent abolishment of onions from futures trading.

Joe Y. Saito, President; Lawern King, Vice President; S. Muraham; A. E. Nagaki; Roy Luce; M. F. Barlon; Tah Kewahara; Wm. Hepworth; Warren Farmer.

ONTARIO, OREG., *December 20, 1955.*

---

MALHEUR COUNTY
ONION GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
*Ontario, Oreg., February 4, 1956.*

The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*United States Senate Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Onion growers of Malheur County are very interested in measures to curb or prohibit the speculative trading of onion futures on the commodity exchanges. They have long felt that the speculative activity of the gamblers in these dealings worked to the detriment of the growers who were trying to sell some onions. This past marketing season has practically proven this to be the case, and growers in this district feel they have sacrificed 50 cents to $1 on every bag of the 1,800,000 bags sold from the 1955 crop.

It looks from here like time to do something, and that is the point of our letter to you. We understand legislation has been introduced into the House by Representative KARL KING that would ban futures trading in onions. Folks interested in the onion industry in western Idaho have asked Senators from there if they might not start similar action in the Senate. We do not know how much has been done, and hesitate to suggest to you what to do, but we do earnestly request your support toward the ultimate objective of taking these gamblers out of the onion business.

As a statement of our reasoning in this request I enclose a resolution passed some time ago by our growers association, and circulated within the industry. We would be glad to assemble further information on the problem for you if it would be helpful. We would greatly appreciate your taking whatever action you can see from there is feasible toward stopping the trading in onion futures.

Sincerely yours,

LAWERN KING,
*Vice President.*

---

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY,
*Washington, D. C., March 6, 1956.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: There have been several developments in connection with futures trading in onions since Mr. Lawern King's letter to you of February 4. On February 23 the Chicago Mercantile Exchange amended its rules relating to the delivery of onions on futures contracts to provide a penalty of 25 cents per bag for onions delivered from warehouses in Chicago, and also tightening up the grading and delivery requirements in certain other respects. These amendments were apparently designed to at least partially meet the general feeling in the industry that large quantities of onions were pulled into Chicago for delivery on the futures markets with a consequent depressing effect on prices. Whether or not the changed rules will result in any improvement remains to be seen.

Onions were brought under the regulatory provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, effective September 24, 1955. We have given much attention to futures trading in this commodity since that time and have about completed the compilation of material which we intend to present to the Commodity Exchange Commission with a recommendation for the establishment of limits on the size of speculative operations in onions similar to those which are in effect on grains, cotton, and certain other commodities.

There has been widespread dissatisfaction among producers and others connected with the onion industry over the extremely erratic price movements which have been registered on the futures markets. The Marketing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture is currently conducting an inquiry into futures trading in onions and also in potatoes. Hearings relating to potatoes were held at Presque Isle, Maine, on December 6 and 7, 1955, and we understand there will be a hearing somewhere in the onion producing area within the next few weeks, perhaps to be followed by hearings in Washington. We believe that the information developed at these hearings, together with that which we expect to present in hearings on the proposed limits on speculative operations will be of value in considering the legislation mentioned by Mr. King to prohibit futures trading in onions.

In addition to the question of further legislation we are now investigating recent price movements in onion futures for the purpose of determining whether there is evidence of manipulation which could be the subject of action under the Commodity Exchange Act. The March 1956 future, which is the last old crop future for the current season closed yesterday at a price of 44 cents per 50-pound bag. This represented a decline since March 1 from 79 cents per bag and from a high of $2.75 per bag for this future which was registered last August 22. Trade interests indicate this decline may have been at least partly the result of large quantities of onions being brought into Chicago last November for the purpose of fulfilling futures contracts at that time. A substantial portion of these onions are still in store in Chicago warehouses and are said to be having a depressing influence on current futures contracts.

While these price movements are of course rather extreme, we are faced with the fact that onions have historically been subject to wide price swings even before there was futures trading in that commodity.

We can only take action under the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act if we find evidence of manipulation. You may be sure that if our current inquiry develops such evidence we will proceed as authorized by the act.

We appreciate your bringing Mr. King's comments to our attention and will be glad to furnish you or him with any further information available to us.

Sincerely,

RODGER R. KAUFFMAN,
*Administrator.*

---

STATE OF OREGON,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Salem, May 16, 1956.*

Mr. RODGER R. KAUFFMAN,
*Administrator, Commodity Exchange Authority, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. KAUFFMAN: Leading onion growers and shipper in Malheur County of eastern Oregon and in the Willamette Valley here have called our attention to features of and facts surrounding futures trading in onions which they feel have depressing effects on the market and prices for their onions.

Directors of the Malheur Onion Growers Association advise us that some regulations on trading in onion futures were put into effect during the past year by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, but that these have not accomplished the desired results. They state that some added restrictions are proposed for which they find no greater prospects for success.

Upon looking over the problems faced by Oregon growers and shippers in marketing their onions, we find considerable indication of detrimental effects of futures trading on their markets and on prices received, even though that trading is on onions grown in other States.

While futures trading may have a stabilizing effect on the marketing of many storable commodities, the reverse may be true of a perishable commodity with normal fluctuations in yearly plantings which can be increased by preseason futures trading.

Onions in my opinion are the most perishable commodity traded on the commodity exchanges. Any increase in United States plantings due to preseason futures trading accentuates the overall supply problem on this perishable commodity with a consumptive marketing period more limited than that of other commodities on the exchanges.

Prior to the advent of futures trading on onions, suplus production in 1 year normally was followed by smaller plantings and some market improvement in the next season or two. However, under futures trading this normal effect appears to have been disrupted by preseason contracts providing financing for plantings in addition to those which in any case would be and are planted for later marketing in the normal channels of trade.

The Malheur Onion Growers Association advises that they proposed last fall that the opening of futures trading be delayed until onion plantings were completed, but that you advised this would be beyond the legal authority of the Commodity Exchange Authority.

Figures for track holdings in Chicago this past season appear to bear out contentions of Oregon and Idaho growers and shippers that futures trading in onions has contributed to heavy truck loadings during option or delivery months compared to those during the nondelivery month of December. Oregon growers advise also that in an effort to discourage storage and additional speculation on onions delivered there, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange added a 25-cent markoff for onions delivered from storage there. It appears that instead of aiding market stability this may have increased sales and depressed prices on the Chicago market further during periods of heavy arrivals in option or delivery months.

With no relief apparent from those regulations which it has been found possible to apply to futures trading in onions, Oregon growers feel the only means of relief from its influence on plantings and surplus production and marketings is through the enactment of H. R. 7920 or S. 3204 to eliminate onions from futures trading. It appears to us that they have good grounds for this stand, and in consideration of the data and information provided as referred to herein, advice as to your position in this important matter will be much appreciated.

Thanking you in advance for your careful attention and consideration, we are,

Very truly yours,

PAUL T. ROWELL,
*Chief, Division of Market Development.*

---

## ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

---

## REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the civil-service retirement bill, because I find a controversy exists in connection with this bill between the Federal employees now in active service and employees already retired.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two bills that really deal with this problem, which I am about to discuss, a bill known as S. 3725, introduced by my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. PASTORE; and the second bill, S. 3731, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, for himself, Mr. JENNER, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be printed at this point in my remarks, because what I shall have to say will relate to those bills.

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

[S. 3725, 84th Cong., 2d sess.]

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a), subject to the provisions of section 2, the annuity of any employee who, before the date of enactment of this act, was retired and is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be increased by $100 plus $10 for each 2 full months elapsed between the commencing date of the annuity and the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That such increase in annuity shall not in any case exceed $300.

(b) Subject to the provisions of section 2, the annuity of any survivor, except a child covered by subsection (c), who, on the date of enactment of this act is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, based on the service of a former employee, shall be increased by $80.

(c) Subject to the provisions of section 2, the annuity of any child who, on the date of enactment of this act, is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, based on the service of his parent, shall be increased by $50.

SEC. 2. No increases in annuities shall be payable under section 1 of this act until, and except to the extent that, an appropriation made for the specific purpose of paying such increases is available for such purpose. Any such increase shall become effective on the first day of the first month for which such appropriation is available, and shall terminate on the last day for which such appropriation is available.

SEC. 3. Section 8 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out the next to the last sentence in paragraph (1) thereof.

---

[S. 3731, 84th Cong., 2d Sess.]

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) the annuity of any employee who, before the date of enactment of this act, was retired and is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following the enactment of this act, by $100 plus $10 for each 2 full months elapsed between the commencing date of annuity and the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That such increase in annuity shall not in any case exceed $300.

(b) The annuity of any survivor of such retired employee, except children covered by subsection (c) of this section, who, on the date of enactment of this act is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity based on the service of a former employee, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following the enactment of this act, by $80.

(c) The annuity of any child of such retired employee who, on the date of enactment of this act, is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity based on the service of his parent, shall be increased to $50, effective on the first day of the second month following the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the annuity of each such child shall not at any time exceed $1,200 divided by the number of children then receiving annuity.

(d) The increases in annuity provided by this section shall be paid from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and shall terminate, without subsequent resumption, on June 30, 1959, or on an earlier date under any one of the following conditions, whichever may first occur:

(1) At the end of the second month following the third consecutive month for which

the Consumer's Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is less than 169.9, the index for the month of April 1948. In the event that the Bureau of Labor Statistics revises the basis of calculating the Consumer's Price Index, it shall immediately furnish to the Commission a conversion factor designed to adjust to the new basis the index figures of 169.9 described herein, and such adjusted index shall be used for the purposes of this section.

(2) On June 30, 1958, unless an appropriation is made to the civil-service retirement and disability fund in the applicable annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1959, or in any prior appropriation act, for the specific purpose of compensating said fund for the cost, as determined by the Commission, of increases provided by this section during the fiscal years 1958 and 1959.

(e) The widow or widower of any retired employee mentioned in the first paragraph of section 8 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, who died prior to February 29, 1948, or the widow or widower of any retired employee mentioned in the third paragraph of such section 8 (a) who died prior to April 1, 1948, if such widow or widower is not entitled to an annuity under any other provision of such act and has not remarried, shall be entitled to receive an annuity equal to one-half of the annuity of her husband or his wife, but not to exceed $600 per annum. Any annuity granted under this subsection shall commence on the first day of the month following the month in which application therefor is filed with the Civil Service Commission, and shall cease upon the death or remarriage of the annuitant.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8 (d) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out: "Such increase in annuity shall not exceed the sum necessary to increase such annuity, exclusive of annuity purchased by voluntary contributions under the second paragraph of section 10 of this act, to $4,104."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the first day of the second month following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these two bills seek to do justice to a group of people in our citizenry who have some justice coming, namely, the annuitants, the retired civil-service employees. There is not any doubt about the fact that they have been placed at a great economic disadvantage. After all, the annuitant dollar, the retirement dollar, which they obtained when they first went into retirement, was worth much more than the dollar is worth today, so far as the cost of living is concerned.

So what do these retired employees have to say to us? They are saying, with complete justice, in my opinion, that they are entitled to some consideration in any retirement act, which would at least give them a more adequate retirement allowance than they get under the present arrangement.

I cannot furnish any better proof of that than a letter, which I shall read shortly, which I received from Mr. Clarence G. Davis, secretary-treasurer of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Oregon chapter.

In an attempt to do economic justice to them, my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], with the cosponsors of the bill I have already enumerated, introduced in the Senate, on April 24, S. 3725, seeking to increase the retirement benefits for these already retired employees. It happens that section 2 of the bill is the section which has created some controversy among the retired employees, and I wish to read the language:

No increases in annuities shall be payable under section 1 of this act until, and except to the extent that, an appropriation made for the specific purpose of paying such increases is available for such purpose. Any such increase shall become effective on the first day of the first month for which such appropriation is available, and shall terminate on the last day for which such appropriation is available.

The Carlson bill—and I want to say I may vote for the Carlson bill when the debate is over—seeks to have the increase in payments to the already retired employees come out of the retirement fund itself. The retired employees prefer that, as will be seen from the correspondence I shall read, to the provision of Senate bill 3725 which will require a special appropriation. Also, the Carlson bill makes provision for the widows of retired employees. I certainly think that any measure we pass, whether Senate bill 3725 or Senate bill 3731, should clearly have in it a provision carrying out the principle of the Carlson bill in respect to widow allowances, because I think we have been very parsimonious. I think we have not been fair and just to the widows of retired civil-service employees.

I want the RECORD this afternoon to show that, I am advised by the sponsors of Senate bill 3725, the reason for calling for a special appropriation is the legislative reason that the probabilities of obtaining at this session of Congress the passage of a bill calling for benefits to come out of the existing retirement fund are not good. This is a delicate matter, but I never hesitate to discuss delicate legislative matters when there is a conflict among groups.

Mr. President, there is no question about the fact that the active civil-service employees today are in opposition to any retirement bill which would seek to lay a heavier charge on the existing retirement fund. I have asked them, as I want the RECORD to show, this question: "Are you showing the appreciation that you ought to show to the already retired civil-service employees for the great service they have rendered you in the past in getting on the statute books, in the first instance, provision for civil-service retirement benefits?"

I wish to say to the active civil-service employees that it is very easy to take the position that our retired civil-service employees are somewhat free riders, when now they ask to have additional benefits paid out of the retirement fund, because at the present time they are not paying into that retirement fund.

I wish to say to the active civil-service employees that they should face the fact that in years gone by, the group of civil-service employees now retired made the great legislative fight, in the first instance, for retirement-benefits legislation.

So, Mr. President, I think every reasonable effort should be made by the Congress at this session to provide the retired civil-service employee with increases in their benefits, including a provision for widow benefits. Whether that can be done under the existing retirement fund, or whether it has to be done by special legislation by way of appropriation, only time will tell. But I want the RECORD to show that so far as I am concerned, as a Member of the Senate, I shall try to work out, either by way of amendment to the pending measure or by way of quick action on newly proposed legislation, a legislative provision which will do justice to civil-service employees who already are retired.

At this point I wish to read into the RECORD the letter to which I have previously referred. I received the letter from Mr. Clarence Davis, under date of May 5. His letter reads as follows:

OREGON FEDERATION OF CHAPTERS,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES,
*Portland, Oreg., May 5, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Oregon Federation of Chapters, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, met in annual convention at Eugene, Oreg., on May 4, 1956, and adopted the following motion:

"That the Oregon Federation of Chapters, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, meeting in third annual convention at Eugene, Oreg., on this 4th day of May 1956, does hereby endorse Senate bill 3731, introduced in the 84th Congress, 2d session, by Senator CARLSON, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the secretary of this federation is hereby instructed to communicate this action to the president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and to the two United States Senators from Oregon, and to all of the Members of Congress from Oregon in the United States House of Representatives, with the request that such Senators and Representatives do their utmost to have said bill, S. 3731, enacted into law."

This action was taken after thorough study of the two bills, S. 3725, introduced by Senator NEUBERGER (for himself, yourself, and other Senators), and S. 3731. We feel that section 2 of S. 3725 utterly defeats the purpose of the proposed legislation, rendering the bill but an empty gesture. We believe that the men and women who have been retired from the Federal Government service and who have contributed to the civil service retirement and disability fund throughout the years, and have a sort of contract with the Government to the effect that the establishment of said retirement act is part and parcel of remuneration for services rendered by them, are entitled to receive annuities therefrom in full dollar value—not a depreciated dollar. We also believe that an appropriation to implement S. 3725 (if enacted) would have very little chance of enactment by an economy-minded Congress and administration.

In addition, we are mindful of the injustice that has been done widows of retired employees who died prior to February 29, 1948, and of those who died prior to April 1, 1948, by not providing any survivor annuities for them, when in many cases their husbands served 40 years, or more, faithfully, giving the best years of their lives in Government service. We want to have this omission corrected. S. 3731 does provide a very moderate annuity for them.

Sincerely yours,
CLARENCE G. DAVIS,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

I shall omit the last paragraph of the letter, because it does not deal with

either Senate bill 3731 or Senate bill 3725.

Mr. President, I do not share the conclusion that Mr. Davis and his associates have reached, namely, that an approach by way of an appropriation renders Senate bill 3725 an empty gesture. If I had thought so, my name would never have gone on the bill in the first place; and if my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] had thought so, the bill would never have been introduced in the first place, because the Senators from Oregon do not engage in empty gestures. But there can be among us an honest difference of opinion as to the legislative strategy, as to whether we have a better chance of getting economic justice for the retired employees by way of a special appropriation of funds to be added to the retirement fund for civil service employees, or by way of the approach in the Carlson bill, namely, to have the benefits paid out of the retirement fund already in existence.

I want the RECORD to show that so far as my personal conclusion is concerned, I have to be shown two things: first, whether the present retirement fund is adequate to meet the needs of the employees who already are retired; second, whether the employees who already are retired have in the fund an equity for an amount over and above the amount of money to which they were entitled at the time when they retired.

In my judgment, one of the strongest points Mr. Davis makes in his argument is based on the fact that the dollar has depreciated; that the employees who already have retired actually put into the fund, over the years during which they made payments, dollars worth more than the dollars they are getting back today, and that in a sense that fact creates an equity on their part for an additional amount out of the existing fund.

I bring that out because it is a point which I hope will be discussed by the members of the committee who are certainly much better versed in this subject, as members of the committee, than I have been able to become as a result of any study of it to date.

I do not agree with Mr. Davis and his associates that there is little or no chance of having S. 3725 passed by way of an additional appropriation. I refuse to believe that my colleagues in the Senate would be unwilling to pass a bill which would do justice to the people already retired, who have been in the Government service. At least I want to try it. I say to those employees that if the legislative situation makes it clear that there is no hope, they will find the senior Senator from Oregon then proposing another approach to the problem.

I also wish to say, as I pointed out to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] this afternoon in the conference I had with him, that I think it is very important, in the debate on the retirement bill, that we have a full discussion of the money in the fund, and the adequacy of that money to meet the needs of the retired employees, as well as a full discussion of whatever equity the retired employees may have in that fund, in view of the fact that over a period of years they paid into it dollars which were worth much more than a dollar is worth today.

Also I wish to say for the RECORD that in my discussions in the cloakrooms this afternoon I found very little support for adding to the pending measure, S. 2875, any amendment which would take care of the needs of the retired employees. The consensus of opinion among the colleagues with whom I have talked seems to be that it should be done by way of a separate piece of legislation. I have gone to the chairman of the committee, and I have been told by him that there is no question about the fact that when S. 2875 is disposed of the committee will give early consideration to hearings on both S. 3725 and S. 3731, the Neuberger bill and the Carlson bill.

I wish to make clear to the retired employees that what I shall do is to work for a final piece of legislation aimed at giving those retired employees, in this session of Congress, the economic benefits to which I think they are entitled. If it develops that S. 3725 is the bill which will receive the greatest amount of support in the Senate, I shall offer—if it is not offered by the committee as a result of the committee hearings—an additional section to the bill, which would provide benefits, as does the Carlson bill, for the widows.

I also wish to say to the active civil service employees, who, I am informed, are in opposition to any additional funds being paid out of the retirement fund to the retired employees, that they will have to assume the burden of proof, in my judgment, for their position that we should not seek to be of some further assistance to employees already retired.

I understand that S. 2875 would increase the payments on the part of the active employees from 6 percent to 7 percent. In my judgment, what we ought to do, as a Congress, is to add to those payments an out-and-out appropriation by Congress to take care of the employees who have already retired. I think those employees are entitled to such treatment, and I think such a course of action would remove the entire controversy as to whether or not we are discriminating unfairly against either the active employees or the retired employees. We, as a Congress, ought to face up to the fact that the existing fund apparently is not sufficient, without an additional appropriation, to take care of the retired employees to the extent I think they ought to be taken care of.

I have made this statement for the RECORD because I want retired employees to know that, although I have cosponsored S. 3725, and still stand on my cosponsorship of S. 3725, that does not mean that I would not look with favor on any modification of S. 3725 which would arrive at a satisfactory solution of this problem.

Once again we in the Senate find ourselves on this issue, in the middle, between two groups of employees who have not gotten together themselves in a satisfactory adjustment of their differences. Therefore there falls upon us the duty to devise the most equitable program possible.

If it develops that S. 3731 is the program we should undertake in this session of Congress, I will not hestitate to vote for it merely because one group of employees happens to be against it. If, on the other hand, S. 3725, or a modification of it, is the approach we should adopt, I will not hesitate to vote for it merely because one group is of the present opinion that it constitutes an empty gesture. I deny that.

In my opinion, the soundest approach would be by way of an additional appropriation, recognizing the obligation that we owe to the retired employees and to their widows.

I have made this statement because tomorrow in the debate I intend to ask the chairman of the committee—and I told him so before he left the Chamber, and he said he would be very delighted to discuss the subject with me tomorrow—a series of questions involving S. 2875, as to why S. 2875 does not contain any provisions with respect to the retired employees; and also questions dealing with the question of how best to take care of the retired employees in connection with providing them the additional benefits they need.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a series of communications which I have received from retired employees in Oregon dealing with the problems I have just discussed.

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

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 16, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

HON. WAYNE MORSE: Greetings and salutations. Many thank for all the correspondence I received from your office this past month or so. Last time I wrote you for the support of S. 3725. Somebody goofed on that one. Now we are asking for your support of Senator CARLSON'S bill, S. 3731. We are told that this bill is more encouraging to us and that will bring the increases this year if brought out of committee. We think that you will be able to muster all the force required in that direction.

Read an article in the paper where some young blood organization in Wisconsin endorsed Adlai for President and Wayne for Veep. Those are my sentiments too. Anyway we are sure of enough votes for you, whichever position you go after.

Thanking you for all past favors, I remain,
Yours truly,

VICTOR B. GOTHE.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*Washington, D. C.:*

We have just received word that bill S. 3731 has been introduced and has favorable chances of passing. This increase to our annuity will come out of our own retirement fund and does not require special appropriations.

Will you support this bill, S. 3731?

Respectfully yours,

ZELLA Z. SCHLOTTMANN.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 18, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
*United States Senate Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Respectfully request your vote and support S. 3731 for annuity increases from our own retirement fund.

HARRY J. STRAWBRIDGE,
*Portland Chapter, National Association Retired Civil Employees.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 9, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your recent letter and a copy of bill S. 3725 introduced by Senator NEUBERGER, yourself and others.

But I don't like it personally for it provides for no appropriation of cash to help us out in the way we need to be helped.

I understand another bill, introduced by Senator CARLSON, S. 3731, covers practically the same ground but does provide that immediate payments be made from the immense surplus now on hand in the pension fund. Thats what we want and was what the NARCE amendment to S. 2875 provided for.

If you really want to help out myself and the tens of thousands other retirees also the 20,000 widows and widowers (not now provided for) please work for S. 3725.

Thanking you, I am

STEPHEN A. ALLEN.

---

SHERWOOD, OREG., *May 8, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR FRIEND AND BENEFACTOR: I received you very fine letter of April 26, and thank you very much. I appreciate, as do thousands of others, the fine help you have rendered us in the past and are now doing for NARCE. I would like to do my little bit in helping retain you as our Senator from Oregon and any boost I can give you will be a great pleasure to me.

I would like permission to send a copy of your April 26 letter to each one of the chapters in Oregon.

Thanking you very much I am,

ALFRED G. LEE,

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 15, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of April 26 with copy of S. 3725. Be assured that I appreciate your keeping me in mind in connection with this matter which is of vital interest to me.

Those of us who are interested consider that S. 3725 is a step in the right direction but that it does not go far enough as we feel that section 2 renders it innocuous.

The matter was discussed at the NARCE meeting May 9 in comparison with S. 3731 which would make the increase payable from the civil service retirement fund. It is our information that the latter is sufficiently sound to carry the increase without a special appropriation and, of course, would be much more acceptable to those on the retirement rolls.

Encouraged by the last paragraph of the above-cited letter, I am asking that you use your best efforts to secure enactment of S. 3731 as soon as reasonably possible.

Cordially yours,

LEROY A. PALMER.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: May I ask you to support and work for Senator CARLSON's bill, S. 3731? This would be effective this year with payment from civil service retirement fund.

Thanking you for your courtesy.

Very truly yours,

Miss DORA CLAPPER.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 16, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As our senior Senator from Oregon, will you please help the old retirees here to get an increase in annuities, by working for the passage of S. 3731, or 3725, amended by the Senate committee. The NARCE has been working hard for this and we hope, with your influence along with Senator NEUBERGER, you can put it through.

My husband was struck blind while a deputy clerk in Judge Solomen's office, and after many loyal years for the Government, now only gets $65 per month, and it's not enough to try to live on, as you well know. We're not complaining. We had a home to sell, but there are so many others who don't even have that. We are told that the money is held by the civil service retirees fund, and so with proper legislation it can be paid out this year. Even a little will help.

This is election day here, we just came back from voting. I hope it all turns out all right.

We trust you will have success with the bill. Thanking you most kindly, and the best of luck (if you put this over, it will help you a lot in Oregon).

Kindest regards,

SALLY P. GATES
(Mrs. Robert J.).

---

EUGENE, OREG., *May 16, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building.*

DEAR MR. MORSE: We wrote you some time ago asking you to again help us get a better increase this year. We know you are a very busy man, and didn't expect an answer soon. Now, we are going to ask you to please support the bill S. 3731, else help get the bill S. 2875 passed promptly. Those bills as you know, would be paid from the civil-service retirement fund. We do need the increase this year. There's been illness in the family.

With sincere thanks.

Mr. and Mrs. GEO. G. RODMAN.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 21, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Building, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: The plight of the retired civil service employee is deplorable. Little has been done to alleviate his condition. His earning days are past, he is faced with the same high and rising cost of living as is everyone.

Senator CARLSON has introduced S. 3731. This bill covers annuity increases in accordance with the amendments that we proposed on S. 3725. It would become effective this year as no special appropriation is required as the proceeds will come from the civil-service retirement fund.

May I ask you in the name of justice to the retired civil service employee to lend this bill (S. 3731) your wholehearted support?

Sincerely yours,

JOS. B. BRADY.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 16, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senator for Oregon.*

DEAR SIR: It has been asked of me that I write you and call your attention to the following: Senator CARLSON has introduced bill S. 3731. This bill is a forward step, encouraging to retired members. It covers annuity increases. It would be effective this year, as payments for this year would be made from civil-service retirement fund. This bill appears to be satisfactory and warrants your strong support. I have further been asked to urge you to work for this bill that would provide payment from our own retirement fund.

Dear Mr. WAYNE MORSE, please do something. Every day wages and living goes up, it is no sinecure to make both ends meet. For myself I don't want nothing. I am 82 years old, and due for the call of death any time. But there are others.

Sincerely yours,

P. J. HANSEN,
*Lieutenant Commander, USNR*
*(honorably retired).*

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

DEAR MR. MORSE: What do you think of Senator CARLSON's bill for retired Federal employees, S. 3731? Can you tell me what is in the minds of our legislatures when they are against or indifferent to such help to these older folks?

Have they forgotten their own generous raise to themselves to meet the higher living costs?

You are doing all right, we think. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. H. R. RICHARDS.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

FRIEND: On behalf of S. 3731, introduced by Senator CARLSON, we are asking for your favorable support. You have been very kind to our group of retirees, and we're not forgetting that tomorrow at our primary election.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN S. and Mrs. CLAUDIA DAWSON.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please get behind S. 3731 (introduced by Senator Carlson). This bill covers annuity increases in accordance with the amendments proposed by the National Association Retired Civil Employees. The bill would be effective this year, as the payment for this year would be made from the Civil Service Retirement Fund, and does not require that a special appropriation be obtained to cover our increase, until later years.

This bill is satisfactory to us and we urge your strong support, of this bill or one like it, that would provide payment from our own retirement fund. At last accounts, our two Senators were supporting S. 3725, but section 2 of that bill requires separate appropriation bill to pay the increase, something NARCE thinks is impossible of accomplishment this year.

Will appreciate your strong support of S. 3731 as above.

Very sincerely,

BLANCHE SIMMONS,
*Member, Chapter 29, NARCE.*

---

THE LINVILLE AGENCY,
*Hood River, Oreg., May 17, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The purpose of this letter is to urge your active support of pending legislation designated as S. 3731, providing for an increase in annuity payments to retired civil service employees.

As a retired Government worker, I am more fortunate than many in that I have some other income than my retirement pay, but I am sure you fully realize the very difficult situation many retirees face with living costs as they are at this time, because of the low purchasing power of dollars.

I am fully aware of the many pressures for the Congress to "do something" about the problems confronting people today, and as a group I am also sure civil service retirees are most appreciative of the increases in retirement pay that has been provided in recent years, but now, again, the need is great. We ask you support of the pending bill.

With best wishes and kind regards to yourself and Mrs. Morse, I am,

Most sincerely,

CLYDE LINVILLE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1596.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I hope you will give your support to S. 3731, introduced by Senator CARLSON. This bill provides increased annuities to retired Federal employees in line with increases granted active employees, and payable from the civil service retirement fund.

Very sincerely,

M. L. MERRITT.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 18, 1956.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am the widow of Ben A. Campbell, retired superintendent of mails of the Portland post office, who passed away in 1946 after serving 46 years in the United States mail service.

I have never received any annuity. I hope this bill, S. 3731, will include the widows whose husbands passed away prior to 1948.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. BEN A. CAMPBELL,
*Member of Chapter No. 29, National Association of Retired Civil Employees.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 9, 1956, I addressed a letter to each member of the committee. I wish the RECORD to be perfectly clear, so that the retired employees will know the position I have taken on this question. I read the letter which I sent to each member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, under date of April 9, 1956:

DEAR SENATOR: It is my understanding that on April 11 the Retirement Subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which you are member, will vote on S. 2875 and on the amendments to it that have been offered.

I want to express to you my hope that the proposals to extend increases in retirement benefits to those presently retired will be approved. I am aware of the fact that retirees received an increase in their annuities last year; however, Congress did not include survivors' benefits in the increase, and the average annuity still amounts only to $1,600 a year, with no minimum. Half of all annuitants receive less than $100 a month, and half the survivors receive less than $50 a month. Surely you will agree that a decent living is just about impossible today on such meager amounts. I believe you will also agree that men and women who have spent their lives in the service of the United States Government deserve better treatment than that.

The National Association of Retired Civil Employees has proposed a series of amendments to extend moderate increases to all on the retired roll. I ask that they be given favorable consideration, and that improved benefits for retirees and survivors be added to S. 2875. The retirement fund appears well able to accommodate them, and while I appreciate that S. 2875 is aimed at improving benefits for those still employed by the Government, it is my hope that retirees and survivors will also be aided in their struggle to meet the cost of living.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, I also wish to read into the RECORD at this time a letter I wrote to a group of constituents under date of April 9, 1956:

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for writing to me about S. 2875 and the amendments that have been proposed to include those already retired in the increases in retirement benefits. I am informed that the retirement subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee will meet soon to vote on the provisions of S. 2875 and that the full committee will take it up immediatedly thereafter.

Because the retired employees received an increase in their annuities only recently, the extension of S. 2875 to them faces tough going. However, I feel personally that their retirement benefits do not enable them to maintain a decent living standard and that they are entitled to further increases. The average annuity for retirees amounts only to $1,600 a year and there is no provision for a minimum annuity. Congress did not make provision for survivors in last year's increase and I believe that retirees and survivors should be included in S. 2875.

I am going to discuss this matter with subcommittee members, and urge that they amend S. 2875 to provide additional increases for civil-service employees presently retired. These fine people who have worked for Uncle Sam are not receiving the retirement benefits they deserve, and I shall work for the most favorable treatment possible for them.

The bill requiring that salary increases for civil-service employees include increases in retirement benefits is before the House of Representatives. I believe we should include a statement of this principle in S. 2875, though it cannot be more than a declaration of intent, since this Congress cannot bind future Congresses to specific legislative provisions.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say that as of now I believe our best chance of getting needed economic benefits for the retired employees is by way of separate legislation.

If the information I received today proves to be the case tomorrow, there seems to be little chance of getting it done by way of an amendment to S. 2875, because the members of the committee with whom I have talked on the subject have said, "This is a bill that we intend to limit to so-called active civil-service employees, those presently in the employ of the Government, and who are presently paying a certain percentage of their salaries into the retirement fund."

The members of the committee with whom I have talked have also said that they agree with me that additional legislation is needed to meet the needs of the retired employees. I have the feeling that it will have to be by way of an equitable compromise or adjustment between S. 3725 and S. 3731.

To that end I shall devote my attention in the debate tomorrow and in the days to come to the further consideration of those two pieces of separate legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

---

## RECESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 22 (legislative day of May 7), 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Frederick G. Hamley, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice Homer T. Bone, retired.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William H. Andrew, pastor, First Baptist Church, Bryan, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Heavenly Father, ruler of the destinies of men and nations, we thank Thee for Thy love, Thy goodness to this Nation, and Thy blessings in giving each of us life for this one day. Grant that today may be blessed with the full realization of Thy presence, Thou living God.

May each citizen, in lowly estate and high office, be guided by Thy wisdom. May the decisions made today be according to Thy will. May the people of this Nation have courage to live as well as to die for that which is just and righteous today.

We pray for our President and for the humblest citizen. May Thy love reign worldwide. In our Lord's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

---

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 18, 1956:

H. R. 1488. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel;

H. R. 1989. An act for the relief of George D. Hopper;

H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;

H. R. 2717. An act for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife;

H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;

H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Dazé;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith;

H. R. 3638. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn;

H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

H. R. 4051. An act to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force;

H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;

H. R. 5495. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures hereto-

fore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service Hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo;

H. R. 6395. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others;

H. R. 6622. An act for the relief of certain rural carriers;

H. R. 6769. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H. R. 7114. An act for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock;

H. R. 7513. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska;

H. R. 8187. An act for the relief of Wright H. Huntley;

H. R. 8306. An act for the relief of Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reaves, and Jackson L. Hardy;

H. R. 8307. An act for the relief of Nathan A. Kahn.

H. R. 8308. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Weeden, Jr.;

H. R. 8310. An act for the relief of Chief Warrant Officer George C. Carter;

H. R. 8311. An act for the relief of Daniel O. Hulse, Jr.;

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.";

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress; and

H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

On May 19, 1956:

H. R. 2423. An act for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho;

H. R. 4633. An act for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co.;

H. R. 6706. An act for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.; and

H. R. 10004. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

On May 22, 1956:

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife Irene.

## 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 and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Colonel Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands;

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody; and

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 5550 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 483. An act to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; and

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to make such transfers of supplies and equipment as may be available to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 510. An act for the relief of Mary A. Mouskalis;

S. 806. An act to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice;

S. 875. An act for the relief of Angel Marie Olaeta-Goitia;

S. 1245. An act for the relief of Agnes V. Walsh, the estate of Margaret T. Denehy, and David Walsh;

S. 1273. An act to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made.

S. 1895. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller;

S. 1961. An act to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2341. An act for the relief of Gertrude Heindel;

S. 2352. An act for the relief of Maj. Luther C. Cox;

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 2690. An act for the relief of William G. Jackson;

S. 2722. A act for the relief of Fai Hoo;

S. 2930. An act for the relief of Eladio Ledesma-Gutierrez;

S. 2937. An act to increase from $50 to $75 a month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service;

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes;

S. 3011. An act for the relief of Chan Lee Nui Sin;

S. 3040. An act for the relief of Gertrud Charlotte Samuelis;

S. 3058. An act for the relief of Javier F. Kuong;

S. 3101. An act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal Reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3147. An act for the relief of Elsie M. Kenney;

S. 3332. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3412. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war risk insurance for an additional 5 years;

S. 3547. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 555), authorizing the sale of certain land by the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque;

S. 3844. An act to amend the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for urban renewal assistance to disaster areas;

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; and

S. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 6, 7, and 8 of the hearings on the study of the antitrust laws of the United States.

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H. R. 10875, the farm bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## RED HAT DAY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 year ago I addressed remarks to the House calling attention to the launching of a unique experiment in the State of Oregon known as Red Hat Day. At that time I described the objectives which this educational program hoped to achieve and suggested that the idea merited adoption by other States of the Union.

The suggestion for Red Hat Day originated with the Portland chapter of the division of Oregon, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., and was officially adopted by the State of Oregon with sponsorship throughout the State by groups interested in conservation, recreation, and by numerous sportsmen's organizations. The general purposes were to promote better sportsmanship practices; prevent fires in timber and range area; encourage caution and safety in hunting; bring about better relationships between sportsmen and landowners; and to encourage observance of game laws.

The results of this experiment have just been made available in a report by the Governor's Red Hat Day committee. The value of the program is abundantly evident from the results which were achieved throughout the State. Enforcement officers of the game division of the Oregon State Police found fewer complaints regarding the conduct of hunters and there were fewer trespass complaints. In some instances, the no-trespassing notices in the local press were substantially reduced. The number of domestic animals killed during the hunting season was the smallest for any similar period on record within the State.

Violations of the game laws were fewer during the early days of the deer hunting season than for any similar period in recent years, although the number of hunters during the year increased by 6 percent.

The United States Forest Service reported about half the average number of fires known or assumed to have been started by hunters. The acres burned as a result of these fires was about one-ninth the previous annual average acreage.

Although more hunting accidents were reported in 1955 than for the previous year, the report indicates that hunters were more careful with firearms when actually hunting. Such accidents arising from individuals being mistaken for game were one-third to one-fourth of such percentages in recent years.

While much improvement can still be made over 1955, the desirability and benefits of the Red Hat Day program has been demonstrated. The public was made generally more aware of the seriousness of the problems facing hunters, landowners, and Government agencies. Succeeding years will bring further improvement as this program continues. Other States may well study the experience of Oregon for improving the protection of life and property and bringing about a higher regard for conservation activities and for the recreational facilities in those States.

## INDIANA TOMATO AND VEGETABLE JUICE

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under the auspices of the Indiana Canners' Association and with the compliments of the Naas Foods, Inc., of Portland, Ind., I have the privilege of presenting cans of Indiana tomato juice and vegetable juice to all Members of the House of Representatives.

Indiana is justifiably proud of its canned foods and especially of its tomato products which are being shipped to all parts of the United States and to many foreign countries.

It was in Indiana where the first tomato juice was prepared and canned commercially approximately 30 years ago. It was in Indiana, likewise, where the process was developed for separating the color of tomatoes for juice purposes. Later it also was in Indiana where the homogenizing process was developed for the manufacture and canning of tomato juice.

The natural tang and taste of Indiana tomato juice is derived from the natural balance of chemicals in the Hoosier soil, and it is this genuine flavor that affords such a satisfying and healthful drink.

Indiana is one of the larges producers of tomatoes and tomato products in the United States. The Fifth Congressional District that I have the privilege to represent happens to have a great concentration of these tomato farms and canning factories producing tomato products. This industry provides employment and an economic livelihood for thousands of factory workers and farmers. Modern agricultural methods provide constantly improved tomatoes, and the sanitary and approved processing and canning plants combine in the continuous efforts to provide the public with these delectable Indiana tomato products.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I want to congratulate my colleague upon this very fine endeavor and the effort to inform our colleagues of the House of the very fine products of our State of Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman. I know tomatoes come from his district. All of you will enjoy the tomatoes that come from Indiana.

## T. COLEMAN ANDREWS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of the House to a recent attack on the income tax in the U. S. News & World Report by T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. Andrews, now employed by The American Fidelity & Casualty Insurance Co., against which company the Government has a $5 million income-tax claim pending, attacks in particular the effect of the income tax on high-income groups. This kind of an attack is valid and proper by any citizen but the persistent nature of this attack by a former Commissioner of the Service is certainly indiscreet and revolting.

The grave error in Executive decision was the administration's design in appointing a person to administer the tax laws of the land who did not believe in the law. This seems to be a basic policy of this administration. For the top job in the Housing and Finance Agency the administration selected the most ardent foe of public housing. It appears now that the Executive judgment in appointing T. Coleman Andrews as Commissioner of Internal Revenue was about as sound as would be the appointment of Khrushchev as Secretary of the United States Department of Defense.

T. Coleman Andrews has used his title as former Commissioner of Internal Revenue to undermine public respect for our income-tax laws. His persistent attacks raise grave doubt as to the quality of his administration of the laws which he so vehemently attacks now. T. Coleman Andrews should be called before congressional committees and give the benefit of his judgment and opinion so that they can be placed on the record. Then every phase of his work should be carefully reviewed to see how extensively his opposition to income taxes for the high-income groups was manifested through his administration acts.

## THE FARM BILL

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to apprise the Members of the House of the fact that the conferees on the farm bill have just come to a unanimous agreement and we hope to have the bill before the House tomorrow. We also hope that there is not going to be any fight on it. The bill is not what anybody wants. Therefore it must be a pretty good bill.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the

Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not more than 1 hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and one-half by myself.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I had understood that there was to be 1 hour on each side. That was the understanding which I had.

Mr. CANNON. In view of the insistence of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], Mr. Speaker, I amend my request. I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to not more than 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11319, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee submits to the House today the 12th appropriation bill of the session. It is a rather notable bill in that it establishes something like five exceptional records.

In the first place, it is presented considerably earlier than this bill was presented in the last Congress.

As a matter of fact, all appropriation bills have now been submitted with the exception of the legislative bill, which has already been "marked up," the mutual assistance appropriation bill, on which we are awaiting the action of the legislative committee, and the final deficiency appropriation bill. All of the annual supply bills are far in advance of the general appropriation bills in any Congress since the Congress of 1950, when we submitted them in a one-package bill and when we were far in advance of previous records. And what was more important, saved more money than had ever been saved relatively before or since.

Another feature of our appropriation bills this year is that all of them, with the exception of one bill, are below the budget estimates. In past years we have always taken pride, and the efficiency of a subcommittee chairman was always judged by the amount he cut the estimates.

However, that appears to be no particular cause for self congratulation this time for we also find that all but 2 of these 12 bills are above the appropriation for the current year. Of course, that is the real criterion of economy. Not a comparison with the budget estimates but a comparison with same for the current fiscal year.

And as further cause for regret—and directly connected with our failure to cut below current expenditures—I am sorry to have to report that in these bills we break another record in that we have made fewer cuts and saved less money—a smaller percentage—in these 12 appropriation bills, than has ever been saved on similar bills in recent years—as a matter of fact—since I can remember. It is a real record but one of which we can hardly be proud. The total amount we have actually saved on the bills that have been submitted to the House and an estimate on the remaining three bills aggregates less than half a billion dollars. Out of a budget of more than $50 billions we have saved only half a billion dollars, the lowest retrenchment for many years.

We have in fact been able to reduce the budget only a little more than 1 percent of all of the more than $50 billions which have passed through our hands, and that is all the more impressive in view of the fact that the budget this year is the loosest budget, it is the largest peacetime budget ever submitted to Congress by any administration in the history of the United States.

I noticed in one of the leading editorials in this morning's Washington Post a very interesting comment on this situation in which they make this statement:

> The Federal budget will be in balance when the fiscal year ends June 30.

It is in balance for the first time in the last 5 years and for the fourth time since the Hoover depression.

The editorial then goes on to say:

> This is a notable achievement for which the administration deserves much credit. It has taken a herculean effort to bring the budget into balance.

I regret I have to dissent from both those statements, because this budget has not been brought into balance by any act of economy on the part of the administration at all. This administration has been spending, and is now spending more money than ever spent by any administration in time of peace.

And the editorial contradicts itself in the next paragraph when it says:

> Government expenditures have been increasing in the last year.

That is true, and Government expenditures have been increasing in the last year.

It further says:

> In January expenditures were estimated in advance at $64.3 billion; now the estimate is $65.9 billion.

They have not only spent more money than has ever been spent before, but they are spending it at a progressive ratio. They are spending more than they expected to spend last January.

This expenditure has been in the face of the fact that we have had the largest revenues in our history. The revenues this year have been in excess of the revenues of any previous year in the peacetime history of the United States or in the history of any other country in the annals of time. That is what has balanced the budget. It is not economy. It is not a decrease in expenditures. It is through no effort on the part of the administration. It is solely due to the unexpected increase in revenues.

That increase in revenues is due to the increase in population and to the great prosperity of business and I am willing to make any concession on that count to the administration. But the glamor of that prosperity is dimmed by the destitution of the American farmer, the hardest workers and most indispensable class in America today.

If the farmer had his old time purchasing power, if he had the money he has honestly earned but not received, they would be recruiting more labor in Detroit instead of slowing production and discharging workmen. Every farmer in America needs a new car—and needs new buildings on his farm. The slowdown which has overtaken the automobile industry and the housing industry and is already spreading to national industry generally is due to this administration. No nation can live and prosper half bloated and half busted.

The high revenues which have balanced the budget are temporary. These money trees cannot bloom indefinitely, the few at the top enriched at the expense of the farmer at the bottom. And the policy of the administration in increasing expenditure when they should be retrenching and in increasing its budget simply because more money is coming in is heading toward a day of reckoning.

The administration has not contributed a dollar's worth of economy or retrenchment to the balancing of the budget. The truth is that whereas the surplus by which the budget will be balanced the 30th of June next is $1,800 million it should have been balanced by billions of dollars that are being sunk without a trace.

And the Congress has been of no help whatever in that respect. Congress is not cutting the budget estimates. Congress is not economizing on its own account. And this bill is an example.

As we witness the stampede across the adjoining corridor to the Committee on Appropriations and listen to the demands recorded in these voluminous hearings for millions of dollars for States and districts, we like to remember that day in 1792 when Washington rode horseback from Mount Vernon to this Hill to select the location of the Capitol Building. It was perhaps a junketing trip but he paid his own expenses. And when the blueprints were being drawn Thomas Jefferson came to this Hill and said to the architect "I want to give something to the United States. I want to give something for this Capitol Building. And the Architect said Mr. Jefferson here in the foyer at the front entrance are six stone columns. You can give those if you wish. And Jefferson out of his slender purse gave the six columns which you see today as you enter through that foyer. Washington refused to accept pay as President. Franklin refused to accept money due him. Many patriots of that day contributed whenever possible and as much as possible to this wonderful new Government—this Government of free men. Even in our

day Herbert Hoover refused to accept pay as President.

They wanted to give something to the United States.

Today everybody seems to be trying to get all they can out of the United States. And they beleaguer the Committee on Appropriations like packs of wolves.

Here we have a bill giving something to everybody. And I voted for it. A year ago we thought we had a very reasonable bill. I collaborated with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the committee reported out a bill we thought was liberal.

But the boys held a little caucus over in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building. Both sides of the aisle got together and they agreed "You scratch my back and I'll scratch your back," and they came over here and ran over us like a bunch of wild steers. You know, 2 or 3 experiences are enough. So I am going to "jine 'em." I am going to vote with them today. Let us make this bill so bad that the people will finally take note.

But I seriously doubt whether that can ever be accomplished now that the tiger has his taste of blood. What we really need is a complete revamping of the budgetary laws of the Nation which will protect Congressmen from themselves. It can be done but I doubt whether the professional spenders will ever permit it to be done.

It is more serious than we realize and it is becoming more serious every year. When men organize and gang up on the committee and the Treasury they confess the poverty of their cause. If their project had any merit it would not be necessary to trade and traffic.

We do not inveigh against any man in this House, or any man to be in this House in the future, for coming before the Committee on Appropriations and requesting an appropriation for a project in his district. That is what he is here for. He is merely performing his duty to his constituents who send him here. But I do say the rest of us ought to consider every application made by everybody from every district and say, "Now, my boy, you are on the right track, but let us be a little reasonable. We are going to have to cut you down a little bit to serve the whole country and put what little taxes are paid in where it will best benefit the most people."

Now, in this connection, may I refer to another article in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. This article is about and by the Vice President of the United States, Vice President NIXON, for whose philosophy all of us on this side have the highest regard. Here is what Vice President NIXON said; and I want to commend it to the Members of this House and the Members of the other House and to the people of the United States as words of the soundest wisdom in this time of great national peril. The Communists have more planes than we have. They have better planes than we have. They are making them faster than we are. If anybody has any doubt about what would happen to this country if one of those hydrogen bombs exploded in the Pacific a couple of days ago should strike this city, he is certainly a man with little perspective or imagination. One bomb would wipe out this Government right now, and destroy the District of Columbia and parts of Maryland and Virginia with it.

Here is what the Vice President said:

> The Communists have said over and over again that they may not have to defeat the United States and the western nations in war; that they may be able to force us to destroy ourselves from within in our efforts to defend ourselves from without, that they may force us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

But I want you to remember, Mr. Chairman, that when that time comes, when Russian planes are bombing every major city in the United States what comfort it will be to remember that in our home districts great expenditures of money have gilded forgotten rivers and therby made Congressmen famous for life.

In this bill, we have something for everybody; we have something for every section in the United States, and the appropriations that are made in this bill are but the beginnings, the entering wedges, which will cause this bill to cost us increasingly more every year until the bulk of the projects are completed. Bills like this are increasing inflation.

Here is a tabulation showing that the dollar in 1939 was worth 101 pennies; it would buy one dollar and one cent's worth of commodities. I do not have to tell you that it will buy today a little bit less than 52 cents worth. So while we are watching this great prosperity, these big dividends, these high wages remember that you must cut them all in two; the country is just half as prosperous as it looks, and the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow is getting half the wages he is supposed to get and you have only half of what you had a few years ago. That has been brought about through this kind of spending.

Oh, there is many a gentleman here who has life insurance in multiples of $10,000. You think you have $10,000 worth of insurance; when you check out your family will be taken care of. But do you know that you have lost money on that insurance policy you bought back in 1939 or at a later date. It is worth only half as much as you paid for it, and when you check out and your administrator settles your estate your widow and children get half as much as you thought they would get. That is due to the character of bill we are passing here today.

But let us turn to another section of the bill and take up the provision for TVA. TVA is the greatest engineering project ever successfully projected by any people in the annals of the human race. In its effect upon the American people and upon our wealth and prosperity and upon the world, the Tennessee Valley Authority is the greatest achievement of modern civilization. Practically every visitor from abroad before he returns to his own country wants to visit the TVA development. If it had not been for TVA you would not have the atomic bomb. If it had not been for TVA we would not have been able to extract the aluminum necessary for the wings of our planes. When in the last world war we squared off to take Tokyo, when the Japs at last were fighting with their backs to the wall on their own hearthstone, when the expenditure of thousands of boys and billions of dollars seemed inevitable, one bomb from TVA delivered by one plane, the wings of which were made from aluminum made possible by TVA, ended the war with complete victory for America.

There are hundreds of thousands of young men walking the streets of our cities today who would not be here had it not been for TVA.

And yet there is a sinister group in this country today who want to destroy TVA, who want to destroy REA, who want to destroy municipal ownership. Why? Solely because they want to put more money in their already bulging pockets and thereby deprive the people of the country of a reasonable price for power. That includes the farm women, the farm mothers, in areas that would not have this advantage but for the public power policy which this group is trying to destroy.

TVA does not take a single customer away from private industry, it does not duplicate any service rendered by private industry, it does not cut the income or the profits of private industry because due to TVA all of them are making more money today than they ever made before and the records will show that.

Mr. Chairman, let us take, for example, page 2 of the report, referring specifically to the last paragraph on that page. Here, Mr. Chairman, the committee recites the immediate situation just as it is. I want to say emphatically at this time, and with the concurrence, I am certain, of the majority of the committee, that this is in no way intended and shall not be construed to limit in any way the authority and the responsibility of the TVA to meet the needs of the TVA service area nor to require any payment in excess of that required by law.

Here is the interesting thing about TVA. It is a source of profit to the Government. The Government has not lost a penny on it, the Government has not given it anything. Every cent is being paid back with interest. It is to be amortized by 40 annual payments. It has made every one of these payments up to this time and is in advance of the requirements. The Government does not lose a penny on it.

The budget estimate came to us with a decrease in appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority of $21,696,000 below what we spent there for the current year, but they returned to the Federal Treasury this year $186,500,000.

The same can be said about the Department of the Interior and the Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administrations. They also are being amortized by annual payments with interest. They also are cut down by this budget. Southeastern is cut $1,978,000. But the revenues from its sales are in excess of $15 million. It is a profitable investment for the United States, and nobody loses a cent. They pay their own way.

The same thing is true of the Southwestern Power Administration. The budget cut their appropriation $1 million. They received only 80 percent of what they had in this bill last year, although it was a paying concern and their revenues are estimated at $12,575,000 for the fiscal year 1957.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I again find myself in a role which I very much dislike. I do not enjoy the responsibility of being a critic with respect to this bill which I have felt to be my responsibility in the course of the past 2 years. But, I do believe that it is a role that must be fulfilled and a role that the public interest requires.

Mr. Chairman, I am not happy with the bill which is before us. I can share in the criticisms that were voiced of it by the chairman of the full committee who just preceded me. But, I can say very sincerely that I do not believe that this is a decent or honorable appropriation bill and I say that meaning no disrespect whatsoever to the members of the subcommittee, for certainly there are members of that group for whom I have the greatest respect, and in whom I have the greatest confidence. But, I do think that anyone who will attempt in an objective manner to examine this bill will find that it is a hodgepodge as it stands today. It was not a good, well-rounded proposal when it came to the committee in the first place, and it has grown worse in its stages as it has progressed through the committee and come here to the floor of the House.

I think that we can start right at the beginning or the intiation of this proposal and say that in my opinion the Bureau of the Budget submitted a much too expansive program in view of all the circumstances that confront the country today.

Over the years, this bill has had its ups and downs. We have not had a regular, stable program of appropriations for this public-works program. There have been some pretty good reasons for that. During World War II the program was brought almost to a halt. We came from that and just resumed the program again, and then came the Korean war and again the program was greatly cut back. But now the time has come when many people feel that we are in a position to go forward with a rather expansive program. But, as I see it, the submitted program was too expansive in view of the other competing programs of the Federal Government at this time. These programs are looking for the same dollars, the same manpower, and the same materials that are necessary in this public-works program. Right now the subcommitttee on defense appropriations, for instance, is considering a military construction program in excess of $2 billion in the fiscal year that covers the same period as this bill does.

This House has passed and the Senate is now reaching the final stages of action on a long-term expanded highway program. Both of those bills, the military construction bill and the highway program, have been given a position of priority by both the executive and legislative branches of this Government, overall, that is probably higher than that of the program we now have before us.

The Corps of Engineers came before us in the course of the hearings, and aside from these two programs, the highway program and the military construction program, complained, I think with justification, about their inability properly to handle the appropriation which Congress made for the public-works program last year. They are short of engineers; they are short of general overall supervisory personnel to do the job that was foisted upon them by the Congress in the appropriation bill last year, in the manner which the chairman of the full committee has described.

So we are here today to provide the money, but I do not think we are providing the means, for properly executing, carrying out, the program for which funds are included in this bill.

When the bill came to the consideration of the subcommittee of 15 that handled the hearings, there were a number of additions made. There was no formula by which the additions were made. We sat down early in the consideration of the bill and worked out a few basic ground rules, but I must say in all candor that those rules were honored much more in their breach than they were in their observance in the course of the markup of the bill. But not all the blame rests on the members of the subcommittee in that respect, either. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] who has worked so often with this bill in the past—for 6 years at least I have had the pleasure of working with him on it—I think it is fair to say just threw up his hands when we found time and time again, where we had written evidence that individual Members of Congress had been told by representatives of the Corps of Engineers that really for economical construction they ought to have more money than had been approved for them by the Bureau of the Budget. That put the subcommittee on the defensive and in a most embarrassing position from the start in attempting to act in accordance with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

That was not confined to the Corps of Engineers. There is at least one instance, when we were trying to pay some adherence to what the Bureau of the Budget, the President's financial right arm, had recommended, where testimony was read into the record that somebody from the White House told a Member of Congress, "Well, this has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but if you see fit to put it in, we won't object to it."

So the responsibility for what has happened here will have to fall probably more in terms of lack of leadership on some people in the executive department, at least as much as it would on the committee which had the job of handling this bill. If we had had the kind of backing from the executive department that we should have had, things might have been different. This is a difficult enough job with all the help we can get from the executive department. But as I said, we really did not have that backing that we should have had this year. I suppose that strong leadership in the committee could have overcome some of those difficulties. But here we were in a position where we had unsatisfactory testimony in many cases but a desire on the part of many members of the subcommittee to put in projects which had not been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. So we have that kind of a bill here today. The bill may not exceed the dollar amount of the budget this year but actually the reductions that have been made, at least in the Corps of Engineers part, do not represent any cut in the overall program. Mostly they represent the picking up of unobligated or unused funds in the past.

In contrast to that, we do have great commitments of money in the years that are ahead. For instance, you will find some additions in construction money in projects that total this year between $5 and $6 million, but they represent something over $300 million in terms of commitments of dollars in the year ahead. There is about $800,000 for increases in planning, and that represents commitments of well over $150 million in the years ahead.

There was one transfer of $180,000 from planning in order to get complete evaluation of a project so the committee could know what it was doing in the future. That has been transferred to construction. That is $49 million to which we are committed without the proper backup information.

In the full committee there was an addition of construction money for 2 projects, totaling less than $200 million in those 2, but they represent the beginning of navigation on a large waterway the estimated cost of which at this date is well over $1.2 billion. So we have continued to develop a program which represents huge commitments in terms of next year's appropriations and the years after that. That is without the funds for investigation and survey which have been added, which are the first step in getting us committed to millions of dollars in the years ahead. We have no way of knowing what the total amount of commitments will be for those additional funds for investigation and survey.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has made two excellent points here, insofar as I see, in what he has had to say. From what was said in the first portion of his remarks it appeared to me that he was emphasizing that there are many other public projects being undertaken by various agencies of the Government which compete for the money and the manpower and all the rest that goes with it. I refer to page 1 and the top of page 2 of the report:

> These funds are allocated to 300 projects with a total estimated Federal cost of approximately $12 billion.

I take it that is the projected-ahead figure of all of these figures that are

under consideration in this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would say that that would be those for which there are funds for planning or construction, because there is no way of estimating the commitments involved or the total estimated Federal cost of projects which are included just for investigation and survey.

Mr. SPRINGER. My question is this: With the highway program, with this $2 billion which he has said is being undertaken by the armed services and some other agencies, is it the feeling of the gentleman that many of these projects could be undertaken more economically at other times?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is my feeling—that we are impinging upon programs which have greater urgency and greater priority in the national interest than many of these which are included in this appropriation.

Mr. SPRINGER. My second question refers to page 8 of the report, at the top of the page, the first paragraph in this statement:

> The committee has again reduced the operation and maintenance estimate in an effort to force some action on the part of the Bureau to turn the operation and maintenance of irrigation projects over to the local interests. Lethargy on the part of the Bureau and the failure of irrigation districts to promptly assume their responsibilities with respect to completed projects continues to be of principal concern to the committee. Until some evidence is given of a change in the attitudes existing with respect to this problem, the committee has no other alternative than to reduce the amount of funds requested for operation and maintenance.

I take it from what the gentleman said there that there is a lack of interest here on the part of both the Bureau and local interests which are supposed to supervise these irrigation projects. Is that true?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think to some extent that might be true. It is a very natural situation where the local interests do not want to take over that responsibility any sooner than someone requires them to do it, and as long as the Bureau of Reclamation has funds with which to carry on the operation it will not have the incentive to put the pressure on in order to get it turned over to the local interests.

Mr. SPRINGER. The effort of the committee is to exert pressure on the local interests to take the responsibility for these projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. My second question is: Is that provided by law? I am not familiar enough with that to know. Does the legislation so provide that it shall be assumed by the local interest that recommended the project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the general reclamation law; yes. That language refers to the Bureau of Reclamation, when a project is completed.

Mr. SPRINGER. At that point the local interest is supposed to assume the responsibility? Does that mean that they are supposed to assume the financial responsibility as well?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They have contracts for repayment with the Government; yes.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. I ask the gentleman to refer to page 11 of the committee report referring to the area for Indiana. I notice there is no inclusion of the upper Wabash River Valley flood-control program. I would like to know whether or not this was reported to your committee by the Committee on Public Works or the Bureau of the Budget and why it is not included or was there any discussion of it within the committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The only way I can answer that is to say it was not brought before the committee for its consideration this year. I do not know what overall status of that project might be. But, the Bureau of the Budget did not submit it to our committee for consideration in connection with this year's appropriation.

Mr. BEAMER. I might explain that I think the Army engineers have placed it in class B, which I understand has their approval and there are certain things that have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget although the Army engineers have informed me that they have been pushing the Bureau of the Budget for approval. Do I understand that then it goes to the Committee on Public Works for approval before it goes to your subcommittee or your committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I could not answer that without knowing what stage the project is in.

Mr. BEAMER. I am asking the question because as the gentleman will note in volume 2 of the hearings, I appeared along with other Members, and together with members of the Indiana Flood Control Water Resources Commission on behalf of this particular program. The gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN] appeared on behalf of the Mansfield Dam which is included. Of course, this other program is a $43½ million program which entails the construction of three very large dams. But I wonder whether or not the gentleman or any member of the committee or the staff could probably inform me as to the status of that particular program at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not in a position to inform the gentleman. I do not know if any of the other members of the committee have any up-to-date information on that. You understand, of course, in addition to this $12 million that is mentioned here, included in this program there is a huge backlog of billions of dollars of other projects in various stages of examination or survey or planning, or some huge backlog of projects for which the planning has been completed and which are awaiting construction. It amounts to several billions of dollars. And I do not know at what particular stage this project might be.

Mr. BEAMER. I would like to explain that I have received a letter from the Army engineers indicating that there are 37 of these projects which they have classed as class A. I think most of them are probably in your recommendations for appropriations. However, they also said they have 43 projects of varying sizes that are in what they consider class B that have been approved by the Army engineers, but which have not yet received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. I believe the Wabash River flood-control project, which is part of the Ohio River Valley program, is in that. I can secure the information, I think, probably from other Members.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If it has a favorable benefit to cost ratio, I assume it will be brought before the committee next year or some year soon.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is that the project on the Wabash River Basin?

Mr. BEAMER. That is right.

Mr. TABER. Above the White River? There is $20,000 in this bill for a general investigation.

Mr. BEAMER. No; there is another one. This is the upper Wabash including the Peru, the Mississinewa, and the Salamonie River dams.

Mr. TABER. Then this is not that one.

Mr. BEAMER. This is a $43½ million proposal. You may not have reached that.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if it is authorized by law. Maybe it would have to go to the Committee on Public Works first.

Mr. BEAMER. That may be the explanation. It may not have been authorized by the Committee on Public Works. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], made his statement, he indicated that he placed everything in the bill that anyone had wanted almost, and that he was going to vote for all the others that might be presented. I am concerned about not seeing the 230 TV transmission line, Fort Randall, Grand Island, Nebr., in the bill. It was approved by the President and the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department. That does not quite jibe with the statement the chairman made that they had placed everything in the bill that everyone had asked for. The Bureau of the Budget had asked for it. Can the gentleman tell me what happened to the budget request for funds for Fort Randall?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the chairman was speaking in general terms when he said there was everything in this bill. I think in general terms that his was an understatement. With respect to this specific project, all I can tell the gentleman is that it was considered by the subcommittee and a majority of the members felt that there was a question about the use of Federal funds to provide transmission lines for a purely public power facility.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department, and ap-

parently the subcommittee in their wisdom saw fit not to include it and recommend it to the full committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I expect to offer an amendment later on to restore the amount and will have some additional remarks at that time on that section of the bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I wish to commend the committee for the recognition that has been given to the improvement of the Delaware River Valley, by an appropriation of $6 million contained in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would say that the gentleman should not feel that there is anything unique about that sort of recognition in this particular appropriation bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I realize it is something the committee should be commended for.

The Delaware River Valley is the fastest growing area in the United States from an industrial and population standpoint. It is therefore gratifying to realize that the Appropriations Committee has recognized its importance by providing an appropriation of $6 million to commence deepening the Delaware River from the Camden-Philadelphia area to Trenton, N. J.

The Delaware River has become one of the principal arteries of commerce in the entire country. Its shores on both the New Jersey and Pennsylvania sides of the river are lined with numerous and varied industries. Many of them are known throughout the world by their products. Plans are already made for additional industries to be located on either side of the river.

A United States Army engineer's report, in recognizing the importance of the Delaware River as a means of facilitating waterborne commerce, has said:

> The area tributary to the Delaware contributed the products of agriculture, mining, and a widely diversified field of processing and manufacturing industries. The local area is almost entirely industrial. It contains numerous manufacturing and processing plants that are of national importance in the character and volume of their products. In addition, a great number of smaller industries contribute a large volume and diversity of commodities.

It is astounding to realize the magnitude of the number and capacity of the manufacturing plants that are located along the shores of the Delaware River, and that utilize this waterway. There are more than 8,600 different manufacturing plants, most of which are located in the highly industrialized cities of Wilmington, Del., Camden and Trenton, N. J., and Philadelphia, Chester, and Bristol, Pa.

Deep water all the way to Trenton will make available to industry upward of 60 miles of shoreline that can be utilized for a tremendous industrialization in the Delaware River Valley. Without the deepening of the river channel there can be no such development as is now planned. Already, with the mere prospect that the river channel was to be deepened, great industries have taken options on land on either side of the river and plan to build immense plants that will give employment to thousands of workers.

The present channel is inadequate. It is not of sufficient depth to properly serve the industries that are already located in the upper Delaware Valley, and, until assurance is given that there will be increased depths, we cannot expect that there will be any great additional industrial expansion beyond what already exists.

As an illustration of what can be expected in the way of growth, the National Gypsum Co. is planning a multimillion-dollar plant in the Burlington, N. J., area, where it will manufacture building products for this area of the country. The company selected the Delaware River site because of the advantages the river, at a proper depth, provides for the transportation of the great quantities of raw material that are necessary in the conduct of the business of the company.

And, on the Pennsylvania side of the river is the beginning of what when completed will be the largest steel mill in the world. Already the Fairless Works of the United States Steel Co., in which has been invested $500 million, is capable of producing 2,200,000 tons of steel per year. Present plans call for the expansion of this plant to double its present capacity. If present plans are carried out, it may be expanded to produce 10 million tons per year. To accomplish this will require great quantities of raw material to be delivered in large seagoing vessels that will require a deep channel. When we consider the value of such a plant to our country in a time of emergency, we certainly should not refrain from providing a river channel deep enough to enable it to operate at its greatest capacity and with the greatest efficiency.

Illustrations of the need of a deeper channel to enable large oil tankers and other vessels of deep draft to use the upper Delaware could be given in great number and variety. At the present time in many instances it is necessary to transfer the cargoes of these larger ships to barges to enable the delivery of such to industries located on the upper Delaware. It can be readily seen that this is an impediment to commerce and deters industries from locating in the area not served by a channel of sufficient depth to permit oceangoing vessels to deliver their cargoes.

The commercial expansion that is taking place along the Delaware River is evident from the figures contained in the official records of the United States Corps of Engineers. Their records show that there has been a 41-percent increase in cargo tonnage from the year 1952 to the year 1954—latest year available—for the Delaware River between Philadelphia-Camden and Trenton. The tonnage for 1952 was 6,949,933; the figure for 1954 was 9,828,355 tons. Not only is this a substantial gain, but the indications are it will continue and become greater with an assurance upon the part of the Government to proceed with the deepening of the river. The above figures are all the more significant when it is realized that during the same period both the ports of New York and Baltimore suffered a decline in cargo tonnage.

In this connection it is also well to realize the extent to which a deep waterway increases tonnage. For instance, the tonnage on the lower Delaware between Philadelphia and the sea is six times greater than that on the river above Philadelphia to Trenton. And, of course, it is easy to understand that the lesser volume on the upper Delaware is the direct result of the insufficiency of water depth in the upper Delaware. Therefore, the necessity of increasing the channel depth on that portion of the river is apparent.

If time permitted, it would be appropriate and beneficial to consider the extent of the improvements and expansion in industry that is taking place all along the shores of the upper Delaware, both on the New Jersey side and the Pennsylvania side of the river. Suffice it to say that the Federal Reserve bank has issued statistics showing that manufacturing industries in the Philadelphia-Camden area plan to spend $228 million for plant expansion and modernization of equipment during 1956.

It would also be instructive, as well as interesting, to study the advantages that have come to our country where there has been development of deeper waterways. The particular areas where such have taken place give unmistakable evidence of the wisdom from an economic standpoint of the expenditure of Government funds in the development and improvement of our rivers and harbors.

I can predict with assurrance, and no fear that the future would show otherwise, that the expenditure of the $6 million in the present bill as a starter and following it the full amount to complete the deepening of the Delaware River will show results of increased income to the Federal Treasury from the business expansion that will follow, as to make it one of the best investments the Federal Government has ever made. I ask that favorable action be taken on the pending bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I rise to ask the gentleman a question which affects my district. I am asking this question because I have discussed it with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], chairman of the subcommittee, and others, to get information. On page 175 of the civil functions hearings, it shows under the heading of "Ohio" a tentative allocation of $27,500 for survey work by the Army engineers in the matter of Mad River Hoffman Dam. Then, on page 5 of the bill, there is a general appropriation for this kind of work, a lump-sum appropriation; and on page 9 of the report these appropriations for general investigation work are referred to again. Can the gentleman tell me if the $27,500 for that survey is still in the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], who is perhaps more familiar with it.

Mr. RABAUT. The Mad River Hoffman Dam is in the bill, $27,500.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is in that general estimate?

Mr. RABAUT. That amount will complete the study, as the gentleman has referred to, and that is the proper place, page 175 of the hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Under your itemization of projects in California you have an item "Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors, $485,000 for construction." Is that reimbursement to the city for dredging the east basin, or is that for the removal of the bridge on the west basin?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My recollection is that that is the bridge, but I would like to ask the clerk of our subcommittee if that is correct. Is that for the bridges at Los Angeles and Long Beach?

Mr. RABAUT. We did not get the question.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The question is that under California, Los Angeles, Long Beach Harbor, there is the figure $485,000. It does not state whether it is for the dredging of the east basin or the removal of the bridge on the west basin. There are two projects there. We would like to know which this is for.

Mr. RABAUT. It is for reimbursement for dredging, and the bridge item is $245,000.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I notice a statement about it on page 17 of the report: Removal of West Basin Bridge, California, and the statement that the Federal Government will assume 90 percent of the cost of the removal of the bridge. Is that 90 percent of the cost represented in the $485,000 under the California itemization? There are two items and I am trying to ascertain which this represents.

Mr. RABAUT. The total amount of $245,000 is carried as an item for the removal of the bridge.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And the $485,000 is for reimbursement of the city for dredging the east basin?

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There are two items listed there; that is correct.

Mr. Chairman, if I may resume for a couple of minutes, I think this bill will put us in the same position with respect to this program as we are in during the current year, and that is that there simply will not be the required supervisory personnel to do the kind of job Congress expects to be done in the handling of a public works program of this size and scope. I do not think the Corps of Engineers have the skilled personnel or perhaps the necessary funds under general expenses to handle a program which has been expanded much beyond what was contemplated at the time it was submitted to the committee.

I have no illusions about this bill. Even though I feel that there are many items in it that should not be in it, I know that any effort to cut them out on the floor of the House would be unsuccessful; in fact, I think most of the members of the committee are on rather poor moral grounds in denying anyone the inclusion of his particular project because he can point to projects in the bill which are of less justification than most of those which could be offered from the floor.

I think the problem will be to hold the line to the present figures rather than attempt to reduce those figures.

I do not propose to get into any argument of philosophy with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I think that Congress is entitled to be assured that there are no duplication of facilities between the TVA and other Federal agencies. I think Congress is entitled to retain supervisory financial control over this or any other agency of the Federal Government so that we do not let them run wild in the use of funds which rightfully belong to the people of the United States. I think the same statement applies to any of the other agencies that are included in the scope of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed 23 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

REMARKS IN COMMITTEE OF WHOLE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], for the manner in which he handled this bill in committee. I want to express the gratitude of the people of the New England area for the cooperation the subcommittee has given to the matter of flood control for that locality.

This public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957 gives a total of some $18 million for the New England area. This amount, coupled with more than $2 million appropriated in the urgent deficiency bill last February, brings that total for the calendar year to more than $20 million. This figure represents the largest amount ever appropriated in any one calendar year for flood control in New England. The cost of the authorized projects for flood control in New England total some $351 million. Since 1936 the Federal Government has expended about $70 million on these projects. The appropriation and expenditure this year of $20 million is greater than any amount appropriated in any 1 year for the New England area. Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to have some responsibility for this action. As a member of the Public Works Subcommittee, I listened to the testimony of the Corps of Engineers and all other witnesses concerning adequate flood protection in New England and the North Atlantic States.

When the devastating floods of August and October 1955 struck New England, I saw at first hand the havoc that was wrought. I visited all of the communities in western Massachusetts and in northern Connecticut to view the terrible destruction to property. As I recall, there were some 135 lives lost.

The Congress some years ago declared it to be a national policy to give assistance to areas that have experienced the ravages of torrential rains and unleashed waters from small streams and large rivers. On that basis, a general overall flood-control program was established for New England. Due to World War II and the Korean conflict, progress has been agonizingly slow. We are now in a position where this program can and must be accelerated. The action that the Public Works Subcommittee has taken insures that acceleration. When Major General Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers, and Brigadier General Fleming, chief of the New England division, appeared before my subcommittee, I questioned them on the amount of money that could be reasonably used in fiscal 1957. Their reply was that the funds requested, plus some additions, would be all that could be reasonably used and which would tax the capabilities of the New England division to the utmost. This bill provides the necessary amounts plus the additions.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

Since the Connecticut River flows through my district, I have a keen interest in adequate flood-control protection for the Connecticut River Basin. I am satisfied that the Corps of Engineers is now on its way in providing that program. This bill carries moneys for construction on the Barre Falls, Otter Brook, Ball Mountain, North Hartland, North Springfield, and Townshend Reservoirs. These are all on the Connecticut River Basin. The Corps of Engineers has testified that planning and construction on these reservoirs is all that it could handle during fiscal 1957. These projects greatly accelerate completion of the program designed to give adequate flood protection to the Connecticut River Basin. It is my hope that for fiscal 1958 recommendations will be made for appropriations for additional reservoirs so that the program will be completed.

This bill carries an additional $400,000 for hurricane studies. It also includes an additional $100,000 for planning for West Hill Reservoir; an additional $400,000 for flood protection in Woonsocket, R. I.; $640,000 for the Thomaston Reservoir in the Naugatuck River in Connecticut; $500,000 additional for the East Brimfield Reservoir on the Quinnebaug River. The Subcommittee on Public Works, in its wisdom, added these amounts when the bill was marked up.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat the gratitude that the New England delegation and the inhabitants of the locality have for the treatment accorded us. Damages caused by last year's floods in New England were the greatest in the history of this Nation, totaling $700,000 million. Our area has come a long way in rehabilitating itself. This has been done by the cooperation of Federal, State, and local authorities. Particularly do I single out the Corps of Engineers and specifically the New England division for the magnificent job it accomplished.

This committee, like all other committees of the Congress, has a very heavy responsibility. This is one place where money can be saved. There is no ques-

tion but that there is a considerable waste of money involved in many of the projects that have been recommended and undertaken by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

This is particularly so in reference to navigation projects. I have some very firm convictions on moneys that are spent on navigation projects. It would seem to me this Congress and the Bureau of the Budget as well as the Corps of Engineers are getting pretty far afield in the matter of recommending navigation projects for every single tributary and river in the United States. I have no difficulty at all with navigation on the main stems, the Mississippi, the Tennessee, the Missouri, the Ohio, and other of the great rivers of the Nation. But I do have some difficulty in justifying certain navigation projects on the smaller rivers of this Nation.

It would seem to me that when the original framers of the Constitution sat down and wrote into the Constitution the commerce clause they did not intend that navigation be on every single waterway as this Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Corps of Engineers seem to indicate. There ought to be a reappraisal by the Corps of Engineers; there ought to be a reappraisal by the Bureau of the Budget in the matter of navigation projects, for the cost of navigation projects is paid by all of the taxpayers all over the United States. I have no difficulty with the flood-control projects. Those projects are also paid for by all the people all over the Nation. Where there is the question of the saving of lives, where there is the question of the protection of property, in my opinion, that money is justified for all of those projects that have anything to do with flood control. I have gone along with them, and I have gone along, too, with navigation projects that are feasible.

Let me say that I echo some of the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. He is and has been, at least from the time I have been here, for 4 years, the voice of conscience so far as this public works bill is concerned. The Congress needs a voice of conscience in matters of this kind. If we provided all of the money for projects that have been recommended or authorized by the Public Works Committee, the expenditure would run to some $7 billion. There ought to be a reappraisal on some of the projects that have been authorized.

Mr. Chairman, this is a committee where you do not win friends and influence people. You lose friends and disrupt people. But it is a job that has to be done. It is a job that some do not like, but it is a job that Members of Congress have to do.

Again I express my gratitude to the chairman for the way he handled the committee and also to the other committee members.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, only the fear of a national catastrophe impels me to take the time of the committee and my colleagues of the House to discuss one item in this appropriation bill. I refer to the Sutton Reservoir on the Elk River in West Virginia. This was first authorized by the Congress in 1941. Initiated in 1946, it was temporarily halted in 1950 due to the Korean war emergency. It was revived again last year with an appropriation of $1,300,000. The present item in the budget calls for $4,500,000.

Let me give you just a little reason why I personally as a Member of this Congress and as a Representative of that district in the Congress of the United States do not want to take the responsibility for what might happen. I remind you that during World War II the Government built two huge gas lines from the Southwest.

It just so happens that in the valley of the Elk River just below this reservoir are located two of the world's greatest natural-gas compressor stations. One belongs to the Hope Gas Co., and the other one belongs to the United Fuel Gas Co. Are you aware of the fact that compressor station belonging to the Hope Gas Co. has a capacity of 17,000 horsepower? It handles 335 million cubic feet of gas each day. The other station handles approximately 235 million cubic feet of gas each day. After the Government sold those pipelines to private industry, they extended gas lines to Richmond, Washington, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and to western New York. They have over 18 million domestic consumers using gas that passes through that one station. The other station has 4.5 million domestic consumers, it has 181 industrial consumers, and it supplies gas to 61 other gas companies for retail to the public and an additional 10 million consumers. So, if a flood accident should happen in this valley, which has happened several times in the last 30 years, enough to damage the John Cornwell station of the Hope Gas Co. $3.1 million since the station was built, and you let another flood catastrophe hit that valley and find this storage dam not constructed, you are going to cut off the fuel supply of more than one-fourth of the people of this country. Think of it, gentlemen. I know you, as Members of this Congress, do not want to take that responsibility. I certainly do not want to take the responsibility of letting that situation longer exist in the district.

It was good business that you add $2.2 million, to the $4.5 million which the Bureau of the Budget cleared for that project, for this simple reason, that the contractors who were prepared to bid on it would have to bid $2 million more for the project if there was not enough money to carry on the operation for a full year. They do not want it closed down for 4 months. It is a good business proposition. I am at a loss why the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, being businessmen as they are, could not see the business advantage involved in this proposition.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee at this time as to why you did not put this item in here. No I am not going to inquire into your reasons. I want to ask you just one thing. If the Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget clear a supplemental item for consideration in the first supplemental appropriation bill, I want to know what the attitude of the committee is going to be. I can better govern my action here today if I can get an answer on that.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, naturally, if it was put in by the Bureau of the Budget, we would have to consider it.

Mr. BAILEY. Could I hope that it would have favorable consideration?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, it would have to have the consideration of the committee. I can talk for myself only. I certainly would look with favor on a budget item in a supplemental bill which showed necessity for the project in that connection. I cannot speak for the whole committee. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. BAILEY. May I inquire of the ranking minority member? In case the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget clear a supplemental request to be handled in the first supplemental bill, will the committee look with favor on an item of the kind I have been talking about?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Well, I could not make any commitment of that kind. And, besides, as far as I personally am concerned, I would have to judge the project by the information that was furnished to the committee and by the witnesses that came before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, when the Congressman representing the First District of Kansas takes the floor in debate on the public works appropriation bill, I think probably every Member knows that he is going to refer to the project that has been turbulent in the First District of Kansas for some 15 years now, more commonly known as the Tuttle Creek Reservoir. My position in regard to the construction of Tuttle Creek is the same as it has been ever since its original authorization in 1938.

From a realistic point of view, however, since Congress in its wisdom decided to make a further appropriation in the first session in 1955 and since the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to include $9 million in the bill before us today, I am not extremely optimistic of deleting that item. However, I do say, to make my position clear, that I am going to offer such an amendment later today.

I do not want to use the few minutes I have been given here today to discuss the merits of Tuttle Creek Reservoir. However, I should like to point out to the Congress some gross injustices that result to displaced persons when a Federal project is built. I am not blaming the Corps of Engineers for these injustices because they work only at the directive of the Congress. I wonder how many Members on the floor today who are attorneys know, if they happen to reside in one of these reservoir areas and the land is condemned, and they are

completely displaced, moved clear away, that they are given no reimbursement at all except a small amount of moving expense, perhaps a few hundred dollars. I wonder how many Members know that. I have talked to 2 or 3 today who have been here for 30 years, and they did not know it. There is no reimbursement to a businessman who is displaced because of a Federal public-works project. I do not think it is right, I do not think it is equitable. I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to reappraise its whole policy on displaced persons in public-works projects.

Another matter has to do with the capital gains tax. Mr. Chairman, if you were 60 years of age and were a forced seller to the Federal Government under the threat of eminent domain, would you feel that you were being treated properly if you had to pay a full capital-gains tax, just as though you were a speculator dealing in land? Do you think that is right?

I have a bill pending in the Ways and Means Committee to readjust the capital-gains tax to unwilling sellers who are displaced because of public works projects. I sincerely solicit the support of every Member of Congress to look at that bill and I urge its favorable consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means. Let me say to the Members, do not forget that a project could be located in anyone's district at almost any time.

Even a more unjust practice has developed in the last 3 or 4 years in regard to land acquisition, known as the easement policy. At least, in prior projects, when the Federal Government took over real estate, and displaced persons in order to construct a Federal project, the land was acquired in fee title. The original owner got his money and was able to relocate his business at a place of his own choosing. That policy has been revised to the point where only a certain portion of a man's land is taken in fee title and paid for. The rest is taken under easement, if it is above a certain level on a reservoir project. What does that mean? It means that the property owner recovers a portion of his capital investment. Then part of it, a second portion he cannot recover and he does not have that money available with which to relocate, and maybe a third portion is above the water level, in a high area, maybe only 25 or 30 acres, and he gets a mere severance damage on that. He is not in a position to relocate his farming operation.

There is so much enthusiasm, I might call it sometimes blind enthusiasm, for Public Works projects.

I sincerely ask that every Member of Congress familiarize himself with the overall policy of land acquisition and cooperate with me or whoever may be directly involved in this matter in urging a more just consideration for displaced persons.

It has been said rather loosely that in the public interest these individuals just have to give way. If it is in the public interest that they are going to to be deprived of their property by the right of eminent domain, they should be reimbursed by the public for the national good, too.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In respect to this project the gentleman has just been discussing, known as the Tuttle Creek project, over which there has been a lot of controversy through the years, the gentleman could very well, if he cared to do so, go into the terrible situation that exists because of the displacement of these people. There is the moving of 4 or 5 cemeteries, as I recall it.

Mr. AVERY. I think it was 13.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There are 13 cemeteries that will have to be moved. They will have to remove the bodies and take them somewhere else. Then, how many towns are there involved here?

Mr. AVERY. Five towns. There are about 100 businessmen involved in the five towns.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You are moving them out to just wherever they can go, leaving them to do the best they can?

Mr. AVERY. They are just being shoved out, reimbursed moderately for the real property that they owed, plus a slight moving cost that does not amount to very many dollars, but they are not allowed anything for their business interests, what have been described by the courts as consequential damages.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You would think from the testimony that appears in the record that there was not much opposition to this project, but there is a terrific amount of opposition to it. I realize that you cannot pay these people in dollars and cents what they are being damaged and what they are entitled to, but I agree with the gentleman that the situation is much worse than it is pictured here on the floor of the House. How much land is being taken over?

Mr. AVERY. Roughly 55,000 acres. That is the total amount of land. If they would buy all that land it would be more acceptable, but now they are not going to buy it, all they are going to do is take an easement on roughly 25 percent of it. The land is tied up, the farmer can use it, but he cannot get his capital out to locate himself in a place where he can pursue his normal operations.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This is outside my congressional district, but I have received a great deal of correspondence and had a great many people call upon me to suggest that what we should have done was provide a watershed program first and following that, if it is necessary, build dams to carry out the project, but not use a dam such as is proposed here, Tuttle Creek.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it takes no economics genius or certified public accountant or even a political science expert to be critical of this legislation. Unfortunately, however, buildings are not built by sidewalk superintendents, nor is beneficial legislation produced by critics.

Last evening I was reading a history of the Erie Canal. At that time a number of people proclaimed, "What is the idea of building this canal through a wilderness?" Yet the Erie Canal resulted in the settling of the West, made the State of New York an empire within itself. The critics of that public-works project are lost in the oblivion of history, while the man who championed that legislation occupies a distinguished niche in our history.

I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the Appropriations Committee, its members—both majority and minority—for making my committee assignments most enjoyable as well as interesting and informative.

If a survey were made as to what in Congress impressed a freshman Member of Congress most, I think that I would have to select as my answer the experience of observing men like the fair and affable chairman of our subcommittee, LOUIS RABAUT, and the distinguished minority member, sagacious JOHN TABER, laying aside partisan politics in an attempt to legislate in the best interest of the entire Nation. Observing them, and the other members of the committee—both majority and minority—men from all walks of life, who could undoubtedly earn a great deal more material rewards in private life than in public life, overcoming sectional influence and appropriating for the benefit of the entire Nation, proves the merit of representative government.

The testimony before the committee by various administrative officials, public officers, and interested private individuals and organizations concerning the present and proposed public works of our country, discloses a bequest to the Nation that has to find its source in divinity.

After hearing the testimony presented to the committee, it would take a very narrow and completely unimaginative mind not to acquire an even greater devotion to our country. In the committee one is awed when he hears of the striking natural beauty of the United States—the Grand Canyon, the Rocky Mountains, Niagara Falls, and many other places of world renown. One is amazed when he hears evidence in the committee of the sources of the inexhaustible natural wealth of this country, vast stretches of farming and grazing lands, lakes, rivers, oilfields, mine regions, and vast forests. Facts presented to the committee concerning the great industrial centers, with their extensive manufacturing plants, the high buildings, great bridges, and vast projects for supplying power, light, and irrigation, give eloquent evidence of the genius of our people.

It is fitting to recall that the instant appropriation is more than an expenditure of taxpayers' funds. It is the investment of taxpayers' funds in the development of the assets of the people. No other Federal expenditure of funds produces more economic good to our people than does the expenditure that is involved in this appropriation.

As I sat on the committee I wondered where this country would be and what would be the economic condition of our citizens if our Congress had not entered into the field of investing the taxpayers' money in the development of the natural resources of our country? It would take

no historian to come to the conclusion that the Nation would not have had its ports, the complete electrification of our country, lands made fertile by irrigation, and its inland waterway system.

We are at the point in our history of facing the responsibility of not only paying for the just demands of our people upon their Government, but also paying for the greatest defense expenditure any Nation has had to bear. The only conceivable way to meet this great burden upon the people of this country is for their Government to prudently develop the great gift God gave this country in its natural resources, its oil fields, its mines, its farm and grazing lands, and the rest.

Of course, in carrying out this responsibility one realizes that the investment in the natural resources of the country—like any other investment—must be made in contemplation of present income. I think that in this proposed appropriation the members of the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee have done a fair job in prudently viewing the annual income with respect to the amount of annual investment that ought to be made in the development of our resources. Although the amount of the appropriation is a staggering sum, when one stops to consider that the amount we are appropriating for our investment in the development of our resources represents less than one sixty-fifth of the total budget for this fiscal year, he realizes that the committee is most frugal in its appropriations for the public works of our country.

To those who might feel disappointed that some project in which they were interested is not included in the appropriation, or who might feel the committee was remiss, I would like to recall that no board of directors of any private corporation in the world, no trustees of any trust fund, regardless of their size, has ever had the responsibility or authority to make the annual investment that this committee was required to recommend in the instant appropriation.

In helping the subcommittee and committee in effectuating its powers and responsibilities, the committee staff, various administrative officials from the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and others were of invaluable assistance.

As the guide in assisting this subcommittee in making the largest investment any investor ever embarked upon, is the Bureau of the Budget. One would assume, and in a large measure this assumption is correct, that the Bureau of the Budget in making its recommendations, after the accumulation of all supporting data concerning the public projects of the Nation, would recommend those public projects that will most benefit the entire Nation for the amount of money that it appears the Nation might be able to expend for such purposes during the fiscal years.

I was disappointed in some of the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget because it appeared to me that its recommendations were not predicated upon criteria based upon the economic welfare of the country but rather upon sectional favoritism. I would like to point out one particular and documented illustration.

Testimony before the committee in the northwest area discloses a serious situation with respect to power. As a matter of fact, evidence before the committee discloses that there is a power shortage in the northwest area. Plans of the administration or plans of private utilities fail to disclose the possibility that this power shortage will be overcome in the years to come. The northwest area has as a natural resource one of the greatest power producing waterways in the world—the Columbia River. To meet its power shortage the Northwest area has a combination of power companies including public and private utilities that have been described as one of the most efficient power combinations in the world.

The Bureau of the Budget, or other administrative agencies, have failed to recommend to the Congress any plans or suggested appropriation to meet the increasing critical power shortage situation in this area. If the failure to request funds to meet the power shortage situation in the northwest area were predicated upon the lack of available funds or an absence of plans, one could well appreciate and concur in the Bureau's budgetary views.

However, in another area where there is no shortage of power one observes the Bureau of the Budget recommending vast appropriations for a power project.

It seems to me that the recommendation of a power project in one area where the supply is available, and denying it to another area where the supply is inadequate, is not a budgetary practice based on sound fiscal principles.

In making its recommendations to the Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers use a formula in which they determine the benefits to be derived from the proposed project as related to its costs, calling this ratio the benefit to cost-ratio. All of the projects appropriated in the instant appropriation have a benefit to cost-ratio which guarantees some return on the investment this appropriation represents.

In determining benefit-to-cost ratios, the various administrative agencies allocate the cost of the projects to the various features of the project, including power, water, irrigation, and the like. In March of 1954, an agreement was made between the Department of the Interior, the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission with respect to allocations of cost in connection with multiple-purpose projects which included power.

Under this agreement power features in a proposed multiple-purpose project are considered after a determination of the factor of taxes foregone. The feature of taxes foregone is an arithmetic computation to determine the amount of taxes which a private utility of like power-generating potential would have paid. On some projects, such as the McGee Bend Reservoir in Texas, it was represented to the committee that the power features of the dam predicated upon the criteria which utilized the aspect of taxes foregone, is not economically justified. However, in two other cases the various administrative heads, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, have represented to the committee the economic feasibility of multiple-purpose dams with power predicated upon allocations to power which do not include the criteria of taxes foregone.

It may be good politics but I think it is bad budgetary logic, or lack of coordination to utilize one method of cost allocation for a dam in one section and another method for some other multiple-purpose project.

I was particularly impressed before the subcommittee with the presentation made in connection with the Calumet-Sag project in the city of Chicago and the Great Lakes connecting channels.

CAL-SAG PROJECT

The Cal-Sag project lies in south Cook County, Ill., and at present has a 60-foot channel, 9 feet deep, connecting the Illinois Waterway system with the Lake Calumet industrial area in the city of Chicago.

This area produces more steel than any other area in the world and is one of the world's principal industrial centers. The committee has authorized $8.5 million for the continuation of the proposed program of widening this channel to a channel of 225 feet in width. The present 60-foot channel has an efficient capacity of 1 million tons of commerce. The present commerce in the channel is three times its present efficient capability.

An excellent case was also made in connection with the Great Lakes connecting channels which, with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway will improve navigation in the Great Lakes area to a point where vessels with drafts of 25.5 feet can safely use the Great Lakes connecting channels as opposed to the current limiting drafts of 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound. Completion of this project will allow free and safe movement of the large vessels presently used in Great Lakes commerce, including those vessels anticipated to move into the area as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The long overdue improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels and the Cal-Sag project will make Chicago the crossroads of the world's commerce. It is appropriate to recall the words of a prominent Philadelphian who, after viewing the phenomenal rise of the city of New York as a result of the Erie Canal, wrote in a letter in 1851: "Transportation is king. Neither cotton, coal, nor any other product is sovereign. Conditions that fix the cost of transportation to market fix the amount in value of the products and their place in the commerce of the country."

These words are as true today as ever before.

One can well appreciate the reason one of our great local newspapers in the city of Chicago—the Chicago Tribune—recently stated that within 25 years after the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway system Chicago will be the greatest city in the world. For with the completion of this waterway system Chicago will have achieved the distinction of

being the transportation center of the world.

One disappointing feature in this appropriation is the failure to include amounts for deferred maintenance. Unless we maintain our existing projects, our national investment is in jeopardy. The postponement of essential maintenance in order to initiate new projects is, at best, a poor policy. An example of what happens if maintenance is deferred or postponed over a long period of time is accurately disclosed in connection with the Lake Calumet project near my own district. This project was completed in 1937 at which time the harbor at Lake Calumet at the end of the Cal-Sag Canal was dredged to an authorized depth of 21 feet. Since that time no maintenance was had on the harbor. As a result of the lack of maintenance, the 21-foot depth decreased to 15 feet.

In the past 2 or 3 years considerable traffic has developed in Lake Calumet harbor and a great amount of local interest has been generated in the harbor.

As a matter of fact, the Chicago Regional Port District has recently sold, and sold very quickly, bonds in the amount of $27 million to develop this port. Obviously, we must be assured that our present projects and proposed projects are maintained in such a manner that at the period of their greatest use they have not been left in such a neglected state as to render them unusable.

Although I understand there are adequate funds in order to complete the deferred maintenance in Lake Calumet, I hope that the Senate will include adequate amounts to begin the deferred maintenance upon our other national projects.

I urge the enactment of this appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my California colleague.

Mr. YOUNGER. As the gentleman knows, we have a project in my district known as the Redwood City Harbor.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have heard of it.

Mr. YOUNGER. There was one authorization in 1945 which called for no local cooperation and one in 1950 which called for local cooperation. In the 1955 budget a million dollars was provided for that project. The Appropriation Committee took it out on the ground that local participation was not available, yet all of the money asked for was for the 1945 authorization. That leaves the project in such shape that the Bureau of the Budget will not consider it because of the position taken by the committee, and the committee will not consider it because it is not in the budget. I want to know from the committee if it is necessary to combine authorization requirements when an appropriation is made which is limited to the work in only one authorization.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has asked a rather difficult question. The best thing I can do is to read to him that part of the report made by the engineers on the project, at the request of the subcommittee. And I read:

> A substantial proportion of the tonnage through Redwood City Harbor is carried by deep-draft vessels requiring 30-foot depths within the harbor and approach channels. Such vessels are subject to the hazardous condition of maneuvering in channels limited to 200 feet in width and 27 feet in depth. In addition, vessels cannot safely enter or depart under full load except at time of extreme high tide. Such conditions are very detrimental to efficient movement of cargo and limit harbor development.

Then there is a note:

> NOTE.—There is no local cooperation required for the modification contained in the 1945 River and Harbor Act. Local interests, however, have voluntarily provided the necessary spoil-disposal areas and impounding works required for that dredging.

That would answer the gentleman's question, that the gentleman's project could be cleared for action sometime in the future.

Mr. YOUNGER. If the Bureau of the Budget put the item in, the committee would consider it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think without question I should say definitely it would be considered.

Mr. YOUNGER. The fact that the local participation was not available for the second authorization would not deter action on the appropriation for the first authorization, which did not require local participation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It seems to have been straightened out, from the engineers' report.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. LOVRE. I note on page 7 of the report that the sum of $451,000 which was programed by the Bureau of Reclamation and budgeted for the Oahe unit in South Dakota has been eliminated. Can the gentleman tell me why this amount was eliminated?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am in a difficult position, as the gentleman knows, because I was ill during a part of the time the hearings were held. I was not there when this matter was taken up, but the record shows, as the gentleman knows, that the Congress has already appropriated over $5 million for the investigation of that project, which would seem, I think, to be adequate before a report is made. The committee has instructed the engineers to finish and submit that report and to take the necessary money out of the general investigation fund. I think the gentleman will agree that that should be the next step before any further money is appropriated.

Mr. LOVRE. Then it is the intent of the committee that the Bureau should make a full report of its findings now before any additional money is appropriated?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I so understand.

Mr. LOVRE. In the gentleman's opinion, will there be sufficient unobligated balances in connection with the basin investigations program to carry out the instructions of the committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. There are funds on hand for completing such an investigation.

Mr. LOVRE. I would like to know how many acres can be irrigated in the James division of the Oahe unit and where; what can be expected in the way of returns on the irrigated lands; how much will it cost the Federal Government; how much will it cost the farmers for participation, and if the project is economically feasible. Will we be able to get this information from the report that is contemplated by the committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman talks like a member of the subcommittee. Those are the things we should like to know, too.

Mr. LOVRE. If additional funds are necessary in order to accomplish this job so that we can have this information, will your subcommittee give this project further consideration at the proper time?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The committee gives all projects full consideration as far as it can, and I would say very liberal consideration.

Mr. LOVRE. In other words, if the gentleman will yield further, as far as the action of this subcommittee is concerned on withholding funds this year it was done without any prejudice to the project itself.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly none on the part of this member and I think I may say none on the part of any member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LOVRE. If it should be discovered that the Bureau needs additional money to carry this project to its logical conclusion before the other body acts on this bill, would be the gentleman object?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; speaking as one member of the subcommittee, I would not object.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress, as a taxpayer and as a citizen of South Dakota, I want to know just how many acres of land can be irrigated in this project. I want to know what the costs will be and certainly want to know that the entire project is engineeringly feasible. I am in hopes that the preliminary reports to be completed this year will show these things.

At the end of this fiscal year, approximately $5,042,729 will have been expended on this report. It is anticipated that the entire report will cost in the neighborhood of $8 million. I do not believe that it is the intent of this committee to leave the project only five-eighths completed, which would be a very unfortunate waste of money. On the other hand, the committee has a right to know, and I want to know, just what progress has been made with the $5 million already expended.

The farmers and townspeople in my district have questions, and lots of them, in regard to the feasibility of irrigation. For over 8 years they have been going to the Bureau trying to get answers to the questions and even after all this time the answers have not been available. Farmers and others have asked me many questions and invited me to meetings to

discuss irrigation, but I just haven't been able to answer their questions because the Bureau has not released any substantial authoritative information.

Mr. Chairman, if this project is not feasible, I do not want it in my district. If the costs per acre are too high or if the land will not take the water, the project should not be started. I do, however, insist that the people of South Dakota have a right to the answers to their questions and if the project is feasible, I want the project started. I hope that the action of this committee will spur the Bureau officials into much faster action than we have had in the past. The Congress and the people of South Dakota are entitled to this information as soon as possible.

I have been led to believe that the action of the committee will not prejudice this project, but is merely an effort to check on a Bureau which seemingly has been negligent about keeping the Congress and the people advised as to where the previous appropriations have been spent. I should like to include here a telegram I received today from Mr. Bruce Campbell, managing editor of the Huronite and Daily Plainsman, of Huron, S. Dak., in regard to this project:

HURON, S. DAK., *May 22, 1956.*

Representative HAROLD LOVRE,

*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

Justification for $451,000 for Oahe unit is primarily that money is needed to assure that a specific project proposal is given to people of South Dakota. That sum is needed to make sure that previous $5 million in 10 years isn't wasted since interim report is synthesis of previous work. Field work on report may be done by target date of July 1, but probably not. In any event, after field work completed, all additional work of evaluating, analysis and cost figuring must be done by successive echelons of Bureau. If given approval after few months, Oahe unit needs maintenance of planning unit to prepare detailed report. Sum of $451,000 is $100,000 less than $550,000 allotted this current fiscal year because Bureau realized that it would be in transition period for few months and could get by on less than this year's amount, although it may pinch, year ago Bureau had panel of three experts conduct soils test, they found large area drainable. But Bureau still has never told people of South Dakota what specific area would be irrigated, what project proposals are exactly, has never given explanation of economics and feasibility of project. Until Bureau does this, people of South Dakota have not been treated fairly. This planning money of $451,000 is sums which will assure South Dakotans of getting clear, definite picture of project proposal, area, costs. Mere report resting on bureaucratic desk somewhere won't do people of South Dakota any good or help Congress which has financed preparation of data. Money needed to make sure report is completed in all phases, then that project proposal is explained to public. South Dakotans agree with committee that Bureau has dragged its feet on making decision, but believe that this $451,000 is necessary to get that decision, then get it explained and applied to big Great Plains area where rainfall is less than 19 inches.

Pattern follows same report pattern that obtained in North Dakota on Missouri-Souris.

South Dakotans don't need to be sold on irrigation; they are turning to it steadily on their own. But they want action on such a big program that would help stabilize agricultural production.

In 1949 there were only 12 sprinkler irrigation systems in State. End of 1955 there were 225 sprinkler irrigation systems, mostly in central South Dakota area, generally believed to come within scope of Oahe unit.

In 1880 were 189 irrigators on 15,715 acres, mostly western South Dakota, in 1930 were 763 on 59,361 acres, in 1950 were 807 on 78,069 acres.

This week in Onida, group of farmers ranchers that area plan to hold second such grassroots meeting to see if they can organize any kind of a district to encourage Bureau to get going faster on irrigation plans. It generally understood that 80,000 acres may be in that general area.

Foregoing is information from our background, from local Bureau people, from State water engineer Joe Grimes.

Can't get statement from any Bureau official. Regional director Frank Clinton, who definitely has favored project, is somewhere in Arizona unreachable on vacation.

BRUCE CAMPBELL,
*Huron Daily Plainsman.*

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Would the gentleman explain to me the reason the committee cut the request of $8 million for the Colorado project as requested by the Budget to $3,500,000?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I would be glad to, because I do not want the gentleman, or any of my colleagues, to have any misunderstanding on the subject.

It is the policy of the committee, and I concur in the policy, not to appropriate money for construction during a fiscal year if it can be avoided when that money will not be spent during that fiscal year.

It appeared from the record, and from the testimony which I think I should say to the gentleman was rather limited, the testimony on the subject, it appeared to the committee that this money for actual construction would not be needed during fiscal 1957; therefore, the committee gave all of the money requested, as we understood, for planning and preparation of plans, all of that money, but did not allow money which we understood was requested for actual construction and not needed in fiscal year 1957.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I believe there was some testimony to the effect that money would be needed for the construction of access roads and dam-site housing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman is right, and I think that that was overlooked in setting the figure at $3,155,000.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I assume if that information is supplied to the other body there would be no objection to restoring that amount.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly not from me, and I feel there would not be from any other member of the subcommittee. I may say, however, that we would want, so far as possible, to determine the actual amount of money needed for the construction of roads and housing before we set the figure or appropriated for it. The money for access roads I think is justifiable, but I think we should be very careful in appropriating money for housing that we do not run into some of the problems we did in building so-called model housing units such as that at Boulder City and Hanford. We should let the contractor supply his housing, and we should supply only the housing necessary, possibly of a more permanent character, for Federal employees. It is my belief that is what the bureau is requesting.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. That is exactly what the request was from the bureau.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think we should be careful.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice funds for the Missouri River Basin transmission division program are allowed with the exception of $5,500,000 for the Fort Randall-Grand Island line, which is a 230,000-kilovolt line which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Could the gentleman give me any light as to why that was left out?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish I could. I did not know that I was to become an authority on the entire public works bill as seems to be the case this afternoon. As the gentleman knows I was not present at all the hearings because I was ill, and I did not hear all the testimony. My understanding is that the item was probably removed because Nebraska has chosen to be a self-reliant and a self-financing State on power. Is that right?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We are a public power State.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is that what the gentleman is saying in other language?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No. We have to come to the Federal Government for money for our light plants and our REA's. This is a feasible project that was recommended to the Bureau of the Budget and every dollar will be paid back.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I just cannot answer it. I wish I could.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CRETELLA. Can the gentleman give me some information with reference to the Quinnipiac River project at New Haven?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I cannot pronounce it, let alone give the gentleman any information on it.

Mr. CRETELLA. It is an Indian name.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear in behalf of the people of Connecticut and New England on matters which are of vital importance to their welfare and protection from the ravages of floods, erosion, and storms.

Connecticut is still digging out from the ruins left in the wake of the August and October storms of last year. In emergency session the State Legislature appropriated $73 million for assistance to those faced with the burdensome tasks of rebuilding their homes and their businesses.

You have heard a joint statement from all 12 New England Senators and from those in the State of Connecticut who work very closely with the problems of floods and are well acquainted with our needs in this regard. I want to subscribe wholeheartedly to these statements and ask that they be carefully and sincerely weighed.

Congress has wasted little time up to now in providing financial aid in the urgency deficiency bill so that a program could be initiated for the construction of dams and reservoirs and other projects.

This Committee now has before it President Eisenhower's request for additional funds which would accelerate the flood-control program in the northeast region in addition to hurricane studies under Public Law 71 and projects for shore protection and improvement.

There is no doubt that millions would have been saved in Connecticut alone if the various dams and projects had been completed in time to bear the forces of our storms last year. It was estimated by the State that the $207 million loss in the Naugatuck Valley could have been reduced by $90 million if the Thomaston Dam had been built. The Naugatuck Valley is one of the most vulnerable in the entire Northeast area to floods and the losses in property and the human misery which occurred there last year should provide ample incentive for Congress to appropriate additional funds as sought by the President.

Although the United States Army engineers have taken active interest in New England flood-control projects, the overall results have been more or less disappointing. This can be attributed to the neglect of Congress in failing consistently to appropriate funds for vital authorized projects. Of the many projects authorized since 1938 only 5 structures have been built thus far although the present budget includes funds for additional work.

New England appears to be increasingly prominent in the paths of recent hurricanes and floods. If we are to have an accelerated program of flood control, Congress must take into consideration the greater and greater jeopardy to which the residents of Connecticut and the Northeast are being subjected. Appropriations of several million dollars even over and above that figure recommended by the President would be put to good practical use. It is expected the Corps of Engineers will recommend new and additional projects to be undertaken as a result of further studies which are being made to come up with a sound program of flood control. Increased funds for fiscal 1957 could be very economically put to use for such expansion.

A project which has been authorized since 1945 in the 79th Congress is the deepening of the Quinnipiac River. The completion of this project would greatly help in lessening the needs of business and commerce in the area which depends on adequate channels for shipping. Industry has grown in New Haven and a good portion of the population depends on the success of companies established on the Quinnipiac River. The great majority of these businesses have indicated their desire to expand their facilities when the deepening of the river is completed. In the original House Document 517 the tonnage shown was 480,000. The present tonnage is 946,141.

Maintenance dredging in New Haven Harbor is to be undertaken soon. Considerable economy could be effected by deepening the adjacent Quinnipiac River at the same time. It would be first necessary, of course, for this committee to appropriate the necessary funds for the Quinnipiac River project. I hope in the interest of a stronger economy in New Haven and the State of Connecticut that these funds will be made available immediately for this purpose.

One of the shore-erosion projects for which funds of $42,000 were appropriated for fiscal 1956 was Woodmont, in the district I represent. The start of construction, however, has been delayed and it appears no work will begin before the deadline of July 1. I urgently request that this appropriation of $42,000 be included in the 1957 budget so the project can be carried out. State and local interests have contributed $150,000 toward the costs. There is a real need in Woodmont for shore-erosion protection and I trust the committee will see fit to include this item in the budget.

Connecticut has continually demonstrated her energy and initiative in defense against the threats of storms, and erosion, and the willingness to help provide suitable navigation and harbor facilities. I hope the interest in these matters as displayed by the citizens of our State will be fairly recognized by the committee and that sufficient funds will be made available so that we can go forward with an accelerated program as a means of protection to the residents of Connecticut from the forces of nature which have thus far taken such a ghastly toll of lives and personal property.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I understand that these two dams, the Glen Canyon Dam and Flaming Gorge Dam are a considerable distance from highways.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We quite often build dams some distance from highways.

Mr. HILL. You have to in that rugged, mountainous area. But when I discovered that the fund had been reduced from $8 million down to $3 million for this particular year the question occurred to me: How can we ever expect to get these highways constructed?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is the point just made by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON]. I concur that there should have been some money put in for access roads, whatever we actually need in the fiscal year. I am not for appropriating money that will not be spent in this fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. This Glen Canyon Dam is 135 miles from the nearest town or a good highway.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The upper basin States are going to do something about these roads also.

Mr. HILL. I understand there is to be a cooperative arrangement between the States and the Bureau; at the same time the State is not very apt to start these highway programs unless they know funds from the Government will be forthcoming.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Can the gentleman tell me how much the other States are to contribute to those roads?

Mr. HILL. In my own State, we have always contributed percentagewise somewhere near 50–50. At the same time that is not the answer. What would be the attitude if the other body should decide to replace this $5 million? That is not a small sum because $5 million is a lot of money.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is a lot of money to the gentleman and myself but sometimes I think it is not considered to be a lot of money when we bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the President submitted a budget request for $8 million for the upper Colorado River storage project for fiscal year 1957. This request included plans and specifications for 2 of the dams—Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge—as well as advance planning money for some of the other authorized units.

Both of the dams are some distance from any present highway and roads need to be built immediately for access to the sites. The access road from United States Highway 89 to the Glen Canyon Dam site is in very rugged mountains and is estimated to cost about $4½ million. I understand the Bureau of Reclamation expects to have specifications ready to award a contract for this road as soon as construction money is available. The Bureau is required to state in its specifications the amount of money available for contract earnings at the time it advertises. It seems essential, therefore, that construction money be available July 1 for this work to get underway.

Glen Canyon Dam site is 135 miles from the nearest town and therefore re-

quires construction housing and some permanent housing for operation employees. The Bureau plans to use trailers and portable houses so far as possible, but it is impossible at present to even get a trailer to the site because no roads exist. Contracts would be awarded within a few months for some housing, office space, warehouses, and so forth.

I am advised that a contract for diversion tunnels is planned to be let about April 1, 1957, and construction funds in the amount of at least $1 million should be available in January 1957 so that the estimated amount of contract earnings can be included in the specifications when they are advertised.

A similar situation prevails at Flaming Gorge Dam site where roads, construction camp, and diversion tunnel contracts will be ready for advertising shortly after January 1, 1957, and construction funds for payments under these contracts should be made available to the Bureau of Reclamation now.

The advance planning money is, of course, essential to complete the planning on other units so that an orderly development can proceed on this project, which was overwhelmingly approved by the House a few months ago.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentleman want a road or a dam?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I have studied this record quite carefully and I can understand how the gentleman from California and the members of the committee might have some reservations here.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I hope the gentleman will understand that I am not arguing the merits of this project either in the committee or here. I have done the same thing with a project in my own district. I have approved taking out money that could not be spent in the fiscal year.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I understand and I commend the gentleman for that. I was trying to get an idea of what would be expected in the way of further information to justify this appropriation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the information would be, what actual work is to be done, the contributions of the States and how much will be needed in the fiscal year 1957. Incidentally, there is the matter of when the construction contracts actually will be ready to be let.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Yes, as to contracts for construction of the diversion tunnels, there is the difference as appears in the hearings between April 1, 1957, and February 1, 1957. If I understand the gentleman correctly, if the information mentioned is supplied in acceptable form, the committee would be inclined to look kindly on it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Speaking for one Member, yes.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The gentleman would be inclined to?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Speaking for one Member, I would not object. The gentleman also realizes a statement that the money might be used in the last quarter is not definite enough.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I understand that. It should be pinpointed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I have about exhausted my time. I just wish to say that I took the floor, Mr. Chairman, to point out a few facts regarding the expenditures of TVA, for example, that TVA, while it has been referred to on the floor as being a self-reliant and self-financing agency, actually it has not even returned to the Federal Government the amount of money which the Federal Government has paid in interest for TVA's money over the same period of years, or less. I just think that this is neither the time nor the place to attempt to discuss that subject fully.

I would like to say in the remaining minute that I have been on the subcommittee which makes that budget for 10 years, but I have never in that time heard anyone say they wished to destroy the TVA. I have heard them say they wished the TVA would recognize the fact that it has in itself the inherent strength to conduct itself as an independent agency, self-financing, self-operating, and to act as if it were grown up. I think that is a subject for which time should be taken on the floor of the House to exhaust the subject thoroughly so that we would not be subjected to a statement like the one I referred to, which said that the TVA was not costing the taxpayers 1 cent. The records of the Congress show that that is not so, nor is it true that the TVA is returning all the money it should return to the Congress, when the records show it returned less than the interest paid by the taxpayers on the money advanced to the TVA. The TVA paid back $127.5 million, and simple interest alone on the money advanced TVA for power construction alone, would be more than $200 million, both figures to June 30, 1955.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to commend the chairman of the committee and members and the subcommittee hearing these proposals on their splendid action in providing for needed flood control projects. The amounts provided for Success and Terminus Dams in my district by this bill represent a start on construction of two worthwhile projects—a construction which has been delayed for various reasons over a period of years.

In order that you might have a complete picture of these projects I will summarize certain major aspects thereof as follows:

SUCCESS RESERVOIR, TULE RIVER, CALIF.

AUTHORIZATION

The Success project is a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized construction and operation of the project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the recommendations contained in House of Representatives Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, 78th Congress, 2d session—also see House Document 559, 78th Congress, which contains the latest published map.

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Success project consists of a dam and reservoir for flood control, irrigation, and related purposes in the Tule River and Tulare Lake areas. The dam is to be located on Tule River about 5 miles east of the town of Porterville, Tulare County, Calif., and will be an earth-fill structure 146 feet high and 3,430 feet long across the Tule River, with an auxiliary earth-fill dam or dike 40 feet high and 6,300 feet long across Frazier Valley about 3½ miles northwesterly from the main dam. It will create a reservoir of 75,000-acre-foot capacity. The spillway will be located on a natural rock saddle about 1,000 feet northwesterly from the main dam, and will be ungated. The total estimated cost of the project, based on 1955 price levels, is $13,900,000.

PROJECT OPERATION

The storage capacity of 75,000 acre-feet will be operated in the combined interest of flood-control and water conservation. In general, the storage capacity would be evacuated to the extent necessary in advance of the winter and spring floods. After danger of floods has passed in the spring, the reservoir would be filled gradually to provide water for irrigation use. The storage and release of water for conservation purposes will be consistent with water rights established by State law and with the desires of the local interests owning such rights. Prior to use of the reservoir for conservation purposes, however, a contract with local water users will be necessary providing, among other things, for payment for the use of the reservoir storage capacity.

PROJECT BENEFITS

The Success Reservoir project will provide full flood protection to about 60,000 acres of agricultural and suburban lands along the Tule River and its tributaries and to the Porterville urban area, which has a population of about 10,000. It will also improve the irrigation water supply by providing about 10,000 acre-feet of new water through reduction in evaporation losses in Tulare Lake, and will provide means for regulating the present irrigation supply. Most of the area to be protected is highly developed farmland, devoted primarily to the production of fruits, truck crops and cotton, and to alfalfa and irrigated pasture for stock feed. In conjunction with the constructed Pine Flat and Isabella Reservoirs and the authorized Terminus Reservoir on Kaweah River, the Success project will help to provide flood protection to about 260,000 acres of highly productive agricultural land in the Tulare Lake area. Data on major floods and flood

damages from rain floods in the Tule River area and from snowmelt floods in the Tulare Lake area are given in the following tabulation:

| Date | Peak flow at Worth Bridge | | Flood damages below dam site from— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Natural (cubic feet per second) | Modified by project (cubic feet per second) [1] | Natural flow [2] | Modified flow |
| RAIN FLOODS | | | | |
| February 1936 | 14,000 | 1,200 | $1,000,000 | 0 |
| February 1937 | 13,000 | 3,200 | 800,000 | 0 |
| February–March 1938 | 14,000 | 1,000 | 1,130,000 | 0 |
| March 1943 | 21,100 | 3,200 | 2,060,000 | 0 |
| November 1950 | 28,000 | 500 | 1,340,000 | 0 |
| January 1952 | 5,500 | 500 | 31,000 | 0 |
| December 1955–January 1956 | 17,000 | 500 | 2,600,000 | 0 |
| SNOW-MELT FLOODS | | | | |
| March–June 1938 | [3] [4] 85,000 | [3] [4] 5,000 | 1,650,000 | [5] $100,000 |
| April–June 1952 | [3] [4] 30,000 | [4] 0 | 620,000 | [5] 0 |

[1] Controlled to nondamaging flows along channels of Tule River below dam site.
[2] Based on 1955 prices and development. Actually the historical damages of the earlier floods were much smaller because the area was not developed.
[3] Acre-feet.
[4] Estimate of volume of Tule River inflow to Tulare Lake under present conditions of development.
[5] Damage in Tulare Lake area; assigned in proportion to damaging flow from each tributary stream.

The city of Porterville has been flooded several times in the past, most recently in November 1950. A repetition of the 1950 flood with current conditions of development and prices would cause damages of $1,340,000 in the Tule River area below the dam site, of which about $130,000 would occur in the Porterville urban area. Damages in the Tulare Lake area, caused by flooding from the Kings, Kern, Kaweah, and Tule Rivers, have approximated $39 million since 1937. On the basis of 1955 prices and stage of development, such damages would amout to about $76 million. The flood of April–June 1952 inundated about 70,000 acres in the Tulare Lake area, causing damages to growing crops and preventing the farming of other croplands, and resulting in damages estimated at $7 million (current prices) of which about $620,000 could be assigned to Tule River flow, on the basis of volume of inflow. The December 1955 and January 1956 floods had lower peak flows than the flood of 1950 but they flooded 44,000 acres of agricultural land below Porterville and caused far greater damage than the flood in 1950. Considerable land was badly eroded and other lands were covered with sand and silt. Orchards, crops, and improvements were severely damaged. In Tulare Lake, damages attributable to Tule River water were estimated at $200,000. The Success project would provide adequate flood protection to the Tule River area below the dam site and would assist materially in reducing damage in Tulare Lake. The project would also improve the annual irrigation water supply to the highly water-deficient Tule River area and would provide means for regulating the present irrigation supply.

The average annual benefits are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Flood control | $659,000 |
| Irrigation | 68,000 |
| Total | 727,000 |

The average annual charges are $590,000 and the benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.2 to 1.

LOCAL COOPERATION

Payment is to be made to the United States by local interests when use is made of the stored water for conservation purposes, but no local cooperation is required for the construction of the reservoir project. Costs for the conservation features of the project have not yet been allocated. Improvement by local interests of the maintenance of existing channels and diversions under project conditions will be necessary in order to increase the capacity for disposal of excess waters, (primarily by channel percolation and over-irrigation) in the Tule River area. Cost of additional maintenance of channels and diversions is estimated at $18,000 annually. General assurances have been furnished by local interests that they would meet the requirements for local cooperation.

STATUS

Design studies are about 80 percent complete. Construction plans and specifications are about 30 percent complete. By the end of the current fiscal year the design studies should be about 85 percent complete and construction plans and specifications should be about 35 percent complete. Planning required to initiate construction will be completed with funds currently available. Construction work has not been initiated.

TERMINUS RESERVOIR, KAWEAH RIVER, CALIF.

AUTHORIZATION

The Terminus project is a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized construction and operation of the project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the recommendations contained in House of Representatives Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, 78th Congress, 2d session—also see House Document No. 559, 78th Congress which contains the latest published map.

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Terminus project consists of a dam, reservoir, and spreading works for flood control, irrigation, and related purposes in the Kaweah River and Tulare Lake areas. Terminus Dam is to be located on Kaweah River about 20 miles east of the city of Visalia, Calif. The spreading works are to be constructed in the valley below the reservoir. The dam will be an earthfill structure 220 feet high and 2,680 feet long across Kaweah River and will create a reservoir of 145,000 acre-foot capacity. The spillway will be located in a natural saddle about one-half mile south of the dam and will be gate controlled. The spreading areas will range in size from about 300 acres to about 2,000 acres, and will be for the purpose of spreading floodwaters to assist in flood control and to replenish the ground-water basin for subsequent pumping for irrigation. The absorptive capacity of the spreading works will be about 60,000 acre-feet per month. The reservoir will provide about 34,000 acre-feet of new water a year through reductions in evaporation losses and will provide means for regulating the present irrigation supply. The total estimated cost of the project, based on the 1955 price levels, is $18,600,000.

PROJECT OPERATION

The storage capacity of 145,000 acre-feet will be operated in the combined interest of flood control and water conservation. In general, the storage capacity would be evacuated to the extent necessary in advance of the winter and spring floods. After danger of floods has passed in the spring, the reservoir would be filled gradually to provide water for irrigation use. The storage and release of water for conservation purposes will be consistent with water rights established by State law and with the desires of the local interests owning such rights. Prior to use of the reservoir for conservation purposes, however, a contract with local water users will be necessary providing, among other things, for payment for the use of the reservoir storage capacity.

PROJECT BENEFITS

The Terminus Reservoir project will provide full flood protection to about 110,000 acres of agricultural lands in the Kaweah River area and for the city of Visalia and adjacent urban area with a population of about 20,000. It will provide about 34,000 acre-feet of new water annually for irrigation through reductions in evaporation losses in Tulare Lake and will provide means for regulating the present irrigation water supply. The spreading works portion of the project will assist both flood control and water conservation by recharging the ground-water basin with floodwaters, and will have an infiltration capacity of about 60,000 acre-feet per month. The agricultural lands to be served by the project are particularly well adapted to the production of fruits, nuts, truck crops, cotton, and stock feeds. In conjunction with the completed Pine Flat and Isabella Reservoirs and the authorized Success Reservoir on Tule River, the Terminus project will help to provide adequate flood protection to 260,000 acres of croplands in the Tulare Lake area.

Data on major rain floods and flood damages in the Kaweah River area, and snowmelt floods in the Tulare Lake area are given in the following tabulation:

| Date | Peak flow at McKay point | | Flood damages below dam site from— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Natural (cubic feet per second) | Modified by project (cubic feet per second)[1] | Natural flow[2] (dollars) | Modified flow (dollars) |
| RAIN FLOODS | | | | |
| February 1937 | 19,000 | 1,200 | 720,000 | 0 |
| December 1937 | 35,000 | 1,000 | 1,030,000 | 0 |
| March 1938 | 15,000 | 1,900 | 620,000 | 0 |
| January–March 1943 | 17,000 | 1,900 | 930,000 | 0 |
| February 1945 | 15,000 | 1,200 | 595,000 | 0 |
| November 1950 | 54,000 | 1,100 | 1,340,000 | 0 |
| December 1955–January 1956 | 73,000 | 5,500 | 12,500,000 | 0 |
| SNOW-MELT FLOODS | | | | |
| March–June 1938 | [3] [4] 240,000 | [3] [4] 10,000 | [5] 4,350,000 | [5] 210,000 |
| March–June 1952 | [3] [4] 145,000 | [4] 0 | [5] 1,960,000 | [5] 0 |

[1] Controlled to nondamaging flows along channels of Kaweah River below dam site.
[2] Based on 1955 prices and development. Actually the historical damages of the earlier floods were much smaller because the area was not developed.
[3] Acre-feet.
[4] Volume of inflow to Tulare Lake.
[5] Damages in Tulare Lake area; assigned in proportion to damaging flow from each tributary stream.

The city of Visalia has been flooded by the Kaweah River several times in the past. The most serious flooding in recent years was during December 1955 and January 1956. These floods had the largest peak flow of record with 73,000 cubic feet per second and a 5-day volume of about 130,000 acre-feet. Nearly three-fourths of the city of Visalia was flooded by the December flood and about half of the city was flooded by the January flood. Most of the city area covered by the January flood had been damaged by the December flood, but some of the area had escaped the December flood. Damages caused by these floods are being surveyed and only tentative estimates are available at this time. Damages in the city of Visalia are in the order of $3 million, and damages in the Kaweah River area, including the city of Visalia, are estimated at $12.5 million. The Kaweah River flood plain is an outwash cone formation with the riverbed usually on the high part. The flood washed out river control structures and cut new channels, thus damaging roads, utilities and nearly 200,000 acres of agricultural lands. Some lands were severely eroded and others were left buried under a heavy deposit of sand, silt, and debris. About 9,000 acres were flooded in Tulare Lake with damages of $500,000 attributable to Kaweah River water. Flood damages in the Tulare Lake area, caused by flows from the Kaweah, Kings, Kern, and Tule Rivers, have approximated $39 million since 1937. On the basis of 1955 prices and stage of development, such damages would amount to about $76 million. The flood of March-June 1952 inundated about 70,000 acres in the lake area, causing damages to growing crops and preventing the farming of other croplands, and resulting in damages estimated at $7 million (current prices) of which about $1,960,000 could be assigned to Kaweah River flow on the basis of volume of inflow; $1.9 million of this damage would have been prevented with the project in full operation. The Terminus Reservoir, with the other reservoirs of the plan, would assist in preventing such damages from occurring in the future. The removal of the flood hazard will stimulate larger growth of industry in the city of Visalia and in the remainder of the Kaweah River flood plain. The reservoir and spreading works will improve the supply of water irrigation.

The average annual benefits are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Flood control | $1,662,000 |
| Irrigation | 253,000 |
| Total | 1,915,000 |

The average annual charges are $855,000 and the benefit-to-cost ratio is 2.2 to 1.0.

LOCAL COOPERATION

Local interests are required to make payment to the United States for the conservation features of the project and to operate and maintain the spreading works after completion. The amounts to be repaid for conservation features of the project have not yet been allocated. Estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance of the spreading works is $22,000. Assurances have been furnished by local interests that they would meet the requirements. Local interests have constructed and are operating some of the spreading works contemplated by the project.

STATUS

Planning accomplished to date consists primarily of field explorations and surveys required for definite design studies. Preparation of the design memorandum to be used as a basis for the construction plans and specifications is about 30 percent complete and is expected to be about 50 percent complete with funds currently available. Except for plans prepared as part of the definite design studies, no construction plans and specifications have been prepared. Construction work has not been initiated.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 14 of the report on the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957, funds have been recommended and allocated for the improvement of the Delaware River, one of our country's major lanes of commerce.

An allocation of $1,060,000 has been recommended for the improvement of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea. The other allocation is for $6 million and authorizes the deepening of the Delaware Channel from 25 to 35 feet.

The foresight of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations has made it possible for me and my colleagues from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to appear on the floor today and request that these two allocations be favorably voted upon and passed without further delay.

As most of you know, we have battled tirelessly during the past year and a half to obtain the approval of these projects by the Congress. We have been particularly concerned about the $6 million allocation needed to initiate the deepening of the channel inasmuch as it was contained in the budget recommendations to the Congress in January.

In March of this year my colleagues and I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee in support of this allocation for construction. At that time I pointed out the obsoleteness of the Delaware Channel and emphasized the fact that our continued growth and prosperity depended largely upon the building of a more modern channel to adequately accommodate the present ocean traffic. I believe I was, to a degree, successful in proving to the committee that the Delaware River today is outmoded and instead of providing a vital link in our transportation system, it is a hindrance to profitable trade. I further pointed out the need for an improved channel in the interest of national defense.

We Members from Philadelphia and our colleagues from New Jersey and Delaware have presented every possible argument in favor of the deepening of the Delaware River.

We realize these projects will greatly enhance our valley's prosperity—and this I am for—but my main concern is safety to ships and the saving of human lives, which cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Since the deepening of the channel will provide greater safety to all vessels calling at the port of Philadelphia and make our port facilities more attractive to foreign trade; and since the deepening of the channel will minimize the navigational hazards and thereby insure the lives of all seamen; and since the deepening of the channel will assure increased prosperity for the Delaware Valley and guarantee greater employment through the establishment of new industries along its banks, I sincerely urge that this body vote unanimously for the immediate passage of the public works appropriation bill for 1957.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I gladly embrace this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and its able members as well

as the entire Appropriations Committee for so expeditiously considering and reporting this most constructive bill.

The measure involves extremely complex engineering matters requiring long intensive study and I congratulate the committee for its patient, laborious, able work which has been so conspicuously crowned with success.

In my opinion this bill is not only unique with regard to the speed with which it has been reported to the House in view of its complex subject matter, but from the standpoint of my district, State and area, it represents the greatest step forward in Federal flood-control legislation since the inception of this government.

In behalf of all my people, in behalf of the people of Massachusetts and the members of our special Massachusetts Delegation Committee on Flood Rehabilitation and Relief and, of course, in my own behalf, I desire publicly to express my deeply felt appreciation to all the members of the committee, its staff and the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget and all others who have contributed to the formulation and presentation of this highly meritorious measure.

The presence of this bill here on the floor today is living proof of the adaptability of this body, and the ready response that can usually be found here, to great public emergencies such as confronted us in the great, devastating floods which ravaged the Northeast last summer and fall.

This measure has laid a speedy and indeed sound foundation for many projects of extreme urgency. It will go a long way in affording the kind of protection which our area will require in the future. It will go a long way toward preventing the recurrence of the great disasters that have been periodically visited upon us during torrential equinoctial storms and hurricanes by raging waters in our river valleys and in other places sweeping everything before them and causing great loss of life and tremendous damage to property and creating havoc, confusion and privation in our communities.

The committee action is unique in another way. In its commendable zeal to meet these problems speedily, for one of the few times in the history of this Government, the committee has cut the red-tape and bureaucratic delay that frequently attends the development of these matters, and has acted across a broad front and in a courageous way to extend relief and provide flood prevention.

We understand, of course, that as splendid and constructive as this bill is, further action will be required by the Congress as we go along in order to assure adequate safeguards and complete protection. The major projects have been, in the main, very well established and should go forward with all practicable promptness. To be sure, there remains a great deal of work still to be authorized and still to be achieved before our area will be adequately protected against floods.

Some of this work can be accomplished by the Federal Government acting alone and some of it will be the subject matter for joint action between the Government, the States, and the local communities.

As to that part of it which is the legitimate concern of the Federal Government, extensive surveys, reviews and studies which the Congress has already authorized are now proceeding. The end results of these activities will enable the Congress to know from an engineering and operational viewpoint as well as in complete detail where additional work is required, its nature, character and scope, and by what feasible means it can be accomplished.

Some of this work can be done under existing authority. For much more, additional authority is being sought. The McCormack bill, H. R. 9554, and its companion, the Philbin bill, now pending before the House Public Works Committee and already approved in principle by the Secretary of the Army reflecting the view of the Corps of Engineers, will greatly broaden the amount of work that can be done by the engineers without coming back to Congress for additional authority. They would raise the limit up to $500,000 for any one such project, and it will readily be seen that this figure more realistically approximates current needs and would promote greater speed and efficiency in coping with emergencies.

It is measures like these which will be the answer to the alleviation of a large variety and number of water resources and water flowage conditions, not only in the northeast area, but throughout the Nation.

In my own district, for example, the basic projects established in the Quinebaug, French, Blackstone, and Ware Rivers will be of infinite flood protection help. There are still many conditions that have come about, and which periodically come about, as a consequence of floods which can only be dealt with by smaller local projects and engineering and construction of a preventive nature in and along these river channels, having to do with removal of rubbish and debris, diking, straightening, deepening and widening of the channels and general rehabilitation work affecting also the tributaries and feeding sources of these rivers which will have to be done independent of and regardless of the construction of major dams and reservoirs.

The Quaboag River is an illustration of this type of need. The recent floods necessarily altered the plans of the engineers for a major project to control the waters of this river at West Brookfield. However, the engineers having already done considerable remedial work along this stream are carefully studying ways and means to effectuate complete control to prevent recurrent damage along its course and particularly at the confluence of the Quaboag, Ware and Swift Rivers with the Chicopee River at Three Rivers where throughout that entire area real control problems exist.

The Nashua and Assabet Rivers are other types where this type of control could be effectual and this is also true of the streams in the Milford area where the State is already going forward with coordinated projects. In fact, in all the river basins in Massachusetts a great deal of work of this character is needed and must be performed. It is my purpose to continue to apply my most vigorous efforts to all these needs and I will earnestly seek the cooperation of the House regarding these additional authorizations and appropriations. These many projects and required public works will certainly have my constant and unflagging attention.

It is true that the local communities and the States in the exercise of their primary responsibilities over streams and waterways will undertake a portion of this work. But a considerable portion of it lies beyond their resources and much of it falls under authority of current Federal mandates already given by the Congress. In the event that some of the projects are completed by State and local governments—many have been—there is still a very wide area for the implementation of the general, overall surveys in river basins and the efficient coordination of this work with soil erosion and soil utilization, antipollution, recreational uses, improvement of public water supplies and other projects looking toward the fuller control and utilization of water resources.

For these reasons, the Congress must and will, I am sure, continue its interest and very substantial support of these objectives by Federal planning and grants for the actual work. I think that we must take a broad, long-range view, not only of the more urgent, immediate needs, but also of the many desirable objectives of community development, area and regional development by the States under the overall guidance of the Federal Government, which will so manifestly promote increased prosperity, economic and social advancement as well as greater safety against disasters of the Nation as a whole.

While we can all feel a real sense of satisfaction with our progress to date, there are still serious and difficult problems to be solved, which will call, not only for steadily expanding operations by the Corps of Engineers, but also require for their solution the adoption of a suitable plan for disaster and flood insurance.

I think such a plan is of the utmost importance. On several occasions I have elaborated my views respecting disaster and flood insurance before the House, and before committees of both branches of the Congress. I do not wish to go into the matter extensively here, but by way of emphasizing this reference to the question, I would most respectfully suggest and urge that our House committee continue to give its diligent attention to pending bills including my own, providing for disaster insurance, and particularly flood insurance, and exert every effort to consider, and if deemed desirable, which I hope it will be, to broaden and extend the measure already adopted by the other body, in any event to report some suitable bill at a very early date.

Before I conclude, I am very anxious also, as chairman of the Massachusetts delegation flood committee, to extend my

sincere and deep thanks to the press and its representatives in my district and State and, in fact, in many other places, for their very valuable assistance in presenting our urgent needs arising out of the terrible floods to the people. This warm interest and wide coverage on the part of the press of the disaster, its aftermath and the emergency character of the need for relief, rehabilitation, and permanent protection has been one of the truly effective instrumentalities contributing greatly to the results achieved up to this time.

Let me say to you, my friends and colleagues, that I will ever be grateful for your many expressions of sympathy for my stricken people, for your warm interest and your whole-hearted cooperation and for your most helpful efforts which have brought the power and resources of our great Federal Government in such substantial degree to the assistance of so many distressed peoples and communities and which are bringing the reality of complete protection against such disasters closer day by day. If we but continue this vital work, many lasting benefits are bound to flow from it and our entire Nation—its well-being and welfare—will be the better for what this Congress has done and will do in the time ahead.

Control of floods in Massachusetts, particularly in the Worcester County area, is a step nearer reality today with House action on the flood-control appropriation bill.

The engineers asked for $340,000 for the beginning of construction work on the East Brimfield Dam and Reservoir during the fiscal year 1956–57, which starts July 1. The committee increased this amount by one-half million to $840,000.

In addition, the committee advanced flood control in the Blackstone Basin by providing $100,000 in planning funds subject to State concurrence for the West Hill Dam and Reservoir on the West River below Upton.

The committee's action is almost unprecedented in approving the West Hill planning funds because of a standing congressional rule of not providing Federal funds for projects which lack State concurrence or approval. In addition, the engineers in testimony before the Appropriations Committee indicated that inclusion of West Hill in this year's budget would tax the ability of the Corps to do the planning work because of the heavy workload involved by other New England projects.

A public hearing has been called for May 24 in Upton by the Massachusetts Department of Commerce on the West Hill project. The department in turn submits recommendations to the Governor, who concurs or withholds approval of Federal flood-control projects in the State.

Following is a breakdown of the $4½ million Federal allocations for central Massachusetts:

East Brimfield, $840,000; Hodges Village, $360,000; Buffumville, $1,200,000; Barre Falls, $1,150,000; and Worcester diversion, $840,000; all construction projects.

West Hill, $100,000, for the preparation of engineering plans and specifications.

Blackstone Basin, $10,000 for a continuing survey at a total cost of $40,000. Last year $20,000 was provided to begin the survey.

The Massachusetts delegation urged the Appropriations Committee to provide planning funds for the Westville project near Southbridge. The engineers, however, placed a higher priority on the East Brimfield project, also designed to protect Southbridge, because that construction will cut down on the difficulties of building Westville, since a cofferdam will not have to be built at the Westville site.

The Buffumville project is located on the Little River in Charlton about 5 miles above Webster. The engineers have set June 1958 as the target date of the $2,820,000 job, all of which will be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking.

Closure of the rolled-earth fill-type dam, which will be 66 feet high and 3,255 feet long upon completion, will take place in May, 1957, when the Little waters will begin to be impounded in the reservoir area. A 220-foot concrete spillway for overflow will be provided.

Land acquisitions for the reservoir will not be completed until June, 1958, under present engineer estimates. Upon completion, the reservoir will permit permanent storage of 1,400 acre-feet of water behind the dam, which amount can be raised to 12,700 acre-feet in time of heavy rains, an increase of 11,300 acre-feet over the reservoir's normal storage.

Hodges Village, to be completed in February, 1959, will cost $4,350,000, all in Federal funds, including land taking costs. It is on the French River in Oxford about 6 miles above Webster. The dam, with height of 55 feet, running 1,140 feet along its length, will be closed in May 1958. The entire project will be completed in February, 1959, under present engineer estimates.

Land acquisitions for the reservoir will not be completed until November 1958. Upon completion, the reservoir will provide a water storage area of 13,000 acre-feet in time of heavy rains.

Buffumville and Hodges Village are 2 of 7 flood control projects authorized by Congress in the Thames Basin. Only one has been built, the Mansfield Hollow Dam, above Willimantic, Conn. This year, construction will start on Buffumville, Hodges Village, and East Brimfield. The latter project is located on the Quinebaug River in Sturbridge and is designed to furnish flood protection for Southbridge.

With the $100,000 provided by Congress in February in a supplemental appropriation for Buffumville, the engineers plan the following work:

Initiation of road relocation, $89,500; engineering and design, $1,000; supervision and administration, $9,500.

Beginning July 1 the $1,200,000 appropriation for the project will be used for the following work:

Land acquisition, $150,000; relocate pipeline and utility, $53,200; continuation of road relocation, $150,800; initiate construction of outlet works and dam, $739,000; engineering and design, $15,400; supervision and administration, $91,600.

The $360,000 appropriation for Hodges Village will be used for:

Initiation of railroad relocation, $179,000; engineering and design, $152,500; supervision and administration, $28,500.

WARE RIVER JOB

The completion date for the Barre Falls project is November 1957. It is located on the Ware River in Barre and will cost $2,680,000, all of which will be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking.

Closure of the earth and rock fill dam, which will be 62 feet high and 885 feet long, is scheduled for August 1957, when the Ware waters will begin to be impounded in the reservoir area. A concrete weir and chute-type spillway, capable of discharging water at the rate of 16,300 cubic feet per second, will be provided in the construction.

Land acquisitions for the reservoir are expected to be completed this month, under present engineer estimates. Upon completion, the reservoir will provide 24,300 acre-feet of water storage in time of heavy rains.

The Barre Falls project is designed to protect Ware, Three Rivers, and downstream points on the Chicopee River as it flows into the Connecticut.

With the $300,000 provided by Congress in February in a supplemental appropriation for Barre Falls, the engineers plan the following work:

Land acquisition in reservoir area, $2,000; initiation of construction of the outlet works of the dam, an access road and utility buildings, $271,000; engineering and design, $4,000; supervision and administration, $23,000.

Beginning July 1, the $1,150,000 appropriation for the project will be used for the following work:

Road relocation, $25,100; reservoir clearing, $30,000; continuation of dam construction, $986,400; permanent operating equipment, $1,500; engineering and design, $10,000; supervision and administration, $97,000.

The West Hill project is located on the West River above Uxbridge. Its estimated cost is $2,730,000, all of which would be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking. The proposed reservoir would control a 28 square-mile drainage area and would have a storage capacity of 11,900 acre-feet. It would provide a high degree of protection to points on the lower West River and would have considerable flood-reducing effect at downstream points on the Blackstone.

The East Brimfield project, which has June 1959 as the target date for completion, will cost about $5,700,000. It is located on the Quinebaug in Sturbridge. All costs will be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking.

Closure of the earthen fill type dam, which will be 55 feet high and 510 feet long upon completion, will take place in August 1958, when the Quinebaug waters will begin to be impounded in the reservoir area. A 140-foot concrete spillway

for overflow will be provided. Land acquisitions for the reservoir will not be completed until June 1959, under present engineer estimates.

Upon completion, the reservoir will permit permanent storage of 1,200 acre-feet of water behind the dam, which amount can be raised to 30,000 acre-feet in time of heavy rains, an increase of 28,800 acre-feet over the reservoir's normal storage.

The East Brimfield project is 1 of 7 flood-control dams authorized by Congress in the Thames Basin. Only one has been built, the Mansfield Hollow Dam, above Willimantic, Conn. This year, construction will start on three others in the basin: East Brimfield, Hodges Village Dam in Oxford and Buffumville Dam in Charlton. The latter two projects will provide flood protection for Webster.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, the city of St. Louis is the only metropolitan city on the Missouri or Mississippi Rivers that lacks adequate flood control protection. Four times within the last decade my city has been visited by disastrous floods. The last was the Kansas-Missouri flood of 1951 which resulted in losses exceeding a billion dollars. During the last session of the Congress a bill was passed authorizing $130 million for a project to control the floods in and around St. Louis. That bill was passed unanimously. There was not a vote against it.

In the current appropriation bill there is an item on page 13—and I call the attention of the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee to it—for the planning of this flood control project in the amount of $551,000. The total cost of the planning work will be $1.2 million. Actually this is about $649,000 short of the total cost. If the Bureau of the Budget could be persuaded to submit a supplemental request for an additional $649,000 to complete these plans, I wonder if the committee would look with favor on that request.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's inquiry on the item for St. Louis flood protection, the budget estimate was $551,000, with which it is proposed to protect an area of something like one-third of a million acres and 600 business firms and business enterprises against destructive floods, and particularly in view of the imperative nature of the menace of the situation I will say that the committee will be glad to consider any further estimates the Bureau of the Budget may send up. As a matter of fact, such estimates would be not only imperative, but mandatory.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to yield to the ranking minority member if he would care to comment on that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not going to be in a position to say whether I, as an individual Member, would look with favor on any proposition until it has been submitted to the committee. It would be giving a blank check, and, as I have said very frequently on this floor with respect to appropriations, I do not favor that.

Mr. KARSTEN. I might say to the gentleman that he has already committed himself to $551,000 and I was wondering if he would be willing to go the rest of the way.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not in a position to make that kind of commitment without knowing all of the facts.

Mr. KARSTEN. The fact of the matter is the Committee on Appropriations has, in this bill, committed itself to providing funds for the planning of the St. Louis flood wall. Funds for only half of the flood wall are of no value in preventing a flood. It would appear to be uneconomical to plan a flood wall on a piecemeal basis. It would seem a more desirable procedure for the Bureau of the Budget to request sufficient funds to complete all of the planning work within the next year in order that the construction work can be started.

As the chairman of the committee has indicated he will be glad to consider other estimates which might be sent up by the Bureau of the Budget, I propose to ask the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to review the matter to see if a supplemental request could be submitted for $649,000 which is the balance that will be needed to complete the plans for the flood wall. If the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers can be persuaded to do this, I hope the request will receive favorable consideration by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the whip of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, this bill as brought to you today by the House Committee on Appropriations, contains $500,000 to begin construction of a tremendously important project to Oklahoma and Arkansas—the Eufaula Dam. It contains a like amount for the very important sister project—the Dardanelle project in Arkansas.

The Eufaula Dam, which is a key unit in the comprehensive Arkansas Basin development program, would be on the Canadian River 27 miles above the confluence of the Canadian and the Arkansas. Because of the great silt-retention capacity it would have, the Eufaula Dam is an essential element in the development of the Arkansas River for navigation purposes.

You perhaps recall that Congress voted $450,000 last year to complete engineering plans and to make a start on construction of Eufaula. Thus far this administration has seen fit to impound these funds so that there has been no construction at all. It is my opinion that in this case the executive set itself above the expressed legislative will of Congress; and, in my opinion, the executive branch exceeded the authority it has under the Constitution. We have reason to believe if Congress again acts in this matter, the executive will allow the Corps of Engineers to proceed with construction.

I regret that the committee did not see fit to provide more than $500,000 for Eufaula in the next fiscal year. I think more money might be spent wisely on this project in the next 12 months. However, I am going to accept the committee's figure because I am so anxious to get this program started that I don't want to quibble over the amount.

Since an element of controversy has been introduced in connection with construction of this dam, I would like for a moment to review its history.

It was authorized by Congress in 1946. The improvement plan provides for flood control, hydroelectric power, and sediment control. This is one of those rare projects that can be justified even under the policy of this administration regarding hydroelectric-power dams.

The concrete and earth-filled dams will be 3,180 feet long and will rise 112 feet above the streambed. The reservoir will have a storage capacity of 1,428,000 acre-feet for flood control; 1,379,000 acre-feet for the generation of power; and it will provide a permanent pool of 897,000 acre-feet for sedimentation reserve, recreation, and preservation of wildlife, a total of 3,074,000 acre-feet. The estimated cost of the project is $153 million. It will take about 6 years to complete.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said before, the Arkansas is the last great river basin in the United States which has not been developed. We in Oklahoma and Arkansas are proud of the great developments along other major streams in this country—the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Columbia, and many others. We feel that the time has arrived and is even overdue when the 4 million citizens of the great States of Arkansas and Oklahoma should begin to enjoy the fruits of river development.

This is a region blessed with tremendous resources, many of them as yet untapped. The greatest coal reserve in the midcontinental area of the United States is the Arkansas Basin. Some of the greatest oil- and gasfields in the world are in this area.

One of the chief deterrents to development of these resources to date has been the high cost of transportation. When the Arkansas River is open to navigation, I foresee the dawn of a new day for those who live in this area. Our people then will be in a far stronger competitive position; our area will be far more attractive to great and expanding industries.

Eufaula Dam will help meet the growing requirements for electricity in this area; it will help meet the ever-increasing demands for water for industrial and municipal purposes. It will help control the floods that almost every year exact a heavy toll from farmers and others who have property along the banks of the Canadian River.

Finally, some of the great defense establishments of our country are located in the valley of the Arkansas and its tributaries. Development of this basin will

be an investment in the security of our country, and in the security of the free world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my gratification over the inclusion of items for the Dardanelle and Eufaula Dams in the pending bill. As part of the comprehensive development plan for the Arkansas Basin, the Appropriations Committee has voted $1 million for the sister projects of Dardanelle and Eufaula. This marks the continuation of congressional policy to promote the multipurpose development of the Arkansas River, a program which received initial approval in the 1946 act authorizing construction. Last year the Congress appropriated $450,000 for Dardanelle in fiscal 1956, and with new funds for 1957 I am confident that the Corps of Engineers will be able to proceed with its construction.

It is only just and right that the last major river in the United States to remain undeveloped is at last to receive its fair attention. The Army engineers' plan for multipurpose utilization of this water resource was authorized 10 years ago. In 1950 there was an appropriation of $1 million to start construction of the Dardanelle Dam, but the Korean conflict intervened and all work on the project was suspended. Some of the $450,000 appropriated last year was used to complete planning, and the Army engineers are ready and able to carry forward the construction work. While under the Budget Bureau's old formula the benefit-cost ratio was impressively favorable; the ratio is still favorable even under the rigid new formula A-47. Thus these projects are a real investment for the United States and will bring the Nation rich dividends in the course of time.

The Dardanelle Reservoir will be located on the Arkansas River about midway between Little Rock and Fort Smith. The project is a major unit of an integrated system to serve navigation, develop hydroelectric power, stabilize river banks, provide flood control, and other related purposes. Hydroelectric power facilities at Dardanelle Dam will consist of 4 units with a total installed capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. The storage capacity would be 495,000 acre-feet, of which 70,000 is for power and 425,000 for navigation. The total estimated cost of the project is $94,600,000. Not only would this money provide these benefits, but it would also contribute to the realization of the vast potentialities of the Arkansas Valley. Such realization will obviously be accelerated by the availability of cheap transportation and electrical energy. Industrial development will be based on utilization of vast quantities of coal, oil, timber, bauxite, and rare minerals in the region. The 4 million people in the Arkansas Valley will then be able to contribute more substantially to the economic prosperity of the Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON], and other members of the committee who have preceded me, have fully covered the major items in the pending public works appropriation bill. This bill carries recommended overall appropriations in the amount of $787,453,000 to speed the work and services of the various agencies for which the funds are needed in the public interest.

It is always stimulating and refreshing to work with the members of the Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee. Service on the Appropriations Committee, at times is taxing and arduous, but it is also rewarding and I would like to take this opportunity to again express my thanks and appreciation to our chairman, Mr. CANNON, and to our subcommittee chairman, Mr. RABAUT, and all of the members of the committee for their kindness and helpfulness. In fact, I should like to commend all members of the subcommittee, in addition to Mr. CANNON and Mr. RABAUT, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the minority members of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

This bill, as reported, carries funds for the management and operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers. This bill can truly be called an all-American measure because of the diversity of the projects included in this appropriation. The public-works development of our Nation will move forward and as a result of the money provided in this bill our country will be made stronger and our national defense strengthened.

Mr. Chairman, having heard the testimony throughout the hearings on this bill, one cannot escape without being impressed with the great public-works program of the Corps of Engineers and other agencies.

Our committee has heard testimony and sympathetically considered projects for all areas of the country—the New England basin, the South Atlantic basin, the upper and lower Mississippi River basins, the Ohio River Basin, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway basin, the Missouri Basin, the Rio Grande and Southwest area, the upper Colorado River Basin, the Columbia River Basin, the Central Valley of California, and, in fact, projects in all areas of our great Nation.

I was particularly impressed with the program to be undertaken in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. The plan there is to dredge a canal from the St. Lawrence River which will extend more than 250 miles into the heartland of our country and connect the great city of Chicago, making it a port city.

In addition, plans are underway to build 32, I repeat 32, hydroelectric power-producing units within this project on the St. Lawrence River, 16 on the American side and 16 on the Canadian side. These are in addition to the 5 major power projects—2 privately owned and 3 Government owned—in this great area.

Similar public works projects are planned in the upper Colorado Basin, the Columbia Basin, in the great Northwest, and in other areas of our country.

In the past the appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a controversial item of the public works appropriation bill. However, this year, the appropriation for this great agency should not be controversial because there is no money included in the appropriation for expansion of TVA's power facilities or steam plants.

Not a dime is included in this bill for new power-producing projects for this agency.

The appropriation further should not be controversial because it is by far the smallest appropriation submitted to Congress in the 23-year history of TVA. The 1957 appropriation of $5,357,000 is 20 percent less than the $27,053,000 appropriated for the current fiscal year. The amount of new funds for fiscal 1957 represents a 77 percent reduction or cut in appropriations for this agency since 1955.

Notwithstanding these cuts and reductions, critics of TVA continue to harass and attempt to curtail TVA's operations.

The critics of TVA say that TVA should stand on its own feet. If there was ever an indication that TVA is standing on its own feet, it is signified in this meager appropriation request. It is a further indication that this agency is being operated in a most efficient and economical manner. As indicated, the budget for TVA for next year does not carry one dime of new money for additional power—for new starts for the system. The funds recommended herein are for navigation, flood control, and general operations—not for power.

The TVA power program is standing on its own feet. It is paying its own way—and it is paying dividends—big dividends into the Treasury. Annual payments into the Treasury through 1957 will have exceeded $285 million. The navigation and flood-control programs of TVA are also paying dividends—in the form of increased river traffic and commerce and the saving of human lives and property.

Yes; the history of TVA is a wonderful story of joint partnership between the people of a vast region and their Government—the Federal Government—a partnership which has combined the industry and ingenuity of the citizens of a great 7-State area into harnessing rivers and streams—working for the betterment of the economic standards of our Nation.

TVA power was used to build the first atomic bomb—there was no place else in the United States prepared and ready to meet the gigantic requirements for the Oak Ridge project. Today, with the atomic and hydrogen age bearing more

heavily on us, TVA is still in the forefront—meeting the defense demands of this Nation with its power supply.

While TVA critics continually harp on TVA's power achievements, little is ever mentioned by these critics of this agency's great flood-control program which has saved millions of acres of valuable farmlands from the upper reaches of the Tennessee River—into the Ohio Valley and to the lower basins of the Mississippi.

Nothing is said of the lives saved by TVA's control of floods which once ripped through the southeast with almost the same consistency as the spring rain.

Little, if anything, is said of the economic benefits derived from improved river traffic and commerce.

Nothing is said of its soil-testing program which has resulted in untold benefits not only to the farmers of the valley but to farmers in more than 20 other States participating in TVA's farm test demonstration programs.

TVA's chemical research aids not only agriculture, but industry as well and the national defense. It should be pointed out that TVA's chemical research and production facilities are an important segment of the national defense program.

During World War II, TVA supplied more than 60 percent of the elemental phosphate used by our Armed Forces.

It delivered for munitions production more than 97,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia and ammonium nitrate and ammonium crystal.

For almost a year during the Korean fighting, TVA supplied the entire elemental phosphorus requirements of the Department of Defense.

Resources development in the area supplements but does not duplicate similar programs of the Department of Agriculture and other areas of Government service.

Included in TVA's resource development program is a great reforestation program, tributary watershed development, topographic mapping and agriculture conservation—the promotion of our Nation's resources.

There is recommended in this bill $1,150,000 for this work—with only $400,000 to be provided by new appropriated money. The amount is small, the return is great.

Efforts are being made to attack this portion of TVA's appropriation on the ground that these services are duplications of programs carried out by the Department of Agriculture. The TVA's resource development program, I repeat, does not duplicate the Department of Agriculture programs.

During hearings on this portion of the bill, our distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. RABAUT, asked Chairman Vogel if there was duplication by the TVA and the Department of Agriculture. Chairman Vogel answered that TVA does work in close cooperation with the Department of Agriculture just as in the field of navigation and flood control TVA works with the Corps of Engineers.

In all cases—

Chairman Vogel testified—

we are trying to bring in local organizations to the maximum extent, utilizing the agencies of the States and the colleges in the region, hoping thereby to develop a sense of local responsibility and hoping that this feeling will be transmitted to adjacent regions. (Public works appropriation hearings for 1957.)

Later, Mr. RABAUT asked Chairman Vogel the specific question:

Does TVA duplicate the work of the Department of Agriculture in this area?

Chairman Vogel replied:

No; I do not think there is any duplication. (TVA hearing, 1956, p. 230.)

Mr. A. J. Wagner, General Manager of TVA, further answered this question when he said:

This activity of TVA in the Tennessee Valley is a kind of activity that is not generally available in the rest of the country. But it does not mean that there are greater Federal expenditures in the Tennessee Valley than there are in the rest of the country as a whole. We have looked into that question and satisfied ourselves about it. So that if the question you had in mind that this is something special in addition resulting in greater total expenditures than in the rest of the country, I believe the answer to that is "No." (Public works appendix, hearings, supra.)

Later in the hearings, Chairman Vogel again testified concerning TVA's cooperation with other agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service and again stated:

I do not believe there is any overlapping of consequence.

As we all know, the President and the Department of Agriculture recently recommended the extensive soil-bank program. Legislation to implement this program has been adopted. The appropriations committee has approved appropriations in excess of $1 billion to finance authorized payments under this program. Embraced within this idea is to take land out of production and plant seedlings. Such a program will require the fullest utilization of TVA seedling production. TVA's seedling nursery is capable of producing 15 million seedlings a year. While the Clinton nursery is in operation, the Muscle Shoals, Ala., plant has been closed for several years because of lack of funds.

This work could greatly augment the soil-bank program because of the definite shortage of seedlings needed for reforestation in taking lands out of production. Commercial nurseries cannot, I am advised, supply the present market—not considering the future demands. This is a vital and needed program and, therefore, should not be curtailed but expanded and continued.

Mr. Chairman, with the reaffirmation of TVA's authority to use needed surplus funds and with approval of the pending bill—modest though it is with new appropriated funds—TVA will be able to continue to contribute to resource development and conservation, promote navigation and flood control of the area and keep step with the needs of vital defense installations dependent upon TVA as an essential source of power supply.

Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that any threatened power shortage will strike at the very foundation of the atomic defenses of our Nation. The atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge is entirely dependent on TVA power. The Atomic Energy Commission installation at Paducah, Ky., requires more than 60 percent of its power from the TVA system. Other defense installations such as the Arnold Air Engineering Development Center in Tennessee, and the great guided missile center at Huntsville, Ala., are also totally dependent on TVA power. More than 60 percent of TVA's power now goes for defense needs and it is reasonable to expect that their needs will be increased by more than 20 percent in the next 2 or 3 years. TVA must keep step with our defense requirements—our national defenses must not be weakened.

When we come to the question of TVA's power demands, all concerned agree that there is a shortage of power. On this there is no dispute.

As the majority report indicates, the TVA's power revenues have provided it with sufficient funds for the construction of such additional units as TVA now requires and balances are available for the construction and acquisition of power assets.

The Congress has directed TVA to pay into the Treasury over a 40-year period the total appropriated funds for power purposes. Through 1955, TVA has paid into the Treasury $127,500,000. Through the current year and 1957, additional payments in the amount of $134 million will have been made. These payments, together with the payment of $24 million into the Treasury prior to the enactment of legislation requiring such repayments, makes a total of $285,500,000, which TVA will have repaid into the Treasury through 1957. This amount is far in excess of the minimum required for annual repayments.

TVA is far ahead of its repayment schedule. It is, therefore, only reasonable and proper that TVA should be permitted to exercise its authority to use its surplus funds after having met its statutory requirements by payments into the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be passed without the repeated criticisms leveled at this great agency.

This bill, I repeat, is an all-American measure and its enactment will go far toward developing our own country and strengthening the defense of our Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the House Appropriations Committee for including a $4,000 appropriation to make a preliminary survey of the Trempealeau River in the 1957 public works appropriations bill before us today. The project, Docket No. 566, was approved by the Corps of Engineers on March 10, 1955, and by the House Public Works Committee on July 14, 1955. Unfortunately, this project was not included by the Bu-

reau of the Budget in the 1957 funds for preliminary surveys.

Before discussing the need for flood-prevention control in the Trempealeau River Valley, I want to touch briefly on the importance of speedy action on completing the preliminary survey. County agents in the area and the erosion control agent of the Wisconsin State Soil Conservation Service have been doing a lot of work in organizing watershed along the creeks flowing into the Trempealeau River. The Corps of Engineers have informed me that, in their preliminary survey, they will consider cooperation by local watershed groups. Since the local groups are being organized or are already organized, once the overall survey is completed, work can go ahead under Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, on the small creeks.

There is a crying need for this proposed flood-control project in the Trempealeau River Valley. Through the years, flood conditions have caused severe, and in several instances, irreparable damage to farms, communities, and other areas in the Trempealeau Valley.

The Army engineers, in approving the review study, has this to say:

> The Trempealeau River, a tributary of the Mississippi River, is located in west central Wisconsin and drains an area of about 630 square miles. The watershed is located in a region that is primarily farming, and includes the communities of Hixton, Taylor, Blair, Whitehall, Independence, Arcadia, and Dodge. The stream has a fall of 330 feet in a distance of 75 miles. There is no existing Federal flood-control project in the basin.

For some time, I have been working with M. W. Torkelson, director of regional planning of the bureau of engineering, State of Wisconsin; Peter Bieri, county agent of Trempealeau County; Antone Chucka, county agent of Jackson County, and with others on compiling damage figures. The Weather Bureau at La Crosse, Wis., in a letter of February 12, 1955, stated that—

> On the average there is a frequency of about three damaging floods in the Trempealeau Valley per year. In the year 1954 there were four damaging floods with an estimated total loss of $438,000.

The dates of these and the damage costs of these disastrous floods are as follows: May 2–5, $118,000; June 20–24, $250,000; July 4, $10,000; October 4, $60,000.

In addition, I have a detailed report compiled by the Trempealeau County Highway Department listing damages to 47 bridges, 7 culverts and 51 roads, at a total cost of $218,992 for the 4 floods of 1954.

For the year 1953, there were 3 major floods, in March, July, and August with a total estimated loss of $35,000. This figure does not include erosion loss which would add greatly to the total figure.

In April 1955, the river again went on a rampage, causing untold damage to homes, business establishments, farmers, livestock, highways, bridges, and railroad and communication lines in the area.

I do not wish to go into a lengthy recital of recent damages, but would like to outline briefly the major effects of the April floods. Final estimates of total damages are not available, but conservative figures run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

At Blair, the dam was damaged, and flood waters inundated farmlands and commercial establishments. Some residents were evacuated from their homes. When the water main supplying the city with water broke, residents were asked to boil drinking water as a precautionary health measure. Estimated flood damage at Blair amounted to $35,000.

At Whitehall, another dam broke and the raging waters flooded highways, farmlands, and homes. Telephone service was interrupted and the community was without mail. Estimated flood damage at Whitehall amounted to $11,000.

Severe flooding of farmlands at Independence caused an estimated flood damage of $10,000.

At Dodge, livestock had to be moved from the lower lands by boat. Estimated flood damage in this community amounted to $25,000. Pigeon Falls reported damages amounting to $7,500.

Arcadia bore the brunt of the flood. In this community, the water was higher than at any time since the disastrous flood of 1919. More than 20 blocks in the business and residential area were under water at the height of the flood and the community was under 3½ feet of water in some spots. The National Guard was called out to assist in sandbagging operations, but floodwaters broke through in the early hours of April 4. A 400-foot bridge was wiped out and railroad service was halted. Total damage at Arcadia is estimated at $105,000, according to figures sent me by Peter Bieri, Trempealeau County agent. This is in addition to $50,000 estimated cost to repair railroad tracks.

The county agent has set a figure of $10,000 as estimated damage to rural areas along the river in Trempealeau County.

In my home county, Jackson County, the village of Hixton suffered the greatest damage. The village clerk has estimated damage to property owners in the area amounted to almost $16,000 while farmers in the area reported damages of about $2,000. The community of York, according to Jackson County Agricultural Agent A. J. Chucka, suffered damages of over $1,000.

The above figures cannot begin to cover the loss in terms of topsoil; nor can they speak for the misery and heartache suffered by those in the river basin. Observers present on the scene commented: "A complete watershed soil conservation program could have prevented all this."

I am able to cite facts and figures on floods back as far as 1919, when two lumberyards were nearly demolished and thousands of dollars of damage was suffered by homeowners and businessmen in the city of Arcadia. But I believe I have presented enough evidence to show the tragic conditions resulting from the Trempealeau River floods over the years.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the passage of H. R. 11319.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to in general commend the Appropriations Committee for its work on H. R. 11319. They put in many long hours considering the almost countless projects presented and deserve the gratitude of us all. I was disappointed, however, to note that in final form the legislation omits a provision of some $250,000 for Mathews Canyon Reservoir contained in the budget for fiscal year 1957. This sum was for the purpose of constructing an access road and acquisition of lands at the dam site of what is known as the Mathews Canyon Reservoir in southern Nevada. This reservoir together with Pine Canyon Reservoir comprises an overall plan for flood control for Meadow Valley Wash and its tributaries in southeastern Nevada. Construction of this project would provide protection to many miles of the main line of the Union Pacific Railroad, to numerous miles of county roads along narrow canyons, much of the town of Caliente, Nev., and an important national highway going through this region.

Reoccurring floods in the past have caused considerable damage and impeded traffic. At one time, the railroad traffic was interrupted for more than 6 months as a result of flood damage.

I am informed that the Mathews project appropriation was excluded because the principal beneficiary would be the Union Pacific Railroad. This seems to me to be an inadequate excuse for removing this project from the recommendations of the executive branch. It is true that the Union Pacific will benefit, but benefits will, also, flow to the city of Caliente, one whose primary industries for many years has been the railroad passing through this area.

Mr. Chairman, is the town of Caliente to be penalized because one of its major industries is a railroad? Are the floods to be permitted to continue threatening both life and property merely because there is not a greater variety of economic activity in this region? Is the State to be discriminated against merely because a substantial part of the benefits will flow to a transportation system instead of to large industrial or farm areas?

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the committee has erred in omitting this worthwhile project and I am hopeful that this item will be restored as presented by the executive branch when considered by the other body.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is a severe disappointment to the people of southeastern Ohio that the public-works appropriations bill does not contain provisions for the resumption of the construction of the Dillon Dam in Ohio. I share this disappointment since I am convinced that this project is sound and

that it is urgently needed if the Muskingum River Valley is to obtain the flood-control benefits it requires and the Ohio Basin is to be spared the devastation wrought in flood periods by the waters of this major tributary.

For many years, the Congress has heard discussions of this worthy project and has already appropriated sums aggregating nearly $9 million for the construction of this dam. Today, the Dillon Dam stands one-third completed. Flood control, however, cannot be obtained from an uncompleted dam. The uselessness of such a considerable expenditure has been called to the attention of each member of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Earlier this year, I wrote to each Member providing copies of a special brochure prepared by the Zanesville (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the McConnelsville and Marietta Chambers of Commerce. This excellent publication outlined the urgency of the flood-control problem in the Muskingum Valley and presented technical and statistical information obtained from the United States Corps of Engineers.

I wish to point out that the Corps of Engineers regards this project as entirely meritorious and necessary for the control of floods in the Muskingum and Ohio River Basins. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, has stated that "Dillon Reservoir is necessary for the adequate control of Muskingum River floods" and the engineers have indicated their belief that the Dillon project is "one of the higher priority ones for completion."

I also wish to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives that after a careful evaluation of all factors involved, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has endorsed the Dillon project, placing it in its first classification. In taking this action, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress stated its conviction that "the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the public interest."

The Dillon Dam also has the support of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association. In a recent letter Mr. William J. Hull, chairman of this association's legislative committee stated, "This association has, of course, included the important Dillon Reservoir in its program. While we did not specify in our presentation to the Bureau of the Budget the amount which we believe needed for the Dillon Reservoir in fiscal 1957, we do expect to recommend an appropriation of $2,500,000 on that project for that fiscal year when we present our program to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees."

Within the past several months, it has been gratifying to me to read in the Cleveland Plain Dealer a series of articles ably and carefully analyzing the technical aspects of the Dillon project, the use to which it would be put, and such arguments as have been advanced against it. Following the publication of this series, the Plain Dealer on Saturday, April 14, published a strong editorial urging the completion of the dam. Summarizing its findings, the newspaper stated, "The public interest, in the largest sense would be served by the completion of Dillon Dam. But whatever the decision, something should be decided and decided now. Further dallying only threatens to make the major investment to date quite useless."

So that there may be no question as to what is involved here, I want to provide a brief statement outlining the background, present status, and future needs of this project.

The Dillon Dam and Reservoir project, authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, provides for the construction of an earth-fill dam on the Licking River 5.8 miles above the confluence of the Licking and Muskingum Rivers at Zanesville, Ohio. Its chief purpose is for urgently needed flood control. The maximum height of the dam will be 118 feet with a top length of 1,350 feet. An uncontrolled concrete-lined spillway will be provided in the left abutment and the outlet works will consist of two gate-controlled conduits near the right abutment. Four dikes will need to be constructed for the reservoir. The project also includes the relocation of 19.5 miles of tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, 12.2 miles of highways, 32.7 miles of powerlines, 17.2 miles of pipelines, and 34.2 miles of telephone and telegraph lines. It also includes the relocation of 360 graves and the acquisition of 15,180 acres of land.

The estimated cost of the entire project is $28,800,000, of which $8,825,300, or nearly $9 million, has been appropriated thus far. No additional funds are required for further planning—all that has been done. The Corps of Engineers has now estimated that it could profitably utilize $2,600,000 during the first fiscal year in which construction is resumed.

This sum would provide for the construction of track work and appurtenances on the relocated alinement for the railroad. The grading work was all completed prior to suspension of work during the Korean emergency. All preconstruction planning has been completed and contract for the track work could be awarded in August 1956. The recommended funds would also provide for land acquisition and utility and county road relocations, thereby permitting initiation of actual construction of the dam early in the fiscal year 1958. Relocation of State highways could also be initiated in fiscal year 1958 and the entire project could be completed during the fiscal year 1960.

According to information I have received, the funds would be applied as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Continued land acquisition | $190,000 |
| Continued county road relocation | 30,000 |
| Initiate and complete track work and appurtenances, Baltimore and Ohio RR relocation | 2,045,000 |
| Continued utility relocations | 60,000 |
| Engineering and design | 105,000 |
| Supervision and administration | 170,000 |
| Total | 2,600,000 |

This project will serve as an essential supplement to the 14 existing reservoirs in the Muskingum River basin and a meritorious unit in the system of reservoirs for reduction of floods on the Ohio River. The reservoir will control approximately 29 percent of the presently uncontrolled area above the highly industrialized city of Zanesville, Ohio. It will greatly decrease the hazards of heavy damage from extreme floods that still exist in the Muskingum River Valley. The benefits to be obtained will accrue largely along the Muskingum River below the mouth of the Licking River, including the cities of Zanesville, McConnelsville, and Marietta, Ohio. Zanesville, with a 1950 population of 40,517, has many varied industries and manufacturing plants including iron and steel and products thereof, chemical, and electrical equipment. The area below Zanesville includes two large steam electric plants—Philo, capacity 500,000 kilowatts and Muskingum River, 400,000 kilowatts—and expanding chemical and industrial developments.

In addition, benefits will be provided by the project to the rapidly expanding industrial developments, cities and towns, valuable farmlands, and railroads and highways along the Ohio River from Marietta, Ohio, to Cairo, Ill. A new unit of the Carbide & Carbon Chemical Corp. was recently completed on the Ohio River bank immediately below Marietta. Large steam electric plants were also recently completed on the Ohio River, at Graham Station, W. Va., about 50 miles below Marietta and at Cheshire, Ohio, to provide power for the Atomic Energy Commission's Portmouth, Ohio, project. Benefits will also accrue to the project by operation of the conservation pool to provide increased low-water flow during dry periods.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated the benefit-cost ratio to be 1.31 to 1 as of July 1955. The Corps has also estimated the average annual benefit from the project at $1,570,000 broken down as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Flood control | $1,464,000 |
| Conservation and public use | 61,500 |
| Water supply and sanitation | 40,500 |
| Navigation | 4,000 |
| Total | 1,570,000 |

However, considering the funds already expended as of no benefit until completion of the project, the cost-benefit ratio on the funds yet needed would be 1.83 to 1.0. Even if we were to consider the entire project as a whole as though no work had already been done, the benefit-to-cost ratio would be 1.31 to 1.

There are 104 projects with flood control benefits in the 1957 budget request. For five of them no benefit-to-cost ratio has been determined. However, 70 of the other 99 have a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than 1.83 to 1, and 30 projects have a ratio of less than 1.31 to 1. Therefore, as it has been pointed out, even if the immeasurable element of human misery is not considered, the Dillon Dam's relative economic benefits still justify its completion.

Additional data has been provided by the Corps of Engineers as follows:

As presently planned, a permanent conservation pool will be maintained at elevation 734 mean sea level, extending up Lick-

ing River 10.3 miles, with a surface area of 1,500 acres. The volume of this conservation pool is 15,000 acre-feet. The net storage of 279,000 acre-feet which is available between the conservation pool and the spillway crest elevation 790 mean sea level, is required for flood control.

Curves showing the frequency of filling of Dillon Reservoir have been prepared and the following tabulation lists pool elevation versus frequency of occurrence for various pool elevations in the reservoir:

| Pool elevation, feet, mean sea level: | *Frequency years* |
|---|---|
| 734 | Permanent pool |
| 750 | 2 |
| 765 | 10 |
| 780 | 57 |

Of the estimated 800 tracts of land required for the project, 131 tracts have been acquired consisting of 3,921 acres acquired in fee, and 531 acres for which flowage easements have been obtained. There remains an estimated 1,730 acres to be acquired in fee and 4,924 acres on which it is contemplated that flowage easements be secured. An estimate made in 1947 indicated that approximately 1,200 people would be displaced as a result of the construction of the dam.

The bridge, superstructure, and railroad steel which was purchased in connection with the relocation work prior to suspension of the project is still in storage. The small steel is stored in a depot in Marietta; the big steel is stored in Zanesville.

In explanation of the part the Dillon Dam will play in the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Muskingum Valley, the engineers have furnished the following information:

The communities along the Muskingum River from Zanesville to Marietta, although protected to a considerable degree by the 14 existing reservoirs, remain subject to a flood hazard because of the large uncontrolled watershed area and the possibility of a flood on the Licking River. The uncontrolled drainage area above Zanesville, including the 780 square miles of the watershed of the Licking River, is 2,572 square miles, or 37.6 percent of the total area above Zanesville. Although the existing reservoirs are adequate to reduce all but major floods on the Muskingum River below damage stage at the more important communities upstream from the influence of backwater from the Ohio River floods, heavy damage will result from extreme floods until additional protection is provided.

It is estimated that the present average frequency of damaging floods at Zanesville, as modified by the existing reservoirs is equivalent to one occurrence in 10 years and that if the Dillon Reservoir were constructed this frequency could be reduced to one recurrence in 50 years. Should a flood equivalent to that of the maximum of record (March 1913) occur, it is estimated that the crest at Zanesville as modified by the 14 existing reservoirs could be reduced by the operation of the Dillon Reservoir an additional 4 feet, or from a stage of 37.8 feet to 33.8 feet. Flood stage at Zanesville is 28 feet. Flood reductions along the Ohio River would be significant during major floods. During a flood equivalent to that of 1913, the Dillon Reservoir could hold out a peak flow of 32,000 cubic feet per second at the dam site and an average flow of 11,300 cubic feet per second during a period of 3 days before and 3 days after the Ohio River crested at the mouth of the Muskingum River. These estimates of holdout flow are considered conservative, in that they were made on the assumption that a bankfull stage of 7,000 cubic feet per second would be maintained at the proposed Dillon Dam during flood periods.



Since the authorization of the Dillon Dam several floods have occurred which might have been controlled and their damaging effects greatly reduced, had the Dillon Dam been completed. In 1952 such a flood poured into the Muskingum Valley largely from the uncontrolled Licking River. Some persons opposed to the dam have charged that this flood was caused by the faulty or careless operation of such dams as already exist in other parts of the Muskingum watershed area. Gen. E. C. Itschner explained what occurred and what might have been prevented:

The flood on the Muskingum River in January 1952 was caused, not by incorrect operation of the reservoirs in the Muskingum River Basin, but by heavy rainfall on areas not controlled by dams. The areas of the upper Muskingum below the dams and the watershed of the Licking River are completely uncontrolled. The reservoirs were operated so as to produce the greatest possible reduction consistent with the requirement that the corps be prepared for the maximum possible flood. This requirement prevents some storage in the early stages of a flood and limits the reduction of moderate floods, while producing the greatest possible effect on more severe floods. The total runoff stored during the flood of 1952 by the 14-reservoir system amounted to 423,485 acre-feet or approximately 70 percent of the total storm runoff from the controlled drainage area, thereby reducing the flood stage at Zanesville by 2.7 feet. Since the heaviest rainfall occurred on the uncontrolled areas nearest to Zanesville, only limited reduction of the crest stage at Zanesville was possible. The area on the Licking River that would be controlled by Dillon Reservoir was subjected to the heaviest rainfall. Control of this area would have completely prevented any flood at Zanesville and below on the Muskingum River upstream of Ohio River backwater.

Operation of the Muskingum reservoir system was initiated promptly in accordance with standard operation procedure as soon as it became apparent that high stages would prevail at downstream points. The storage of virtually all runoff from the controlled areas indicates that there was no tardiness in effecting operation. A review of the reservoir operations confirms efficient operation.

Certain other questions have arisen which have been fully explained in testimony before the Congress during the past decade. One deals with the suggestion that the flood-control problem in this case might be more effectively dealt with if a series of smaller dams were constructed on streams tributary to the Licking. Such a plan has been fully explored by the Corps of Engineers. This study leads to the conclusion that the plan would require a greater Federal expenditure, would take more land, and dislocate many more families than the single larger dam.

Another issue in the past has raised the fear that if the Dillon Dam were built, the city of Newark, upstream on the Licking River, might be flooded. Dealing with this question, a spokesman for the Corps of Engineers has stated:

That simply is not a fact. The elevation of the river at the approach to this dam was determined by levels, and it was actually determined and even if we assume that at some future date there will be a flood in the Licking River 25 percent in excess of what has ever occurred in the records of the river, the water would still lack something like one and a half miles of reaching the city of Newark.

Some apprehension has arisen that 10,500 acres of agricultural and other lands might be taken out of farm production as a result of this project. In explanation of the baseless character of this fear, the engineers have provided the following information:

Actually there will be really taken out of cultivation only 1,500 acres. The remainder of the acreage up to the spillway level will be affected only intermittently, and if the experience in the Miami Conservancy District, or in the remaining dams in the Muskingum Conservancy District, is any criteria, only a small percentage of the acreage will be covered. In fact in the 14 reservoirs the United States does not own much of the land within the reservoir area; there is only an easement to flood at certain irregular and unknown periods; and for that easement and for the damage which might result from such floods the proper owner has been paid in the form of an easement agreement; so that the permanent area that is taken out of cultivation is 1,500 and not 10,500.

Another question has charged that the city of Zanesville is anxious that the Dillon Reservoir, created so that it might serve as a source of a municipal water supply. In response to this argument, I wish to quote a letter which I received this morning from Mr. W. A. Keslar, president of the Zanesville City Council. The letter is as follows:

MAY 19, 1956.

Hon. JOHN HENDERSON,
*15th District, Ohio,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: You are aware of my interest in the Dillon project on the Licking River near Zanesville.

At various times in the past certain opponents of this flood-control project have said that Zanesville wanted it for future city water supply.

In order that you may advise any interested parties I want to refer you to the fact that on May 8 the people of Zanesville voted a bond issue for $2,500,000 in order that we may improve and enlarge our waterworks. The engineering plans call for taking the water from the Muskingum River and not the Licking River so that for the next hundred years demand for water would not require us to use the Licking River.

Many thanks for your continued efforts to secure funds for this much-needed flood control project.

Very truly yours,

W. A. KESLAR,
*President, Zanesville City Council.*

Mr. Chairman, there has been some local opposition to this project. I had thought that such opposition as had once existed had greatly declined. However, it has become apparent that, while the opposition has diminished, it has not disappeared. It is, however, a vocal and powerful minority, a situation common to any flood control project.

As a result, the Dillon Dam has been subjected to the closest scrutiny over the years—far closer than that accorded virtually any other project now pending. The disclosure of the full facts in the case has always shown the project to be fully justified and necessary. The arguments against it have been shown to be ill-founded or completely unsupportable in view of the facts in the case. Despite the most careful exposition of the facts on many occasions, one still hears some

of these bankrupt arguments repeated with incredible monotony. If such minority opposition were allowed to deter Federal action, there is grave doubt that any flood control projects would ever be authorized or completed. Proponents of Dillon wish only that the project be considered entirely on the basis of need, the benefits it would bring, and the favorable benefit to cost ratio.

I must state in all respect, that the failure of the Congress to provide the funds needed for the Dillon Dam has caused dismay and consternation to the people of southeastern Ohio. Residents of the Muskingum Valley find it difficult to believe that there is an intention to abandon such a valuable project. I share their consternation. However, I am positive that there is no intention on the part of the Federal Government to turn its back on either the recognition it has already given of the necessity for the project or the $9 million it has already spent at the Dillon site.

The long delay in resuming construction of the dam which was suspended during the Korean emergency is a source of great and continuing concern to me. In this my feeling is shared by both of our Ohio Senators as well as the Governor of our State. These eminent spokesmen for the people of Ohio have taken strong and unequivocal positions in urging that the Dillon project be completed without further delay.

The Corps of Engineers clearly put the people of the Muskingum Valley on notice that flood control is impossible unless the Dillon Dam is completed. Already this year there have been threats of floods from the uncontrolled Licking River. It is, therefore, not difficult to understand the impatience which the potential flood victims feel, particularly when in the course of normal weather, disaster might strike at any time and particularly when the means for preventing such an occurrence has been so clearly defined and approved many years ago by the Congress.

It is my most earnest hope that the Muskingum Valley will be spared the havoc of floods until the Dillon Dam can be completed and the rampaging waters of the Licking River brought under control. I must state in all sincerity that the responsibility for failure to finish this dam could prove to be a heavy one.

I have received petitions containing the names of thousands of Muskingum Valley residents urging that favorable action be taken in the Congress. Many letters from community leaders have also been received. Some of these letters are as follows:

THE GREINER DAIRY CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 30, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As you know, much interest has again been shown the Dillon Dam project near Zanesville. You are familiar with all the details. You are also probably familiar with the fact that about 15 years ago some 15 dams were constructed to control the Muskingum River and its tributaries. This has meant much to Zanesville, and we have not had the great floods that threatened our community heretofore. However, after heavy rains, the Licking River still rampages and causes much damage to Zanesville. For this reason, I urge you to make every effort to have funds allocated to complete this project, which, of course, was started several years ago.

Very truly yours,
EUGENE C. GREINER, Sr.

---

DUTRO BROS.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In regard to the Dillon Dam. We have been here in business for 11 years and have been washed out 3 times. We feel as though we have paid taxes long enough here—and as the Dillon Dam project already has been started, we feel as though our money has been wasted, it costs a lot of money and hardship on everyone in this locality every time it floods, which doesn't take too much rain. We are threatened again this spring—please help us. Our money we have paid for taxes is being wasted if the project is not finished.

Yours truly,
DUTRO BROS.

---

OXFORD OIL CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We urge you to support additional appropriations to cover the completion of the Dillon Dam above Zanesville, Ohio.

It seems to us only common sense to protect the investment already made in this project.

Very truly yours,
J. W. STRAKER, *Vice President.*

---

THE UNITED FUND OF ZANESVILLE AND MUSKINGUM COUNTY, INC.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 30, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR Mr. HENDERSON: We in Zanesville as a community are very much interested in seeing enough money appropriated by your Congress to start work again on the Dillon Dam project.

The same principle is certainly involved in this delayed project as applied to all of the other Muskingum conservancy dams, and a great many communities, including Zanesville, will benefit by this work being reactivated.

Having spent most of my 60-plus years in Muskingum County, I feel that this Zanesville protection is a "must" at some early date.

Thanks for your cooperation and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
E. ROYAL CRAWMER,
*Executive Director.*

---

MARCH 30, 1956.

JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am taking this means to thank you for the support given in reawakening interest in the ultimate completion of the Dillon Dam.

I urge you to continue with your efforts to have funds allocated for the completion of this most vital project.

Very truly yours,
R. E. EMERY,
ZANESVILLE, OHIO.

---

THE ZANESVILLE STONEWARE CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*Old House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: Here in Zanesville we are very much concerned over the reluctance of Congress to place in the appropriations bill a reasonable sum for the reactivation of the Dillon Dam flood-control project on the Licking River.

This writer well remembers the disastrous 1913 flood in Zanesville. Although this plant is on high ground and the flood waters of 1913 did not reach it, the company was out of business for over a month following that flood and suffered that year a manufacturing loss. The plant was first open to refugees from the flooded areas and later was the barracks for National Guard troops sent into the area. We don't want anything like that to happen again.

It seems to a businessman unjustifiably wasteful to allow approximately $8 million of work to be gradually washed away down the Muskingum Valley. In my estimation, if the advice of the Army engineers is accurate, and if there was basis for the approval of the project originally, there is every reason for this Congress to fulfill an obligation of the United States Government to complete this Dillon Dam.

In all progress there is some opposition, but it is the good of the majority which should prevail.

Very truly yours,
V. B. LINN.

---

BONIFIELD HARDWARE CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In the interest of flood control for the city of Zanesville and the entire Muskingum Valley, I sincerely would appreciate your support in seeing that funds are allocated for the Dillon Dam project as authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1938.

Yours sincerely,
J. W. BONIFIELD, Jr.

---

ROYAL CLEANING CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: A note to express our interest in future work on Dillon Dam.

We wish to urge you to your best efforts to obtain the proper allocation of funds for the completion of the Dillon Dam project.

Sincerely,
E. E. TALLEY, *President.*

---

MUTUAL FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION OF ZANESVILLE,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We in this community appreciate the sympathetic interest you have so far shown in the completion of the Dillon Dam project. We want to urge upon you that the matter be pressed to a successful conclusion when it comes up shortly for decision.

As designed by the Government engineers when the Muskingum watershed flood-control plan was conceived, location of a dam on the Licking River, to be known as Dillon Dam, was to play not only an integral but a prime role in accomplishment of the area objectives. Failure of the Congress to provide sufficient funds for completion of the Dillon Dam after it had been started was most unfortunate and wasteful of public funds, not only from the standpoint of ensuing erosion but by increase in subsequent cost. And it has resulted in the watershed conservancy project falling short of realizing the full benefit possible and necessary.

So, whatever impetus you can give the promotion of this most worthy enterprise to

a successful conclusion will earn the lasting gratitude of countless people in the Muskingum River Valley.

Very truly yours,

MYRON BUKER,
*Assistant to the President.*

---

THE CITIZENS NATIONAL BANK,
*Zanesville, Ohio, May 8, 1956.*

Mr. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I want you to know that I personally appreciate very greatly your efforts to rejuvenate the Dillon Dam portion of the Muskingum River flood-control project.

As an active businessman in Zanesville, I feel that the $9 million which have been spent on this project would be a great waste of public funds if it is not continued to the completion of the recommendations of the United States Army engineers, as a control of floodwaters in the Muskingum Watershed. I have been a resident of Zanesville for 25 years and know that there is a definite threat of floods from the Licking River, if Dillon Dam is not completed.

I am thoroughly convinced that the headwaters control is the only reasonable solution to the flood-control program of the United States Government. As a public-works program, this type of conservation of our natural resources will be the most beneficial to the country as a whole.

I sincerely hope for your continued efforts on the Dillon project, and pledge my support to any actions which you take.

Very truly yours,

W. D. MURPHY, *President.*

---

BURNHAM CORP.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I note that a decision will be reached within the next few weeks regarding the future work on the Dillon Dam. We here in Zanesville are vitally interested in the completion of this project. The writer is vitally interested in the completion of the project, because the last time we had a flood in Zanesville the Licking River caused the writer to move from his residence, lose a week's work, and approximately $500 damage to his residence.

Let me urge you to exercise every bit of political power you have to see that funds are allocated for the project.

Also, let me suggest that this letter be shown to the eastern panel of Public Works Subcommittee.

Yours very truly,

L. E. SHRIGLEY,
*Manager, Electric Appliance Department.*

---

THE NATIONAL CASH REGISTER CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It's raining today. I noticed the creek running past my place. It is just ready to go over its banks. This creek runs into the Licking River. The Licking River runs into the Muskingum and the Muskingum runs into the Ohio. Now I also note that all the other creeks are as full as mine which means there will be high water again; which means it will get out of control and many a nice property along the Muskingum will be damaged. We had some nice weather early in March and I noticed that when I went down Route 77 most everyone was out renovating their places but now this is all for naught. All because we do not have a Dillon Dam to control this surplus water.

I was reading the other night that the United States Government plans to build a big dam in Egypt. I for one and many of my friends think it is high time to discontinue this foreign spending and do something at home. Yes, we are believers that charity begins at home.

I was a United States Army Engineer officer in World War I and after the armistice, it was necessary to get a release from various French cities in which and through which our forces had stopped and traveled. We did many unnecessary things such as resurfacing tennis courts, resurfacing bridges over which we had not traveled, renovating cemeteries merely as goodwill builders, but it was my observation we didn't get the goodwill we anticipated and they thought us fools.

I do not care to relive those moments because it stirs up my ulcers but the purpose of this letter is to ask that you put forth your best efforts to secure the necessary funds for the completion of Dillon Dam which is so necessary for the prosperity of this community.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. HEIZMAN, *Branch Manager.*

---

LINE MATERIAL CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: The work that you are doing on the Dillon Dam project is commendable.

As we all know this has been one of those regrettable jobs on which a large amount of money has been spent with no benefits. Completion of the project would seem to be a logical answer whereby benefits would result.

Certainly completion of the Muskingum flood-control program would be realized. Conservation of water alone would be justification for completion.

May I encourage you to continue your efforts.

Very truly yours,

L. L. BLACK.

---

WINSOR'S STEAK HOUSE RESTAURANT,
*South Zanesville, March 29, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Please do something for the appropriation of funds to complete the Dillon Dam in Zanesville, Ohio, it is understood to help everyone concerned in this part of Ohio State. To help us and our business.

Respectfully yours,

EVANGELOS GEORGE ARGYROPAIS,
*Manager, Winsor's Steak House, Inc.*

---

THE H. WEBER SONS & CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 22, 1956.*

Mr. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I received the photograph of the group from Zanesville and McConnelsville, and I want to thank you for it. It was kind of you to think of me, and I just want to go on record as saying that I personally am very much impressed with the work that you are doing in regard to the Dillon Dam.

It is most inspiring to know that you have made this one of your active interests. I again want to thank you, and when you are in Zanesville I would love to have you drop in and say hello.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. WEBER.

---

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *April 2, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing to urge you to bend every effort toward securing an appropriation of funds to continue construction on the Dillon Dam project on the Licking River near Zanesville, Ohio.

The money already expended on this project indicates that the merit of the project has been fully realized. It would seem unwise, indeed, to allow the value of the previous expenditures to be dissipated by erosion, thereby increasing greatly the eventual total cost of the project.

The increased public interest in flood control resulting from widespread disasters in 1955 should greatly increase the support you need to get favorable consideration given to this very worthy public improvement.

Very truly yours,

MARVIN H. RUTHERFORD.

---

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *March 28, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*Eastern Panel of Public Works Subcommittee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I am writing to add my opinion to that of others of this district in hoping you will do everything possible to bring about completion of the Dillon Dam. In addition to the factor of flood control, the waste of the several million dollars already spent on the project is hardly defensible.

Very truly,

DONALD A. URBAN, M. D.

---

SEARS, ROEBUCK & CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: It seems sacrilegious not to complete the Dillon Dam project. To invest $9 million and let it go to waste on an obvious flood-control need is not good judgment businesswise or politically. Please pass any measures necessary to complete it.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. KEEFE, *Manager.*

---

THE TIMKEN ROLLER BEARING CO.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, April 2, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am wholeheartedly in favor of the Dillon Dam project. It would not be sound economics not to continue, considering the expenditures that have already been made on this. This dam is also needed for the protection of the Muskingum Valley inhabitants.

Your continued support of this project will be very much appreciated.

Yours very truly,

E. J. SCHWEITZER.

---

STARR'S,
*Zanesville, Ohio, April 5, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: This letter is being written to you to urge you to do your part for residents of Muskingum County toward allocating Government funds for the completion of the Dillon Dam project. As you must well know, this project has been at a standstill for quite some time, and unless additional funds are appropriated soon, all of the money already spent in this very worthwhile project will have been wasted and the efforts already expended will have been in vain. This project should be completed for many reasons, but particularly in the interest of much needed soil conservation and flood control. Please do all you can for us.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN STEINBERG.

DAVID DAVIES, INC.,
*Zanesville, Ohio, April 3, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: On behalf of David Davies, Inc., and myself I wish to encourage you to favor that funds be allocated to resume work on the Dillon Dam.

Communities along the Muskingum River from Zanesville to Marietta, although protected by existing reservoirs to an appreciable degree, today are still subject to great flood hazards as long as the watershed area to be controlled by Dillon Dam poses the ever present possibility of a flood down the Licking and Muskingum Rivers.

R. S. ROBERTS.

I am certain that the justification and value of the Dillon Dam is recognized. I also feel certain that this recognition will be reflected in future appropriations to continue its construction. However, until these funds are made available I shall continue my efforts in behalf of the Dillon Dam, so that it may confer upon southeastern Ohio the flood-control benefits which are so sorely needed there.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise further to inform the House of the importance of several projects included in the bill before us today. They are recommendations for construction by the United States Army Engineers in Tampa Harbor, St. Petersburg Harbor, and the Anclote River. All are in the First District of Florida and all are of great economic importance to the immediate communities affected by this work. I appreciate the long study and the unqualified recommendation of these projects made by the Appropriations Committee of the House and their approval this year of amounts requested of them. I feel certain of their justification in this action. I would further call to your attention several factors that still further qualify such a program as is now being considered by this body.

In the case of the Tampa Harbor project a great new development is now begun. Work, since last year, is well under way with an appropriation of $977,000, $477,000 of which was reinstated on my appeal by the House last year. The benefits that will result through the widening and deepening of this channel are already in evidence. One very important feature of the work-progress program has now developed and I would call this to your attention at this time. Certain additional funds beyond the $2.5 million recommended by the committee which, I am sure, will be recommended by the House today, are now needed for an orderly and economical progress of this work. In the Senate hearings subsequent to those of the House the request for funds was raised to $4 million. The contemplated overall cost is estimated at $11 million. I would outline for you the developments that brought this current increase about.

In the preliminary planning of this project first consideration was given to the dredging of the channel and increase of depth from 27–30 feet to 34 feet and widening to 400 feet from the present 300-foot width a distance of some 50 miles. The United States Army engineers let contracts for the dredging in 1955 and work has been under way in a contracted amount of $3.1 million. Progress on this portion of the dredging has proceeded at a greater pace than anticipated by the engineers. In a report just made on April 21, 1956, by the Corps of Engineers, and subsequent to both the preparation of the budget and hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House it is now revealed that this contract can and will be completed early in 1957 if the present rate of progress is maintained. The original appropriation of $977,000 and the earlier budget requested funds of $2.5 million as reported to the House today will not be sufficient to carry on this reasonable rate of work and the entire project would have to be called to a halt in early 1957 unless additional funds are provided at this time. The truth of the matter is that the work is well ahead of the money. Should present funds be depleted early in 1957 and no work continued until money is available in fiscal 1958 the cost of reactivation of the dredges themselves would be heavily reflected in the bids received which bids are expected to run an additional $600,000. These substantial savings should not be overlooked in the efficient progress of this project.

Because of the rapid development of the dredging work on these channels that segment known as Egmont and Mullet Key Channels, where work will be done by the United States Army engineers' hopper dredge, should also be gotten under way in 1957. Anticipating 5 months' work in each of the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 an additional $625,000 will be needed in fiscal 1957.

Activation of both of these dredging portions of the project at the same time and to thus complete in the year 1958 the Hillsboro channel project will see even more and substantial benefit savings. Figures now available clearly show that with the completion and the use of the Hillsboro-Tampa channel portion of the project as herein proposed $1.5 million per year will be saved at that time. Therefore the additional amount requested above the earlier request will be fully justified by this additional saving. Estimates of the benefit-cost ratio have now been placed at 3.38 to 1 on this segment of the channel and I feel sure that this is a conservative figure.

I include a chart of these needs and costs justifying this increase for your information at this time.

| | |
|---|---|
| Fiscal 1956 appropriation for Tampa Harbor project | $977,000 |
| Actual expenditures: | |
| Hopper dredging | 280,000 |
| Hydraulic dredging | 785,000 |
| Engineering | 130,000 |
| Supervision and engineering | 87,000 |
| Total expenditure | 1,282,000 |
| Advanced by U. S. Army engineers (to permit contract performance) | 305,000 |
| Total | 1,282,000 |
| Funds required, fiscal 1957: | |
| Repayment of advance by U. S. Army engineers to project | $305,000 |
| U. S. Army engineers (supervision and administration | 174,000 |
| Payment to Standard Dredging Corp. to complete work on $3.1 million contract covering dredging on cuts A–F Tampa Bay channels ($785,000 of contract will be completed in 1955–56). Full contract to be completed in early 1957 | 2,315,000 |
| Subtotal | 2,794,000 |
| Request 1957 budget | 2,500,000 |
| Additional required | 294,000 |
| Pro rata portion of second contract and required in early 1957 to permit work on dredging to continue without extra cost of activation and deactivation which would raise this estimated bid. 4 months' work to June 30, 1957 | 600,000 |
| 5 months' work by U. S. Army engineers hopper dredge on Egmont and Mullet Key channels. Includes supervision and administration cost | 625,000 |
| Total additional funds required over budget request of $2.5 million for 1957 | 1,519,000 |
| Total recommended as appropriation for 1957 | 4,000,000 |

NOTE.—These figures are as prepared by the U. S. Army engineers and are consistent with testimony by them before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They include figures not available prior to April 21, 1956.

It is my intent to ask that the Senate Appropriations Committee recommend additional funds above the House figure to be approved today and upon conference on the bill I shall urge this revised figure of $4 million be approved by the House conferees as well. In such manner the request will be in the interest of the savings that will be realized for both the Government and the public. Any orderly advancement of the day when, through these new harbor facilities, annual savings of a conservatively estimated $2,230,000 can be brought about certainly should be encouraged. I hope you will act favorable both at this time and at a later date when opportunity will exist to revise upward the amount of the request for Tampa Harbor.

Since 1899 the Anclote River project has served a unique community and important section of the west coast of Florida. The city of Tarpon Springs, only sponge fishing community in the United States, is located some 5.6 miles from the deep water of the gulf. It is situated on the Intracoastal Waterway for which completion plans are well under way.

The channel has been developed under authorizations over a period of years and Federal funds have been expended in the amount of $244,921 since inception. The Appropriations Committee recommends an expenditure of $68,000 for deepening of the channel and for a turning basin. This will complete the balance of the projected development which is now 86 percent complete. The

proposal consists of a channel 9 feet in depth and a turning basin adjacent to the wharves.

I urge that the House complete this project of such long standing and provide for this community a channel and turning basin both for the economy and safety factors that now exist as a most justified appropriation.

At St. Petersburg, Fla., the rapid growth of pleasure craft use and the great recent increase of small business population has antiquated the facilities of the harbor. Over a period of years Bayboro Channel and the channel in Salt Creek have filled from silt. Both commercial and pleasure craft have found that the harbor is unsatisfactory for use. In cooperation with the United States Army Engineers, the chamber of commerce, city officials, and many other interested parties I have been successful in reaching satisfactory agreement on the improvements that have been so badly needed. The committee has recommended some $22,000 for the purpose of clearing and deepening the Bayboro Channel and providing an entrance channel to Salt Creek. I feel their convictions of the necessity of this project have been well developed and I assure you of the great need for this project.

Thank you.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk for a long time. I feel that this bill, and most of the other bills that we have considered, have been higher than they should be, but I have recognized that the sentiment seems to be in favor of spending money.

Projects were loaded onto us last year on the floor that will ultimately cost three or four billion dollars. This year the committee started on one set of projects alone that will cost $1,200,000,000. The committee has started a large number of other projects. Now we have to provide for a certain amount of flood control. We have to provide for real navigation, but we should be very particular to see that none of those projects is approved unless we have absolute evidence that they will serve a good purpose. The more times we provide for more money than is needed, just so many times is it necessary to go back a long way when things go bad.

In this particular case the appropriation for the Corps of Engineers is down by $26,000. I can remember when they have been cut by a great deal more. The appropriation for construction, general, is down $953,000. Other appropriations are up. The appropriations for reclamation are down $31 million. I am hoping that the Congress will have a sense of responsibility as it approaches the reading of this bill. I understand it is going to be read in the next few minutes, and I am hoping that the Congress will not increase the amounts that are provided here, because I believe the committee itself has been fully as liberal as it ought to be right down the line. If we go ahead and put more money into the bill all the way through, we are just going to create a very difficult situation for the Treasury to meet in the days to come. All of us have got to the point where we feel the pressure of taxation. Taxation has gone up, and personal exemptions have gone down as the result of inflation. That has produced large increases in tax revenues.

The result of all that sort of thing is a very great feeling of unrest. Some people have actually come out and started a drive with very considerable behind them to get rid of the income tax. I do not see how they can get rid of the income tax. On the other hand, it represents the feeling that has been generated by too liberal expenditure on the part of the Government, and I am hopeful that this Congress today and tomorrow if consideration of this bill lasts that long, will exercise its correct judgment in considering any attempt that may be made to raise this bill. I hope that for once this Congress will do a job.

Statements have been made as to the Southwest Power Administration and the Southeast Power Administration. Actually the Southeast Power shows a loss of $7,919,000 for 1956 according to their own estimates. Southwest Power shows a loss of $7,570,000 for 1956 according to their own estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, not to exceed $2,000 for entertainment of foreign visitors, and purchase (not to exceed 211, for replacement only) and hire of passenger-motor vehicles, $5,357,000, to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations: *Provided*, That no part of funds available for expenditure by this agency shall be used, directly or indirectly, to acquire a building for use as an administrative office of the Tennessee Valley Authority unless and until the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, following a study of the advisability of the proposed acquisition, shall advise the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Tennessee Valley Authority that the acquisition has his approval: *Provided further*, That there shall be available for resource development activities pursuant to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, not to exceed $1,150,000, of which $400,000 shall be derived from this appropriation and $750,000 shall be derived from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against certain language in the Tennessee Valley Authority paragraph as follows:

First. In lines 8 and 9, the clause "Not to exceed $2,000 for entertainment of foreign visitors."

Second. In lines 11 through 13 ", to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations."

Third. Lines 13 to 22, the proviso reading: "That no part of funds available for expenditure by this agency shall be used, directly or indirectly, to acquire a building for use as an administrative office of the Tennessee Valley Authority unless and until the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, following a study of the advisability of the proposed acquisition, shall advise the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Tennessee Valley Authority that the acquisition has his approval: *Provided further*."

Fourth. On page 3, lines 1 to 3 ", of which $400,000 shall be derived from this appropriation and $750,000 shall be derived from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all of the language to which I have referred is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the language read by the gentleman is unquestionably legislation on an appropriation bill and I therefore concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] makes a point of order against the language appearing in four different provisions of the paragraph of the pending bill referred to. The gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, concedes the point of order.

It is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: On page 3, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided, further*, That none of the funds provided herein may be used to acquire a building for or as an administrative office of the TVA."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAKER) there were—ayes 79, noes 58.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to initial allocation of appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, $5,270,000, of which $4,560,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be

used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask of the committee handling the appropriations relative to construction funds for the Bureau of Reclamation 2 or 3 questions. I notice on page 6 of the report in reference to the Collbran project that the committee has denied the $1 million which was included in the budget for the beginning of construction of such project with this statement:

Funds requested for starting this project amounting to $1 million have been disallowed since the repayment contract has not yet been executed.

I wish to ask some member of the committee whether or not it is their policy and has been their policy to require that contracts be executed before the committee recommends funds for construction of reclamation projects?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; that is the regular procedure of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. In the budget for fiscal year 1956 and in the apropriation bill for such year, funds were set aside and recommended and approved by the Congress and the bill was signed by the President for the Palo Verde project, the Santa Maria project, the Michaud Flats project, and the Owl Creek project; and, that there were no contracts let or no contracts executed until months after the funds were allowed.

Mr. RABAUT. Those projects were all going on. This is a policy that the committee has adopted because we have had some trouble with some of them in the past and we are now trying to protect the taxpayers.

Mr. ASPINALL. The Collbran project was authorized 4 years ago. The gentleman from Colorado, together with one of the citizens of his district, appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for reclamation appropriations some 2 years ago and recommended that the then budgeted amount of $1 million be not authorized until a contract had been entered into. The gentleman from Colorado is presently advised that the repayment contract will be signed within the next few months and it undoubtedly will be signed in time that construction can start within the fiscal year 1957.

Mr. RABAUT. When and if it is done we will be very glad to consider it in so much as you have had it in, you can get it in the budget again, and in the supplemental we will be very glad to consider it and take it up. But to anticipate what is going to be done, some sad experiences of the past made the committee feel that in justification to the people who have huge funds invested in these types of projects, there should be a firm commitment on the part of those who are going to get the benefit from the project.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I ask my good friend the gentleman from Michigan this question? If before the other body considers this legislation and makes its final decision the contract should be executed, could the gentleman from Colorado expect then that this committee and the conference committee might go along with the other body's decision?

Mr. RABAUT. I can only speak for myself, of course, but inasmuch as the committee deleted the project because the repayment contract had not been signed, I see no reason why, if the contract is executed in time for the project to be included in the bill by the other body, that we would not go along.

Mr. ASPINALL. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I congratulate the committee upon the position that it takes in wanting to know where the money is going before they make a recommendation. The gentleman from Michigan and his committee know that I have appeared before their committee and have made such suggestions for sound business procedure from time to time.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to say to the gentleman that he is a very worthy Representative of his district and the people of his district should be proud to have him as their Representative.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify the situation regarding the appropriation for the Collbran project in Colorado. This project was authorized for construction on July 3, 1952. In the budget for 1955, an authorization for $1 million for this project was included. However, at that time, there was some uncertainty over the project and the necessary repayment contract and I appeared before the committee with James Groves, attorney for the water users, and we advised the committee that the appropriation should wait until the repayment contract was assured.

In the budget for fiscal 1957 the $1 million appropriation was reinstated. On March 19, I appeared before the committee and again advised of the developments in the area. It was my wish, and the opinion of the local people, that we should keep the committee fully informed. At that time, the actual signing time of the repayment contract was uncertain and my suggestion was that the appropriation be conditional on the signing of the repayment contract, or actually that the construction should not begin prior to the execution of the repayment contract.

When representatives of the Bureau were before the committee in April, testimony was offered to indicate definite progress in the repayment contract and in preparation for actual construction. At that time, the committee was advised that the contract, agreed to as to form, was in Washington for approval by the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Secretary of Interior and that its actual signing could well take place prior to the end of the present fiscal year and therefore in ample time for the initiation of construction in fiscal 1957.

I was somewhat surprised then to note in the committee report that the funds for Collbran had been disallowed due to the fact that no repayment contract was in hand. The record shows that it is expected to be executed in ample time for work in the fiscal year under consideration, and that being the case, we should not unnecessarily delay this project.

The people involved, including myself, have made every effort to keep the committee fully advised and we have made no effort to obtain funds in order to start construction of the Collbran project prior to the execution of a repayment contract. We feel now that we are amply justified in requesting that the funds for Collbran be allowed to stand with no more restriction than that no construction be undertaken until the actual signing of the repayment contract has occurred. We have attempted to play fair with the committee and have advised the committee of all developments. It is too bad that this effort at fairness should rise up to strike down the appropriation just when the long effort to get this project underway is about to come into fruition.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on page 6 of the report there is a statement relative to the Helena Valley unit:

Helena Valley unit, Montana: The new funds requested for this project have been disallowed, in view of the fact that there is no repayment contract with either the city of Helena for municipal water supply or with the supplemental water users in the irrigation project area.

That language adds additional conditions to be met before this project can start. The Helena Valley unit was started because of an agreement in the act for Canyon Ferry Dam that land in the area would be put under irrigation using Canyon Ferry water in order to replace some of the irrigated land inundated by Canyon Ferry Reservoir. On the 13th of April in 1954, a meeting of Helena Valley water users and attended by the representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation was held in Helena.

More than 17,000 acres of land in Helena Valley was represented. At that time it was agreed that owners of some 4,600 acres who had decreed water rights and who only needed to use water on an auxiliary and supplemental basis would not come into any district to be formed.

The supplemental water users were adamant that they would never participate in any repayment contract except on a sales basis. The Bureau of Reclamation at that time and all times since has known that the supplemental water users would not participate in any repayment contract.

When the irrigation district was formed the district judge who presided over the proceedings made findings in which he said:

That the Bureau of Reclamation expected and thought that after the project was in operation, owners of additional lands not included as a part of the Helena Valley Irrigation District, would seek to purchase water from the district and that the plans for construction made allowance for such additional users, but that it was not a necessary part of, or essential to, the feasibility of the project that such contemplated additional users be a part of the Helena Valley Irrigation District.

It was never contemplated that these supplemental users could come in on a contract basis or that it would be necessary for them to come in.

When Mr. Dexheimer testified before the Appropriations Committee of the House on May 2, 1955—hearings, part 1,

pages 282–285, 295–297—he discussed the Helena Valley unit. He said:

We have 13,000 acres in the district being formed now.

Mr. Clinton said:

When they started to canvass the landowners to find out how many of them would be willing to come into the new district, the people on the 4,600 acres of supplemental water lands decided that they did not want to come into the district along with the full lands. They preferred to deal with the Bureau separately for their supplemental water.

Yet Mr. Dexheimer at the same time and at the same hearing said:

The next step after the district is formed will be for the Bureau to proceed to negotiate a contract with the Board of Commissioners of that district, and we are anticipating that that step can be completed by August of this year (1955).

When that is done it will permit us to start construction either late August or early September of this year.

Note that Mr. Dexheimer says the Bureau will negotiate a contract with the district and when that is done construction will start.

Later on, in response to a question from Congressman PHILLIPS, Mr. Dexheimer assured him:

We will not start any construction work on that unit until we have an executed and firm repayment contract from the district.

No mention of a contract with supplemental users and, of course, nothing about the city of Helena.

The second part, that there be a contract with the city of Helena, was never a part of the plan.

The Bureau of Reclamation admits that the negotiations with the city of Helena started after "submittal of a definite plan report" of the Helena Valley project and negotiations only started last winter for Helena Valley.

It was estimated that about $700,000 additional to apply on construction cost would be paid by the owners of the approximately 4,600 acres of irrigable lands outside of the Helena Valley Irrigation district for a supplemental water supply, but this $700,000 is to be on a voluntary sales basis rather than a repayment contract and the Bureau of Reclamation knew that it was to be that since the first meeting with the Helena Valley water users.

In addition, it was contemplated that the city of Helena may repay with interest as much as $942,000 of the cost of construction of the Helena Valley unit but the city of Helena came in after the preparation of the original plan and, therefore, is a potential additional market for water above and beyond the market originally contemplated. The interest of the city of Helena, therefore, in this additional water, makes the project even more feasible than the project as originally planned.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Of course the gentleman is quoting from various sources. We have to meet the rules about the money that is spent by Congress. There is an unobligated carryover balance, as reported on page 6, for this Helena Valley unit in Montana of $2,250,000. It is available for the beginning of construction, but they are not going to go ahead and do that construction unless there is an outlet for this water. We have to have some form of commitment. In other words, this project is not going to stand on the basis of its own. They are going to make a commitment for water or they do not need construction.

Mr. METCALF. Let me say to the gentleman that last year your committee wrote into the bill that "no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate construction of the Helena Valley unit until a repayment contract has been executed." At that time it was contemplated that the repayment contract would be executed with the Helena Valley Irrigation District, the main water user. That has been the plan since 1954, with the approval of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Helena Valley water users have complied with the condition imposed last year. This year you come in and add another qualification that not only must there be a contract with the irrigation district but that there be a contract with the city of Helena or supplemental water users, which is changing the rule after the people of the district have organized the district and performed their part of the agreement.

Mr. RABAUT. You have got a contract for about half——

Mr. METCALF. Not half; 13,000 out of 17,000 acres.

Mr. RABAUT. We will be glad to release this money if the water users will make a contract.

Mr. METCALF. I say to the gentleman that we have complied with every qualification and every condition put in last year, and the committee now is coming in and adding additional qualifications.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the chairman of the committee relative to another phase of the bill. I have been a bit disturbed about certain items not being in the bill. I notice in your report on page 7 "Transmission Division":

Funds amounting to $5,500,000 which were programed for the Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt transmission line have been disallowed.

This item was allowed for this purpose by the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department and I am wondering whether anyone can shed any light on the real reason why the amount was not included in the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will try to answer the gentleman. In the committee, I made the motion to take the money out of the bill for that transmission line.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is not a reason; I know the gentleman made the motion, but I wondered what the real reason was for taking it out.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will give you the reason. That was for a transmission line from that dam——

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. For the Fort Randall-Grand Island transmission line, from Fort Randall in South Dakota.

Mr. KIRWAN. Into Nebraska. In the 82d Congress in presenting the Interior bill to that Congress I had 7 rollcalls in 1 day.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; in 1 day.

Mr. KIRWAN. More rollcalls I believe in 1 day than had ever been had on 1 bill before.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What does that have to do with this?

Mr. KIRWAN. I will tell you why. On those rollcalls the Members from Nebraska voted against public power in the Northwest; they voted against public power in the Southwest; they voted against it in the Southeast and they voted against it in the Missouri Basin.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is enough. It was a political reason. That is the answer I expected. It was a political reason. I cannot yield further to the gentleman unless he can get me more time. Now I will reply to that. On those five rollcalls——

Mr. KIRWAN. No; there were seven.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Every man voted as he had a right to do. I say this is a challenge to every man and woman in this House that if you do not go along with the chairman of the subcommittee and vote as he thinks you ought to vote, then 4 or 5 years later he is going to come along and chastise you because you followed the dictates of your conscience.

And let me say to you, sir, that the Congress was a Democratic Congress. I checked on that when I saw your press release on this subject. One amendment that was offered to cut the Southeast power project was offered by a Democrat from Virginia, and the Democratic Congress agreed with the Members of the Nebraska delegation and went along with them.

The other amendment to cut Southwest power was offered by a Democrat, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], who is a Member of this body. It cut them from $3,900,000 to $3,200,000; and the House did not agree with you, Mr. KIRWAN, they agreed with the Nebraska delegation. A Democratic House went along and did not agree with you.

The other cut was one offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], as I remember, to cut $2,960,000, and that was agreed to by a Democratic House. Another amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], cut the reclamation fund 5 percent. That hurt Nebraska but I voted as did the Democratic Congress to go along. There was a need for economy.

That was at a time when the Government budget was out of balance $14 billion and Mr. Truman, after the Congress got through, froze all of these new projects; he did not permit any project to go forward.

Another amendment was on the Bonneville power project. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] offered an amendment to reduce that from $67 million to $62 million; and I remind you that a Democratic chairman and those under your own leadership did not go along with you; they went along with the Republican delegation from Nebraska of which I happen to be the surviving member in the House.

I will say again to you that if it is going to be the purpose of a subcommittee chairman to move to take out of a bill an item which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, approved by the President of the United States, approved by the Interior Department, because some Member of the House 5 years ago happened to vote against him on 5 or 6 votes in 1 day in a Democratic House and the Democratic House voted, as the record shows, as the delegation from Nebraska voted. When he says because you did not vote right 5 years ago we take this item out of the bill today, I say that is purely a political reason and in bad taste.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall move to reinstate this item.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Nebraska that I have been here for a long time. The gentleman tossed a challenge out to Members of the House here. But in my time I have never pointed the finger of suspicion to anybody or said anything about politics. There is no public power in Ohio. However, Nebraska is 100 percent a public-power State. Nebraska is the only State of the 48 States that has 100 percent public power. There are no private utilities out there. I am for private utilities and I am for public power. They can both work together.

When the Interior bill was on the floor in the Truman administration every one of the items that the gentleman helped to cut out of the bill involved public power, and now he is hollering about it. Those items were all budgeted in the Eighty-second Congress.

Let me read them to you. The Truman administration made certain recommendations. You know, I only happened to be presenting that bill to the House. As I stated, there is no public power in my district or in the State of Ohio.

First, you voted to reduce funds for Southeastern Power Administration. The four Members from Nebraska did that.

On the second rollcall you voted to reduce by $550,000 the funds for Southeastern Power Administration.

On the third rollcall you voted against the western Missouri project. The four Members from Nebraska voted against the Bonneville Dam operation. You voted to cripple Bonneville Dam with a war going on.

I am reading what the record shows now.

No. 5, you voted against the Bureau of Land Management.

Sixth, you voted to reduce the funds of the Bureau of Reclamation for construction of transmission lines. You voted against the construction of transmission lines. You voted to reduce TVA by $13 million.

As I said, Nebraska is the only 100-percent public-power State in the Union. The United States Government has spent a huge sum of money in delivering this power. We built a transmission line out there for 150 miles in northern Nebraska. We did that for you after you voted against every State in the Union having public power. Now you come in here and you want to spend a total of $9 million on Nebraska for another line.

Some 70 years ago when I came to this earth my parents taught me to have a little reciprocity in me, to treat your neighbors kindly. You have ben hollering about foreign relations and other things, but I do not know of any State of the 48 States in the Union that would do what Nebraska has done, vote as a unit, right to a man, to cut public power out of every State that had it, yet they have it 100 percent. Do you call that fairness? Anything fair about that?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell me, did the House that was Democratic at that time go along with the gentleman?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not care about the House. I am not interested in politics, whether there was a Democratic group here in charge or who it was. I am interested in America and in fairness to all the States, not whether the House was Democratic or Republican. I do not care what it was. I only presented the bill to the House at that time and I am telling the gentleman the way Nebraska voted against every State that wanted public power. I do not believe Nebraska should get a Federal appropriation for this transmission line when it has been in opposition to appropriations for public power in its sister States.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain facts that should be brought out in this debate relative to the item under consideration. About 5 years ago after the Department of the Interior requested hundreds upon hundreds of miles of transmission lines to be built in many sections of this country, the Democrat controlled subcommittees for the Interior appropriation bill of the House and Senate decided there must be a stop put to many of those requests for transmission facilities. So sort of an unwritten yardstick for the building of Federal transmission lines was established. It is quite simple. We agreed that where private utilities and/or REA and/or municipalities already have adequate power producing and transmission facilities to furnish power and to transmit power to preferred customers and others from hydroelectric dams and would enter into contracts to wheel power from hydroelectric dams to preferred customers and others at reasonable rates, than the Congress was not justified in appropriating tax dollars to build such facilities. Since that time—and the record will prove it—the Congress has appropriated money to build transmission lines just to the closest load centers into the different States where the people could then come and connect onto the substation and get the power. Now, that is why the committee denied this appropriation for the building of a transmission line into the State of Nebraska from Randall Dam on the Missouri River in South Dakota costing over $9 million. Even though Nebraska were not a 100 percent public power State from which the Federal Treasury receives not one single red penny of tax from power revenues from that State, the committee would still, I am sure, have denied the term which our good friend and able colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will ask to be reinserted in the bill.

Now, those are the facts. It would make no difference who was asking for it or what Member of the House asked for such a line as the gentleman from Nebraska is asking for. The treatment would be the same by the Committee on Appropriations. We have treated Nebraska as good so far as building transmission lines into that State as we have in many other States of the Union. For instance, 2 years ago I myself was instrumental in appropriating funds to build a short line from Gavins Point Dam in South Dakota to Lawton, Nebr., because the REA's in that area were in great need of electric energy.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $125,900,000, of which $63,083,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures, after submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior (1) on the cost and feasibility of said project, including the necessary distribution system and (2) on the rates required to be charged to the ultimate consumers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $208,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the construction of fish protective facilities at Savage Rapids Dam, Oreg., to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $200,000 of this appropriation shall be available for lighting the spillway of Grand Coulee Dam and shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed, by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 7, line 22, after "Congress.", insert "*Provided further*, That $5,500,000 shall be programed and remain available until spent for the Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt transmission line."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from Iowa because they were not political. I think what he said is correct, but I believe that transmisison lines have been built into or to Iowa and into or to Minnesota and into and to other States. This line was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It was approved by the Department of the Interior.

Now, as to the merits of my amendment. The 230 kilovolt line is needed to bring electrical power from the Fort Randall Dam, on the Missouri River, to Grand Island, Nebr., which is the load center in central Nebraska. During the summer months, water must be discharged through the dam down the channel of the Missouri River for navigation purposes, and it is only good business, at the same time, to produce power with this water. The navigation time corresponds with the time when this power is urgently needed by Nebraska farmers to operate their irrigation pumps. Nebraska is fortunate in having a great amount of underground water. What we lack in rainfall, and we are seriously lacking there, we could make up substantially by drawing from this tremendous underground reservoir. In recent years, the number of irrigation wells has been increasing at a rate of about 2,000 per year, so that we now have about 15,000 irrigation wells, and as many more farmers have indicated an interest in drilling more wells in coming years. The power that could be carried on this line is desperately needed if we are to continue to grow and to stabilize our agriculture.

Yes, Nebraska is a public power State. All power is sold and distributed by REA's, municipalities, or subdivisions of the State. All our power customers are preference customers. I can take little credit for this method of power distribution. That was a choice made by the voters of my State. They held elections out there years ago, and a great majority voted to have a public ownership system; so, I do not see how it can be within the province of the gentleman from Ohio to comment or to criticize the power structure of my State.

These REA's, and these public bodies that supply the farms and towns of Nebraska desperately need the power from Fort Randall Dam. We have a drought condition to combat, and the best way I know to do it is by making more irrigation possible.

We are not asking for a handout. Funds for the construction of this line would be in the nature of a loan. Every dime would be repaid to the Federal Treasury, and with the benefits that would come through increased and stabilized incomes, greater taxpaying ability, and a more secure agricultural economy, the return to the Treasury would be actually manifold.

This request I am making in this amendment should be permitted to stand or fall on its merits and strictly on its merits. I ask nothing more, because I am sure that after the House has examined the amendment they will find it is meritorious. But the gentleman from Ohio has not seen fit to permit such action. His action was based on narrow, vindictive, and political grounds.

I am more than a little surprised and shocked at the attitude that has been taken by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. He has been quoted quite widely in the press, and if he was quoted accurately, this is the reason why the 230-kilovolt line from Fort Randall to Grand Island, Nebr., was deleted from this appropriation bill, and I quote from press release:

KIRWAN told a reporter that apparently the philisophy of the Nebraska House Members was not to give anything to any other State but to grab everything they could for Nebraska. He said that while representing a public-power State the Nebraskans generally were against public-power projects for other States.

If that's the philosophy of the voters in Nebraska and the men they send to Congress, then I'm going to use every opportunity I have to be against this project they want.

Now, to prove his point he has reached back to 1951 and 1952 and selected 6 or 7 rollcall votes that he interprets as votes against public power by myself and Hon. CARL T. CURTIS, then a Member of this body, and now the junior Senator from Nebraska. There is nothing in any of these votes that would by any reasonable stretch of the imagination permit the gentleman from Ohio to make such an accusation, and I do not intend to let this go unchallenged. I would like at this point to point out the votes that Mr. KIRWAN has irresponsibly charged as being votes against public power:

First. One vote was to strike out $3.4 million from the Southeastern Power Administration for power lines in the State of Virginia. A Virginia Congressman offered this amendment because they would duplicate existing lines now serving the area.. Although the Democrats controlled the Congress, a majority agreed with the Nebraskans and passed the amendment.

Second. Another amendment complained of by Mr. KIRWAN was offered by Congressman HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas. It was to reduce the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration from $3,925,000 to $3,775,000. It was not a vote against the Southwestern Power Administration. It was an amendment for a small economy cut in wartime. You must remember that at this time the United States was in the so-called "police action" in Korea, and the budget was running along at a $14 billion deficit for that fiscal year. Is it Mr. KIRWAN's philosophy that every Member of this Congress must vote every penny requested by the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Southwestern Power Administration, or the International Cooperation Administration? Does he mean to say that if I vote for a little commonsense economy in Government, that conclusively proves I am against public power? Here again the majority—Democratic—voted as I did, and against Mr. KIRWAN.

Third. Another amendment was to strike out $2,936,000 for the western Missouri project for the Southwest Power. This amendment was offered by a Missouri Congressman, Mr. DEWEY SHORT, for the reason that the lines, if built, would duplicate and run parallel to existing lines serving the territory. Again the majority of the Democratic controlled House voted for the cut, just as I did.

Fourth. Mr. KIRWAN next criticizes my vote on an amendment offered by the Congressman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to reduce Bonneville Power Administration funds from $67,550,000 to $62,000,000. In thinking back over this vote, I recall that this amendment was also approved by a majority of the House Members, and still the House was controlled by Mr. KIRWAN's party. If this vote is to be construed as a vote against public power, the gentleman from Ohio, who is the astute chairman of the Democratic campaign committee, should certainly begin rewriting his party's policies on public power because so many Democrats went against him again on this one.

Fifth. Next the gentleman complains that the Nebraskans voted to reduce the appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management from $7.7 million to $6.9 million, or a cut of $800,000. Again let me remind the gentleman that this reduction was made, that his party was in control of the Congress, and that if he would choose to be fair he would certainly have to admit that this vote was not even remotely connected with public power, private power, or any other kind of power—except possibly a curb on the power of one of the bureaus of Government.

Sixth. The next vote to come under the fire of the gentleman is the one that caused a blanket 5 percent reduction in the total amount for reclamation projects. This motion was made by Mr. TABER, of New York, to reduce the total from $207,109,000 to $197,000,000. I again voted with the majority, but in so doing let me remind the gentleman my vote also reduced irrigation project appropriations in Nebraska by the same 5 percent. This again was another attempt to economize during time of war.

Seventh. The seventh vote Mr. KIRWAN has singled out was on an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], providing that funds should not be used to start new power lines within areas covered by wheeling service contracts. This meant that if there were lines over which the electricity could be carried, the taxpayers should not be required to build new and duplicating lines. Again the majority of the House agreed with the Nebraskans, and disagreed with Mr. KIRWAN.

Now, just a word of caution to my colleagues in this House who have reclamation or power projects that are vital

to their people at home. Your record had better be spotless, it had better be unblemished—and by that I mean that it had better be right down the line with Mr. KIRWAN or he is going to kick you in the teeth.

I would challenge anyone in this body to show me that he has worked any harder for the development of land and water resources than I have, or who has voted any more consistently for power and reclamation developments whenever the opportunity has arisen. In the debate on the Interior appropriation bill on March 27, 1952, I took the floor to make some remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 3, pages 3066 and 3067. In these remarks I criticized the policy of the administration and the policy of Congress, as well as the bill, because no new power or irrigation starts were provided for. I said this:

I have not always approved of the method and policies of the Department of the Interior relative to irrigation projects, or the building of powerlines, but in this country it seems to me it is imperative that we look after some of our own resources. Electric power makes irrigation feasible.

And again on page 3067 I said:

I repeat, these new irrigation projects plus the electric energy adds new wealth, brings in more business, taxes, and security to our Nation. These resources must be developed to meet the needs of our expanding population.

Now, in this appropriation bill we are now considering, there has been deleted at the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] a request for funds to build power-transmission facilities in my State, admittedly not on the merits of the project, but for purely political and individual reasons. Merely because Mr. KIRWAN said "MILLER hasn't voted like I wanted him to vote in the past." I do not believe I have encountered such an attitude during my 14 years in this House. Let me say just a word or two more about this project: The total cost is approximately $9 million, and we are asking approximately $5.5 million of the project cost this year. This $5.5 million is not a new appropriation, it does not involve new funds. We simply requested authority from the Congress to transfer the funds appropriated last year for the 115-kilovolt line from Fort Randall Dam to Neligh, Nebr., and other Bureau of Reclamation funds previously authorized. The request was in the nature of a transfer, and not an appropriation. The balance would be requested at a later time.

This line was carefully studied by the Bureau of Reclamation last year. It was found to be feasible, its construction was requested by the Department of the Interior, it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and President Eisenhower saw fit to request that it be constructed.

It now appears that the recommendations of the departments and the President himself are being thwarted and blocked by one man, the gentleman from Ohio.

Now, it is true that I have voted "nay" many times in this House, but let me say that I always vote the way my conscience dictates and I always try to vote the merits of the legislation. I hold no grudge against any Member of this House, and I respect the right of each Member to vote as he sees fit, regardless of whether he may agree or disagree with me. I hope Mr. KIRWAN can explain his action to his colleagues.

Let me remind the gentleman that if I had voted on these matters as Mr. KIRWAN would have me vote, I am quite sure my constituents would have stopped sending me back here to Congress some years ago.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are constrained to insist upon our point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I concede that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes a point of order; the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] concedes it and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND

For payment to the "Upper Colorado River Basin fund," authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (Public Law 485), $3,155,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: On page 9, line 4, strike out "$3,155,000" and insert "$6 million."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to correct what I think is an inadvertent oversight on the part of the Committee on Appropriations. The bill as it now stands calls for $3,155,000 for this project. There is much work to be done in the building of roads and electric lines. In one instance the shortest route to the town is 135 miles. I think we should have had the entire amount that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, which was $8 million, but I decided to make it an amount which certainly I could justify and for which I think every Member of this House could vote. I do not believe there is a desire on the part of anyone here to unnecessarily delay progress in the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Recalling the colloquy that took place here a few hours ago between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], I think that it is conceded, is it not, that the item for construction of access roads and housing facilities was perhaps overlooked. Certainly the $6 million would go a long way toward covering that amount.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They were entirely overlooked; and to the extent their construction was needed on the Glen Canyon unit, $5 million, and the Flaming Gorge unit, $1,300,000, and the Navajo Dam came into this, I decided to bring the amount down to $6 million. I hope the committee can see its way clear to approve this amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from New Mexico in offering and supporting this amendment. We both know that the full $8 million, as requested by the President, has been justified in detail to the satisfaction of the Bureau of the Budget. However, the committee obviously has not relied and should not rely upon this. They should and have considered the request on the basis of the record made by the Bureau of Reclamation at the hearings before the subcommittee.

I have studied the record of those hearings pertaining to the justification of expenditures for the upper Colorado River storage project very carefully, as I know has the very able gentleman from New Mexico. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the record made there by the Bureau of Reclamation as to justifications for all of the money requested leaves much to be desired in satisfying the criteria of the committee, as set forth by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] a few minutes ago; that is with regard to stating the actual work that is to be done and how much will be needed for the specific types of work in fiscal year 1957. The record does not present a clear-cut justification for each of the various items of the general program. The committee in its report indicates that it has allowed the amount requested for preconstruction work in the aggregate of $3,155,000.

I think that the bill, the committee report, and the record of the hearings show that the committee has given this very complex appropriation legislation generally fair and careful consideration. Members of the committee have, in most commendable fashion, indicated that in regard to this specific appropriation, some items with regard to funds for construction of housing facilities and access roads were sufficiently justified but were inadvertently overlooked in computing the amount of the appropriation to be recommended. If all of the reasonable inferences from the testimony are considered, the amount of $6 million proposed by this amendment is, I believe, justified. I sincerely hope that the committee members will agree with that and will accept the amendment. If so, I think that I can fully agree with the members of the committee that the burden is squarely on the Bureau of Reclamation to further specifically justify the additional funds in the hearings before the other body. By letter and by telephone information, the Bureau of Reclamation has presented to me, as I am sure they have to the gentleman from New Mexico, information which would justify a minimum of the full $8 million requested. But that information was not presented to the committee for their consideration as shown by the hearings. The Bureau can and should furnish with particularity the amount of additional funds over and beyond $6

million that they will need for construction of additional access roads, camp site facilities, and for construction of the diversion tunnels. If this is done in making their presentation before the committee of the other body, then I believe it has been indicated by at least some members of the House committee, here today, that they would be inclined to look with favor on the granting of such additional funds when the matter was before a conference committee for consideration. I think that this is a very fair approach to the problem. On the basis of the ex parte information I have, I am confident that the Bureau can justify the additional amounts, but the committee is justified, I believe, in expecting them to do just that in the regular order of proceedings before the committee of the other body.

I again urge the adoption of this amendment and express the sincere hope that the members of the committee, in line with the previous very commendable expressions that have been made, will accept the amendment of the gentleman from New Mexico to increase the appropriation to $6 million on the basis of that which can reasonably be justified from the testimony of the Bureau representatives before the House subcommittee.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I was rather confused, too, until I got a letter this morning from Mr. Dexheimer, who I think is a very able man.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield to me, since my name was brought into this, I am constrained to say that on the basis of $6 million I would not argue against it, I would be constrained to accept the amendment, because I think more than the $3,155,000 will be needed if the roads and the proper construction in the way of housing is to be done. I think we might have difficulty, as the gentleman says, in justifying more than the $6 million, but certainly that can be justified. I would suggest, if the other members of the committee would agree, that on this side of the House we would accept the amendment.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would appreciate that very, very much. I hope that the chairman on this side will see his way clear to accept the amendment. I am addressing myself to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman has reduced this amendment to $6 million, I accept the amendment and ask for a vote.

Mr. JENSEN. As another member of the committee, I will say, as did the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], I feel the $6 million which the gentleman requests is completely justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, no other reclamation project ever authorized by Congress has received the study and attention that the upper Colorado River storage project has. Despite well-financed opposition, Congress this year supported President Eisenhower and the Department of the Interior and authorized this multimillion dollar, long-range development of an entire river basin by a vote of 256 to 136.

The administration has requested an initial appropriation of $8 million for this project. This amount would enable the Bureau of Reclamation to bring its plans for Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams up to bid stage. It would also provide funds for the construction of access roads to the dam sites and for the building of construction camps for Bureau personnel. In short, the requested appropriation would get this project underway.

The House Appropriations Committee has cut this amount by nearly $5 million. Members of the committee in granting planning funds have recognized the need for this project. But we cannot save water now wasting in the Pacific Ocean with plans. This project contemplates a 25-year development and construction period. It is of prime importance that we begin storing water at the earliest possible date. I commend the Members for their support of this amendment to restore at least $3 million of the amount cut but by the Appropriations Committee and I want to serve notice that we will continue our fight for all of the funds requested by the President for this project which is so vital to the area and to the Nation as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, preliminary examinations, surveys and studies (including cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law No. 520, 71st Cong., approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented), of projects prior to authorization for construction, to remain available until expended, $7,962,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 15, line 16, strike out "$7,962,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,122,000."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds $160,000 to this particular item. The object is to have a resurvey of the Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway. This project was authorized in 1946. It had approval of the Army engineers and the Congress. But in 1951, the Committee on Appropriations through a special subcommittee chairmaned by Mr. Kerr, of North Carolina, made a special investigation of the project. Based on information, which committee members felt to be sound, they found that the project was not at that time economically justified. The committee issued this particular statement in the report as follows:

This project cannot be justified by the statutory criterion of a favorable benefit-cost ratio unless economic conditions in the area drastically change.

Mr. Chairman, that was 5 years ago. It is our contention that over that period of 5 years, there has been a drastic change in the economic conditions of that particular area. Through this amendment it is our object to carry out the specific directions of the Committee on Appropriations, that is, to determine whether or not the project is economically sound. This can be done only by a resurvey by the Army engineers. Actually that was about what the Appropriations Committee directed. But we cannot have a resurvey without financing. The amount of money which the Army engineers contend will be required to finance the resurvey is $160,000. That is what I seek.

I hope the members of the committee will see fit to accept this amendment. It simply carries out the directions which the committee itself ordered 5 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] that will provide the sum of $160,000 to be used for a restudy of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

Although this proposed waterway was authorized by Congress in 1946, no construction funds have ever been appropriated. After making a study of the proposal, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions issued on September 18, 1951, a report which concluded that the "proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway cannot be justified by the statutory criterion of a favorable benefit-cost ratio unles economic conditions in the general area of the project undergo a drastic change."

No further efforts were made until this year to obtain funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, although the conclusions reached in the subcommittee's report were contrary to those reached as a result of studies made by the United States Corps of Engineers.

In March of this year, however, I appeared with several of my colleagues before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee to request that they include in the bill now under consideration the necessary funds for a restudy of this project. We made this appearance because we were convinced that "economic conditions in the general area of the project" have undergone the "drastic change" referred to in the report issued by the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions.

The growth of industry in the area which would be served by the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and in the two areas which would be connected by it, plus the growth of the waterborne commerce of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Tennessee River—the two waterways to be connected by the project—indicates that such a change has taken

place in the 4½-year period since the subcommittee made its report.

Since 1951, five integrated chemical plants have been built and put into production on the reaches of the Tombigbee River between Mobile and Jackson, Ala. Two multimillion-dollar paper mills are now under construction on the reaches of the Tombigbee River between Jackson, Ala., and its confluence with the Warrior River at Demopolis, Ala. The development of new industry and the growth of established industries in the Mobile area and along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Mobile and New Orleans are among the greatest taking place in the entire Southeast.

At the other terminus of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway on the Tennessee River, similar industrial development has been going forward and continues to go forward.

This industrial growth, coupled with the tremendous attraction which the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Tennessee River have demonstrated for commerce, indicates that a restudy of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee project is in order.

The movement of commerce on the Tennessee River in 1954 totaled 8,415,769 tons. In the same year, we moved on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Mobile and New Orleans 6,149,064 tons. Only a careful survey will determine what portion of the commerce moving over these two existing waterways would move over a link between them. But from my knowledge of the commerce that has been and is being attracted to the Warrior-Tombigbee waterway in Alabama by the improvements that are now being made on the project, I am confident that some portion, possibly a substantial portion, of the 13½ million tons of the commerce moving over the two waterways we propose to connect would move over the connecting link.

I do not think we have to depend upon the divergence of commerce that now moves over the Mississippi River system as such to find commerce for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. Of course, commerce will be diverted for various reasons, but it is my opinion that commerce will also be generated when this project is accomplished. I am not in a position to know what commodities would move over this waterway. Only a careful study will establish this information, but certainly there is a strong demand in Alabama for grains from the midcontinent area of the United States which lend themselves to movement by barges.

There is also a growing demand throughout the entire Southeastern area for petroleum products including petrochemicals. This is true of the area served by the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Tennessee River, and there is every reason to believe the same would be true of the area which would be served by the link between these established waterways. In addition, an abundant coal reserve exists in north and central Alabama, and with the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, the coal from this region would become readily available to the areas served by the Tennessee River.

In addition to the economic changes that have taken place in the period following the committee's report of September 1951, time has proved incorrect several assumptions made in this report. As part of its adverse comments, the report suggested that the Corps of Engineers had not included in its cost estimate the rebuilding of three locks and dams which now exist on the lower reaches of the Tombigbee River. The report pointed out that these existing low dams, with their lock chambers of approximately 52 feet by 285 feet, would have to be rebuilt at what the report estimated to be a cost of $51 million. On March 6, 1956, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors approved a project report on the proposed Jackson Lock and Dam as a replacement for these three existing locks and dams on the Tombigbee River. The estimated cost of the Jackson Lock and Dam is $23.6 million. Assuming that the replacement of these three locks and dams should be included as a part of the cost of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project (and there are good reasons why this should not be done), the 1951 estimate in the subcommittee's report is in error by approximately $28 million, and this error lowered considerably the committee's estimate of the cost-benefit ratio on the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

In criticizing the estimate made by the Corps of Engineers of benefits to be derived from the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, the report contended that hazardous and uneconomical operating conditions exist between the ports of Mobile and New Orleans. While I am not thoroughly familiar with the operating conditions over this section of the intracoastal waterway, I do know that the equipment which is used to move commerce on the Warrior-Tombigbee system in Alabama is also used on the intracoastal waterway between these two ports. It is also true that standard operating equipment from the Mississippi River system moves without difficulty across this intracoastal waterway system. The fact that over 6 million tons of commerce moved between Mobile and New Orleans over the waterway in 1954 is certainly an indication that the operators of barges and towboats transporting the commerce find no unusual difficulties.

Although the appropriations committee states in its report that the request for the inclusion of funds for a resurvey of the Tombigbee and Tennessee Waterway was given serious consideration, action on appropriations for the resurvey was deferred until the next session of Congress.

Those of us who realize the importance of this development are confident that a restudy of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is thoroughly justified by rapidly changing economic conditions in the Southeastern States. I therefore respectfully urge the Members of this body to approve today, rather than postpone, the small appropriation necessary for this restudy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I support the Abernethy amendment, to provide $160,000 for a new survey of the economic feasibility of construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. I believe this to be a great project, one that will make America stronger, one that will make America more certain to achieve her economic destiny.

Evidently, the Congress of the United States thought right well of this project at one time, because in 1945 it authorized its construction.

About 1951 an investigating group of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives purported to find that the project was not justified. This investigating group raised a doubt in the minds of many Members of Congress. In justice to them, and in justice to all the people of America, this Abernethy amendment should be adopted so that we can again get a thorough appraisal of this project by the Corps of United States Engineers.

Not only has this project been authorized, but our Government has spent nearly a million dollars for planning the works on the Tombigbee River which crosses Pickens County, Ala., in the district which I have the honor to represent. We should go this step further. The cost is relatively very small. It will be a good investment for building a stronger America.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this is merely planning money, money for a resurvey, and in view of the fact that the committee has repeatedly expressed itself in favor of the resurvey, I accept the amendment and ask for a vote.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I suppose perhaps it is like spitting into a strong gale, but I do feel there should be somewhere we should draw the line in adding additional commitments to this bill today. It is not as if this were an original proposition that we were asked to evaluate to the tune of $160,000 in order that we might be properly advised as to whether future planning and construction funds should be allotted to this project. This is one of the oldest of the old chestnuts that we have in the multi-billion-dollar backlog of authorized projects that are waiting their turn on the list to get into the appropriation program. I do not know how well some of you who have been here some time will recall this project, but it used to be the pet project of another gentleman from Mississippi who is no longer here. I think most of you will recall the fact, and I think it is a fact, and not being unkind about it at all, that it got to be a kind of laughing stock on the floor of this House. I have a rather strong feeling that if we now pour another $160,000 into this well-traveled, well-recognized pathway to huge expenditures, perhaps we will be the kind of laughing stock that this project used to be when it was brought up so frequently by a former Member of this House from Mississippi.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand that this particular project requires an enormous investigation over miles and miles and that the project, if approved, probably would cost in the neighborhood of three

or four hundred million dollars. Does the gentleman feel that we are in the kind of shape in this country where we can embark upon such a project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think my views have been pretty well expressed both here today with respect to this amendment and I think I have also expressed myself on other occasions in relation to other projects. This is a dream. The Corps of Engineers time and time again has found that it was not a practical dream. I feel that this is one place where we ought to draw the line, and I hope you will reject this amendment.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FISHER offers a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: Strike out "$8,122,000" and insert "$8.172,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISHER) there were—ayes 54, noes 86.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 106, noes 87.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ABERNETHY and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 123, noes 92.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the public-works bill before us today contains one item of great interest to many of my constituents in southeastern Oklahoma. It allocates $15,000 for a new survey looking toward relocation of the previously authorized Hugo Reservoir on the Kiamichi River.

The district engineer at Tulsa, Okla., has assured the Oklahoma Senators and me that $15,000 will be sufficient to do this resurvey.

The Hugo Reservoir, as originally authorized in 1946, was limited to the single objective of providing flood protection on the Red River below Denison Dam. The State of Oklahoma and the residents of my congressional district opposed the initially authorized project because it did not contain multipurpose features. It made no provision to meet local needs for industrial and municipal water supplies. It would inundate some of the richest farmland in Oklahoma, but it would provide precious little flood control for us.

We do not disagree with the engineers in their view that additional flood-control measures are essential to protect the Red River. However, we do insist that the reservoir be tailored more to the needs and the demands of the people in the area where it is to be located.

I am deeply grateful that the committee has seen fit to include this relatively small item in the bill it has reported to the House. I trust the engineers will proceed to make the resurvey promptly once the money becomes available.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: On page 15, line 16, after the figure "$8,122,000", add the following: "$75,000 for a study of the canalization of the Big Muddy River, Ill., $50,000 for a study of flood control of Cache River, Ill., and $25,000 for study of flood control in Harrisonville and Ivy Landing District No. 2, Monroe County, Ill."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that the figure which this amendment seeks to change has already been changed and that a second amendment to the same figure is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This amendment provides for an addition following the sum, which does not affect the sum previously adopted. This is in addition to. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It would allow $150,000 for the Army engineers to start two flood-control survey studies in my congressional district amounting to $75,000 and one navigation study in the amount of $75,000. A breakdown is as follows: $75,000 for the canalization of Big Muddy River in southern Illinois from the proposed dam site of the Rend Lake in Franklin County, Ill., to the Mississippi River.

The next item would allow $50,000 for a survey of the flood control problem existing on the Cache River and tributaries in the extreme tip of southern Illinois.

The third item would provide $25,000 with which to study an internal drainage problem in the Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage District No. 2 in Monroe County, Ill.

Mr. Chairman, I have a map before me, and I would like to show the Members my congressional district in southern Illinois, which is bounded on both sides by two of the greatest navigable streams in the world, the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. There has been very little done to meet the internal drainage problems of the tributaries draining into the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. I, of course, will not have time to discuss each of these projects in detail, however, I would like to impress upon you the fact that thousands of acres of good farmland is being inundated due to floods and has been resulting in great losses in property and money. The two flood-control studies would certainly be a step in the right direction in order that we may be able to get to the bottom of this problem with a sound and justifiable solution.

The other remaining item concerning navigation would allow the continuation of a study of the Big Muddy River with a view toward canalizing that stream.

I have here in front of me a complete story of the 15-county congressional district which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, telling of the economic chaos in the coal fields of southern Illinois. We are trying to get on our feet. We do not want any handouts, but we would like the Federal Government to give us an opportunity to canalize some of these streams so that we will be able to barge this coal and compete with residual oils and other fuels that are displacing these coal mines.

My people are up in arms. They want at least a study made of these problems.

They do not mind me voting for worthy projects all over the United States, but I can tell you, I am not much to look at, but unless I get some money to be spent down in southern Illinois, to study some of these problems you may not be seeing me here next year. I hope all of the Members will go along with me and vote for my amendment. I am asking here only for the small sum of $150,000. Will you please go along with me? They are good projects. Thanks very much.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] on as frank and straightforward a statement as I have ever heard on the floor of this House. That is one of the reasons I was constrained to rise in support of his amendment.

I have heard this bill which has been brought to the floor of the House today, this public works bill, described as calling for a tremendous sum of money, a great appropriation. Well, there was a time in my life when I would have considered this a tremendous sum of money, but it is only a little less than eight-tenths of a billion dollars. Just the other day I was on the floor of this House and helped pass a bill calling for $34 billion plus. Perhaps it was needed. It was for national defense.

One of these days we are going to have before us a bill asking us to appropriate $4.9 billion to give away to folks whom I have never seen and probably never will; to be perfectly frank, folks in whom I have not too much interest. I do not want them to starve or live submarginally, or anything like that. But still I do not like to bankrupt the United States in order to feed them and clothe them, send them implements and tools and build dams for them so that they can irrigate the Sahara Desert and raise long staple cotton to sell in the world market in competition with what we raise.

So I am inclined to support the gentleman's amendment and support this bill. I would have been glad to pass it exactly as it was brought to the House, but if there is anything done to it, I would rather add a little to it than take something away from it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to know here just a little bit the direction in which we are going. Just a moment ago, we adopted an amendment which

related to a project which was specifically referred to in the committee report. The committee report is the responsibility of the majority members of the subcommittee and is signed by the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee. It gives reasons why funds for some particular project were not put in the bill. But when it came time for a teller vote, it seems as if there had been a change of heart between the time when they wrote the report, on which Members of the House are supposed to rely in their consideration, and the time for them to express their personal preference as to whether or not the funds should or should not come in. I do not profess to take the responsibility alone for holding this bill in line. That ought to be and is properly the responsibility of the majority party, which brought the bill to the House.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I am sure the gentleman would not deny me an opportunity to present my case either to the committee or the House? As I have said I was not permitted to attend the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations hearings because as a member of the Committee on Public Works we had under consideration the highway bill, and on that day I could not attend the hearing. There was not a chance offered me on a subsequent date. I do not think the gentleman in his fairness would deny me an opportunity at least to present a worthy project to the House. I do not think it would apply to the statement the gentleman is reading from the record. They were not referring to those projects which they had not had under consideration.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not referring to the amendment which the gentleman offered. I was referring to the previous amendment and the vote on that particular amendment.

I do not profess to take the responsibility of opposing this amendment. If the majority members of the committee will not undertake the responsibility of holding the line on the bill which they reported, that certainly is not my responsibility as a minority member of the committee. I place the responsibility where it rightfully belongs, on the majority members of this subcommittee, to do so.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition in order to reply to the gentleman from Illinois. The Corps of Engineers testified to us that they could use the $150,000 for the drainage work, and we have allowed that. Some of the gentleman's projects are in that category and naturally would be considered. We are not certain that the others are even authorized.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. The $150,000 to which the gentleman refers is for the Army engineers to use in making studies at their discretion. I am sure the gentleman is aware that when they send down to the Bureau of the Budget a list of projects that are worthy, that need to be studied, the Bureau of the Budget approves only a small majority of those. The rest of them, of course, go begging. I am hopeful that the Congress will go ahead and earmark the money for these particular studies because I know exactly what is going to happen if I go to the engineers and say, "Will you take care of my particular project?" They will say, "Well, it is worthy, but we have one of a little higher priority." Consequently, no money.

Mr. RABAUT. We have put in all the money they said they could use. They asked for $150,000 more and we gave them that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

The Committee divided; and on a division (the Chairman being in doubt) there were—ayes 93, noes 111.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin and Mr. GRAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 111, noes 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly disappointed that funds were not included for the Quinnipiac River project in my district in the 1957 public-works appropriations. This project was authorized in House Document 517, 79th Congress, to provide for the deepening of the Quinnipiac River, in view of the increased shipping and economic conditions in the area. Documentation has been clearly provided by various businesses along the river to show that an increased depth to 22 feet would result in greater volume and improved commerce, all of which would accrue to the benefit of the New Haven area residents.

Funds of $3 million have been appropriated by Congress to deepen the main New Haven Harbor in 1948, 1949, and 1950 as a result of the authorization in House Document 517. Yet the 11-year-old authorization for the Quinnipiac River, which flows into the harbor and is essential for adequate shipping, has had no action. The United States Army Corps of Engineers has shown that 1 year after completion of the main harbor project the benefits were in ratio of 13 to 1, and that the savings were $1,661,000. Proportionate benefits could be derived from the completion of the Quinnipiac River project. Fill from dredging the river could have been used very conveniently in the construction of the Greenwich-Killingly Expressway through the State of Connecticut. In addition, fill would have been used in adjacent swamp areas, thereby developing the land for industry and other useful purposes through which the city would derive great potential tax benefits and enjoy increased employment.

Every year of delay in the completion of this project involves considerably more money. In 1945, the original project was authorized at a cost of $262,000 and has risen in the past 11 years to $512,000. Besides, records show that the tonnage in the main harbor and the Quinnipiac River has increased from 430,000 tons in 1945 to 946,141 tons today.

New England, and specifically Connecticut, has been greatly discouraged by the seeming lack of interest shown by the appropriations committees, now and in the past, in the need for river and harbor development and beach erosion control in our States. As evidenced by the recent committee report, Connecticut has had but one project recommended for construction this year, amounting to a mere $1 million. This is out of a total of $421,734,000 recommended for general construction in the public works appropriations for 1957.

Since 1952, when I was elected to Congress, I have worked arduously with my colleagues from the State and those in my district who are intensely interested in projects such as the Quinnipiac River. The results of these efforts are indeed frustrating and while I am aware of the fact that Congress is perennially faced with lack of funds in this category, I think serious and favorable consideration should have been given to this most worthy authorized project in the Quinnipiac River. For myself, I can say that my efforts will not cease nor, do I believe, will those who have have striving for the same objectives.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); and not to exceed $1,400,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; to remain available until expended, $421,734,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may at the discretion and under the direction of the Chief of Engineers be used in payment to the accounts of the Confederated Tribes of the Yakima Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation; or other recognized Indian tribes, and those individual Indians not enrolled in any recogized tribe, but who through domicile at or in the immediate vicinity of the reservoir and through custom and usage are found to have an equitable interest in the fishery, all of whose fishing rights and interests will be impaired by the Government incident to the construction, operation, or maintenance of The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Wash., and Oreg., and must be subordinated thereto by agreement or litigation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2 million of the funds provided herein shall be available for the construction of small authorized projects selected by the Secretary of the Army the cost of which is not in excess of $150,000 and any such proj-

ect shall be completed within the funds herein appropriated.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 16, line 4, strike out "$421,734,000" and insert "$422,734,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the additional $1 million which would be provided by this amendment of the amount at line 4 on page 16 of the pending bill would furnish sufficient funds for the completion of the plans and the first year's construction of what is known as Davenport Center Dam, a proposed authorized flood-control dam in New York State which is needed for the protection of the Triple Cities area of Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City. As the New York member of the majority of the House Committee on Appropriations it becomes my duty to offer this important amendment.

The Triple Cities area of New York State—I have in my hand a Corps of Engineers map—is represented here in the House by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who favors and will support this requested appropriation.

The area which would provide the reservoir for Davenport Center Dam is located in the district of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. In the vicinity is the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], in Otsego County, and the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in Chenango County. You will see from the map that Chenango County is quite a distance away from Davenport Center.

The granting of this appropriation would affect the property rights of the owners of 49 properties in their entirety, and 59 pieces of property would be partially affected.

The status of the project at the moment is this: The plans have been 92 percent completed, and the allowance of this $1 million would supply the money needed for the completion of the remaining 8 percent of the plans and the first year's construction.

In this area there were 7 flood control dams originally authorized by law, 2 of which have been built. The Davenport Center Dam is one of the 5 remaining. These dams were authorized as a result of the loss of 35 lives and $70 million property damage from floods in the year 1936. Every year we have the same thing happen in this area, recurrent damaging floods, even as recently as March and April of this present year.

The allowance of this appropriation would not only help to protect the cities of Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City from floods—and I want to tell you very frankly there is in this bill previously approved by the committee $1,030,000 for construction of levees to help protect these cities, but it would also help to protect communities downstream on the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania and on into Maryland where the Susquehanna meets the Chesapeake.

Who is in favor of this requested appropriation? Not only is the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COLE], who represents the Triple Cities area which has a population of 200,000 people, but we also find among its proponents the mayor of the city of Binghamton; the State senator from that area, Mr. Warren M. Andersen; the president of the well-known Endicott-Johnson Corp. which manufactures shoes; the director of public relations of the International Business Machines Corp.; Assemblyman Black of the New York State lower house and chairman of the New York State Flood Control Commission. We also find the president of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce vigorously in favor of it. I think it is fair to say that everybody in the area of the Triple Cities is vitally interested in the completion of these plans, which, as I said a while ago, are now 92 percent completed and in commencement of the first year's construction of this very, very important flood control dam.

In opposition we find some owners of farmlands. I repeat there are 49 pieces of property to be affected in their entirety and 59 partially affected. The entire area affected is only 1,800 acres. Thirty acres of these 1,800 acres involve residential, commercial, school and church property, the remainder being rural.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. CANNON) Mr. ROONEY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in the past century there have been 16 major floods in this area. In the month of August last year if the Hurricane Diane had just swished her tail a degree or two you would have had the same holocaust in the Triple Cities area of south central New York, a very, very important industrial community, that occurred in the Connecticut Valley.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that as this vitally affects a populous area of 200,000 people, the amendment should be agreed to. Of course, in every event where land is to be taken for flood control reservoirs, somebody has to kick; but in this instance only 49 pieces of property are directly affected and about some 47 or 48 partially affected. It is in the interest of good government to protect an industrial area such as the Triple Cities containing important defense production plants such as those I mentioned a while ago.

It would seem that as the result of the protests of these few farm owners this matter has been delayed to the extent that it is becoming dangerous. Mr. Chairman, I ask favorable consideration of the proposed amendment which would add, and I repeat again for the sake of emphasis, but $1 million to this bill to complete plans already 92 percent completed and to start the first year's construction of Davenport Centre Dam.

The following testimony was presented last May 8 to the House Committee on Appropriations by the distinguished Governor of the State of New York:

TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1956.

FLOOD CONTROL IN BINGHAMTON, N. Y., AREA

STATEMENT OF HON. AVERELL HARRIMAN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman from New York, Mr. ROONEY, to take the chair.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed honored to be given the opportunity to preside during the course of the reception of this testimony. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] as well as to all the members of the subcommittee.

We are indeed honored to have with us this morning the great Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Averell Harriman, who wishes to address the committee with regard to a matter which concerns the people of the State of New York.

Governor Harriman, we are pleased to have you with us and now look forward to what you have to say.

Governor HARRIMAN. I want to express my appreciation to Chairman CANNON and to the members of the Committee on Appropriations for this opportunity to appear before this distinguished subcommittee of the United States House of Representatives. I appreciate the courtesy you have extended me in arranging this special meeting in order that I might testify on a matter which you have already considered at an earlier date.

I have come here because the issues under consideration are of vital importance to the south central part of New York State, and in an important way to the State as a whole. It is worth noting also that areas of Pennsylvania downstream along the Susquehanna River will benefit materially from the appropriations I am requesting.

Here with me today are a number of distinguished citizens of Broome County who are members of the flood protection council, and some of whom represent industries exposed to the risk of severe flood damage:

Hon. Donald W. Kramer, mayor of Binghamton;

State Senator Warren M. Anderson;

Mr. Charles F. Johnson, Jr., president of the Endicott-Johnson Corp.;

Mr. Robert H. Austin, director of public relations, International Business Machines Corp.;

Assemblyman Jerry Black, chairman, State flood-control commission;

Horace Evans, director of the State flood-control commission;

George E. Knowlton, Jr., chairman, public relations committee, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

Mr. Howard E. Orton, division manager of the New York State Electric & Gas Corp.;

Mr. John Bruner, secretary-treasurer of the Endicott Lumber & Box Co.;

Mr. Edgar E. Severson, secretary-treasurer of the Binghamton Container Co.; and president of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce;

Mr. Heath D. Andrews, staff executive of the chamber of commerce;

Mr. George G. Coughlin, chairman of the flood protection council; and

Commissioner John F. Donnelly of the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance, and chairman of the Democratic Committee of Broome County.

I can say I speak for them as well as myself, and they have submitted briefs to the committee on the matter before you.

*Flood damage to Triple City area of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott*

The Triple City area of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott has a population of 200,000. It is one of the industrial centers of the northeastern United States. It possesses an unusual combination of skilled workmen and creative management.

Its products are vital to our Nation's prosperity and, particularly, to our national defense.

It is a correspondingly alarming fact that these cities have suffered recurrent flood damage that has reached disaster proportions and may in the future suffer even greater damage unless vigorous and immediate preventive action is taken.

The Susequehanna River and its tributary, the Chenango, meet at the center of the city of Binghamton, Johnson City adjoins Binghamton on the downstream side, and Endicott is located a short way down from there. They are thus doubly exposed to flood conditions.

Along the course of these streams and in low-lying areas are many industrial plants, large and small, and thousands of homes.

Sixteen major floods have, in fact, occurred during this century alone. In July 1935, and again in March 1936, catastrophic floods took place with a heavy loss of life and with direct property losses of over $70 million.

I understand at that time it was nearly 25 percent of the assessed valuation of the area affected.

*History of flood-control measures*

Following the 1935 flood, and again in 1936, Senator LEHMAN, then our governor, was most active in pressing for flood-control measures. In July 1936, he wrote to President Roosevelt urging the Federal Government to move ahead rapidly on the program which the Corps of Engineers was planning for the southern tier. He said that this program "if successfully carried forward will be of the greatest possible benefit to the southern tier counties and, as a matter of fact, to the States a whole."

Following the 1935 flood, Congress authorized the construction of seven dams upstream from Binghamton. Of these, two have been completed—at Whitney Point on the Otselic River in Broome County and at East Sidney on the Ouleout Creek in Delaware County. None of the remaining five has been built, or even wholly designed.

Last summer's floods brought home to us once again the folly of efforts to economize at the expense of effective flood control measures. Aside from the human factors involved, these dams pay for themselves with surprising speed. Whitney Point (completed in 1942) has already prevented more damage than it cost, according to Corps of Engineers estimates.

I hardly need to detail to this committee the devastation—to business, to homes, to farms—that occurred in some areas in 1955. The point I want to make is that it was sheer chance that it did not happen in Broome County.

If Hurricane Diane had switched her tail a degree or two on her course last August and not taken a right-angle turn before Philadelphia, we would have had 1935-36 or worse all over again.

This close brush with disaster, and the terrible reality of the havoc wrought in Connecticut and other neighboring States, have pointed up to all of us in New York the critical importance of flood-protection measures.

This year, in March and April, heavy rains in the Susquehanna and Chenango drainage basins caused considerable flood damage in low-lying areas below Binghamton. The damage would have been more severe if the gates at Whitney Point and East Sidney had not been closed. But it would have been reduced had the Davenport Center Dam or any of the other projects been completed. Such flood damage occurs in this area almost every year.

We have already suffered much; we have been warned of even more.

We feel there can no longer be any excuse for further delay. The fact that we have been lucky so far should not blind us to the risks we have taken or the disasters which may yet occur before the program is completed.

You will understand, therefore, the degree of our disappointment when we learned that the President's budget for the civil works program for the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1957 did not recommend the appropriation of funds for any of the uncompleted dams.

I assume that the omission was either an oversight or stemmed from a lack of understanding of the importance of this flood control program to south central New York and parts of Pennsylvania.

In fact, all the way down the Susquehanna River which runs over 400 miles these flood-control dams which I speak of will be of assistance right straight down to where the Susquehanna hits the Chesapeake.

*Davenport Center Dam*

The United States Army Corps of Engineers and the New York State Flood Control Commission have assigned the highest priority to the dam at Davenport Center on Charlotte Creek, a Susquehanna tributary in Delaware County, for which plans are 92 percent complete.

Accordingly, this year we are asking particularly for an appropriation of $1 million for the completion of these plans and the first year's construction. The total cost of this dam is estimated at $12,100,000. It will have a reservoir capacity of 52,500 acre-feet, and will reduce the flood discharge of the Susquehanna at Binghamton by more than 7 percent above the Chenango confluence, and by 4 percent below the Chenango. At flood stage such margins can, and often do, spell the difference between safety and disaster.

In addition to the Tri-City area, the Davenport Center Dam will benefit Owego in Tioga County and a number of communities above Binghamton, including Oneonta, Unadilla, Sidney, Bainbridge, Afton, Wellsbridge, Otego, and Conklin-Kirkwood, and also a number of areas in Pennsylvania, both above and below Binghamton.

The remaining 4 dams of the approved program are estimated to cost about $43 million. In order of priority, they are Genegantslet on the stream of that name in Chenango County, West Oneonta on Otego Creek in Otsego County, South Plymouth on the Canasawacta in Chenango County, and Copes Corners on Butternut Creek in Otsego County. Eventually these dams should all be built to provide adequate protection both above and below Binghamton, but we are not pressing for construction funds this year as the plans are not sufficiently advanced. I am, however, asking for an appropriation of $468,000 for additional planning on these 4 dams.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, our requests are indeed modest in light of the dangers that confront our industries and homeowners in south central New York.

In making these requests, I have tried to take account of the problems you face in the total Federal budget and in balancing our needs against the demands of other areas.

Knowing of the pressure of time that is upon the committee, I will not outline the specifics of the products for which we are seeking appropriations. The briefs filed by the State Flood Control Commission and the Broome County Flood Protection Council set forth the details.

Again may I express my appreciation to the committee for its courtesy to me in setting this special hearing.

Mr. ROONEY. In behalf of the committee, may I express our thanks to you for a highly interesting and informative statement.

Are there any questions?

Mr. JENSEN. Governor, what does the local participation amount to? What do the local people intend to put up in the way of contribution to the costs?

Governor HARRIMAN. It is entirely a Federal project in accordance with the programs that the Federal Government has assumed in other flood-control measures. The State, as I understand it, purchases the land subject to repayment by the projects when they are approved.

To specifically answer your question, this is entirely part of the flood control program as developed in accordance with congressional legislation and plans developed by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. JENSEN. Then it is 100 percent flood control?

Governor HARRIMAN. One hundred percent Federal. I may say, and I think I am right in saying this, the Susquehanna River runs over 400 miles, rising in Pennsylvania, coming into New York State, again going into Pennsylvania and down south into Chesapeake Bay, and all those living on the Susquehanna River will benefit from this project, although the immediate urgent need is for this important industrial area.

I might state to this committee that there is in the budget, which I hope the committee will approve, the sum of $1,030,000 for additional walls and levees along the river below Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson, and the small community of Vestal which will help control the flood waters. The amount is $1,030,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you know whether or not the Army engineers made a request of the Bureau of the Budget for any funds for any of these projects?

Governor HARRIMAN. I think these requests have been up before the Bureau of the Budget, but I don't know exactly concerning the presentation made to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. EVANS. At one time $100,000 was added to the bill for this but later was lost in conference.

Mr. JENSEN. So you do not know what went on between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget?

Governor HARRIMAN. I am not familiar with that. I do know that all these dams are on the program of the Corps of Engineers. The total program for the State as originally outlined was over $90 million, of which about half has been completed, 2 in this part of the State and 2 in another part of the State.

The program was developed at the time of the floods in 1935-36. Twenty years have gone by, and much damage has been suffered by these communities.

As you well know, sir, the urgency of flood control comes just after there has been terrible damage, and then we are apt to forget about it.

We had this very close shave this year, with considerable damage in spite of what has been done, so I feel that this 20-year-old concept should now be carried out before it is too late.

May I say that as I understand it, requests to the Budget are usually kept confidential, so I cannot inform you as to what happened there. There is no doubt as to the position of the Corps of Engineers on these projects. They have been approved, authorized by the Congress back in 1936, some of them, and I think two were added at a subsequent date.

Mr. JENSEN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you very much, Governor Harriman.

Governor HARRIMAN. There is a small amount of local objection. I have had a few letters on this. Local farmers in the communities affected, as always, whether it is a road or flood control, object to it. However, the main body, as I get the situation and know the situation, of the people living in this area are strongly in favor of this project.

We have had a few letters from particular farmers there. There are 49 pieces of property entirely affected by this in these 1,800 acres, and about 59 are partially affected.

I mention this only in case some of you get a few letters suggesting that this appropriation be postponed.

Mr. KIRWAN. As you stated, the length of the Susquehanna is 400-and-some miles?

Governor HARRIMAN. That is right.

Mr. KIRWAN. You can follow the river all the way down to Chesapeake Bay. They have built or are now building levees at many points all along that river. They have them all through Wilkes-Barre and down through that area.

We have apparently not learned much from the Mississippi. On the Mississippi we built levees for years and years instead of building dams at the headwaters. Now they realize the importance of upstream control. They have been building dams in recent years all along the tributaries of the Mississippi.

If they would build more dams like you are proposing they would make some of these levees unnecessary and it would be a much better means of protecting these cities and communities and the whole area, including farmlands, roads, and so forth. Is that not correct?

Governor HARRIMAN. Mr. KIRWAN, as I understand it, these levees are probably wise in themselves, but none of them are sufficient unless we combine them with the flood-control dams. The work asked for in the $1,030,000 I mentioned is to build levees in the area below Binghamton. It will keep normal flood water in the channels and it will increase the flow, for instance, from 42,000 cubic feet per second to 75,000 cubic feet in the Chenango and 80,000 cubic feet in the Susquehanna River. But that is not enough.

Mr. KIRWAN. The levees are not enough to stop the floods?

Governor HARRIMAN. They are enough to check a small flood but not a big one.

Mr. KIRWAN. But the dams will?

Governor HARRIMAN. Combined with the others they will.

Mr. KIRWAN. Combined with the levees they will check the floods at these cities and towns but the dams will offer some degree of protection all the way down the river.

Governor HARRIMAN. The two combined have been worked out by the Corps of Engineers.

I cannot speak as to the area below here, whether the dikes would be necessary, or the levees, if we complete all these dams. I would not be able to answer that.

Mr. Chairman, some of the gentlemen who by their presence have come with me to indicate their interest in this proposal would like to have the privilege of submitting supplemental briefs in addition to those already submitted. May that be done?

Mr. ROONEY. Such supplemental briefs may be inserted at this point in the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

"A BRIEF FROM THE BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL IN THE MATTER OF APPROPRIATIONS TO CONSTRUCT FIVE RETENTION DAMS ON THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER—REQUEST FOR FLOOD PROTECTION ON THE (UPPER) SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

"(Communications with respect to this brief may be addressed to George G. Coughlin, acting chairman, Broome County Flood Protection Council, 66 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N. Y.; Howard E. Orton, chairman, governmental relations committee, Broome County Flood Protection Council, 66 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N. Y.)

"I. LOCAL PROTECTION FOR ENDICOTT, JOHNSON CITY, AND VESTAL

"It is to be assumed the Appropriations Committee will recommend that the first phase of the construction of dikes, levees, and pumping stations for local protection for Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal will go forward as recommended by the Director of the Budget. If this is not so, or if there is any doubt as to this project being recommended by the committee, then we would like an opportunity at a proper time and place to present facts showing the urgent need for such construction to protect the important industrial communities of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y.

"II. ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

"The group appearing before the committee today represents the Broome County Flood Protection Council, which is a unit of the chambers of commerce of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott in Broome County, consisting of representatives of those chambers of commerce, mayors of the city of Binghamton, villages of Johnson City and Endicott, representatives of the governmental bodies of rural communities bordering on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers, the Broome County Planning Board, the Upper Susquehanna Watershed Association, and other agencies vitally concerned with the problem of flood protection in the southern tier. Present at today's hearing are Mr. Charles F. Johnson, president of Endicott-Johnson Corp., Mr. Arthur L. Becker, general manager of International Business Machines Corp. plant at Endicott, N. Y., Mr. Robert Ford, chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Broome County, Hon. Donald W. Kramer, mayor of the city of Binghamton, Mr. Raymond Fairbrother, acting mayor of the village of Endicott, Mr. Heath D. Andrews, secretary of the Broome County Flood Protection Council and member of the managerial staff of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Howard E. Orton, chairman of the governmental relations committee of the Broome County Flood Protection Council and manager of the Binghamton district of the New York State Electric & Gas Corp., and George G. Coughlin, who appears in a dual capacity as chairman of the flood-protection committee of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce and acting chairman of the Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"III. COMMUNITIES AFFECTED

"In Broome County are Binghamton, Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, the largest industrial communities in the State of New York, directly affected by the five dams on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers authorized by Congress in 1936 and 1944, moneys for the construction of which have not been appropriated. The approximate population of the area to be benefited by the construction of the 5 retention dams is 200,000.

"IV. VITAL INDUSTRIES

"Three great industries are directly represented here today; two of them by resident managers, International Business Machines Corp. by Mr. Becker, New York State Electric & Gas Corp. by Mr. Orton, and the other, Endicott-Johnson Corp. by Mr. Charles F. Johnson, its president. It is not casual interest in the problem which brings these men here today. They are vitally interested in the welfare of upward to 50,000 area workers in the plants and in the protection of the plant properties themselves.

"V. LOSSES

"In the 1935 Susquehanna River flood, 35 lives were lost. In the 1935 and 1936 floods on the Susquehanna, direct property losses were estimated at over $7 million. In 1936 Congress authorized the building of the Davenport Center Reservoir, the West Oneonta Reservoir, and the Copes Corner Reservoir, on the Susquehanna River. In 1944 Congress authorized the building of the South Plymouth Reservoir and the Genegantslet Reservoir, but these projects were held up presumably due to the war. We are reliably informed that the 5 reservoirs, 3 on the Susquehanna and 2 on the Chenango, are the only reservoirs in the State of New York authorized by Congress but not completed.

"VI. ADDITIONAL PROTECTION REQUIRED

"We do have flood walls and dykes in Binghamton alone, but these are only part of the program. We need upstream reservoirs for the Army engineers tell us that an increase in protection at Binghamton is necessary since the protective works there would be overtopped by a recurrence of the July 1935 storm transposed eastward in the basin.

"VII. URGENT NEED

"The torrential rains associated with Hurricane Diane pointed up the need for additional flood protection not only for southern New York, eastern Pennsylvania, and northern New Jersey, but also for southeastern New York. It is true that the sections worst hit by the floods caused by Hurricane Diane were in New England, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, but a study of the data submitted by the United States Weather Bureau indicates that the course of Diane was headed northward past Raleigh, N. C., and west of Washington, D. C., and when it reached the point opposite Philadelphia it took almost a right angle turn and headed for Long Island and New England. An inspection of the Weather Bureau's map showing the total storm precipitation during the period from August 17, to August 20, 1955, indicates that if Diane had continued its course northward or veered slightly to the west, Broome County, N. Y., would have been one of the worst victims of the storm. We were just plain lucky.

"VII. LOCAL RELIANCE

"We submit that the dams already authorized by Congress should be constructed before new dams are authorized. People in a community are entitled to rely on the authorization and approval of dams by Congress. The five dams in question should be beyond the controversial stage. They have already been approved by Congress. All that is needed is the appropriation by Congress to carry out its good faith commitment. Two examples of the reliance by the people in Binghampton on the commitment of Congress are to be found in: (1) the plans for erection of a $4 million hotel by the Sheraton Hotel Corp. The hotel is to be built in an area unprotected by walls and dykes. Sufficient protection, however, would be afforded by the building of the authorized dams; (2) a large shopping center is being constructed between Johnson City and Endicott in an area which could be inundated by a flood of the 1935 proportion. The authorized dams would help protect that area.

"IX. COST

"Latest estimate for construction costs of the 5 dams is $47,665,000. The building of these dams authorized in 1936 and 1944 is long overdue. We respectfully submit that considering the fact that New York State pays over 18 percent of the tax burden of the Nation, it is not unreasonable to ask for an appropriation of $47 million for the 5 dams.

"There should be no compromise with the proposition that dams already authorized should be built before new dams are authorized. There is no justification for piecemeal construction. It should be noted, however, that the Army engineers are talking about redesigning the dam at Copes Corner on the Susquehanna. If any one project should not be acted upon this year it probably would be the Copes Corner project. However, we believe the construction of the remaining 4 dams should be authorized this year. That would give 2 on the Susquehanna, the Davenport Center and the West Oneonta Dams, and 2 on the Chenango, the Genegantslet and the South Plymouth Dams.

"Respectfully submitted.

"THE BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL."

"IN THE MATTER OF APPROPRIATIONS TO CONSTRUCT FIVE RETENTION DAMS ON THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER—REQUEST FOR FLOOD PROTECTION ON THE (UPPER) SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

"SUPPLEMENTARY BRIEF OF BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL

"The following representatives will appear before the committee in Washington on March 8, 1956:

"Hon. Donald W. Kramer, mayor, city of Binghamton, N. Y.

"Senator Warren M. Anderson, State senator, 47th District, New York State.

"Edgar E. Severson, president, Binghamton Chamber of Commerce.

"John Brunner, vice president, Greater Endicott Chamber of Commerce, and vice chairman, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"Charles F. Johnson, Jr., president, Endicott Johnson Corp.

"Robert H. Austin, director of public relations, International Business Machines Corp.

"John Donnelly, deputy commissioner of motor vehicles, State of New York.

"George G. Coughlin, chairman, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"Howard E. Orton, chairman, governmental relations committee, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"Heath D. Andrews, staff executive, Binghamton Chamber of Commerce and secretary treasurer, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"INTRODUCTION

"On March 28, 1956, we filed a brief urging appropriations to construct the five retention dams authorized in 1936 and 1944.

"Because inclement weather prevented the airplane flights from New York State to Washington, we were unable to appear before your committee at the scheduled hearing on March 28. Thereafter, we requested another opportunity to be heard.

"Today Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York State, appears before your honorable committee in support of our request that appropriations be made to further the work on the construction.

"I. NEW INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE UNITED STATES CORPS OF ARMY ENGINEERS

"Under date of April 20, 1956, the undersigned council received the following information from Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of the Army Engineers for Civil Works:

" 'Based on the status of planning for these projects the following amounts could be economically used during the fiscal year when funds may next be appropriated for these projects: $1 million to complete planning and initiate first year construction on Davenport Center Dam; $168,000 for continuing the next year of planning on Genegantslet Dam; and $100,000 for similar planning of each of the South Plymouth, West Oneonta and Copes Corners Dams. The status of planning on these projects would preclude use of the larger construction funds you suggest.'

"We, therefore, request that your committee recommend to the Congress the appropriations for the coming fiscal year of the following sums for the five uncompleted retention dams on the Susquehanna watershed:

"Davenport Center Dam to complete planning and initiate first year construction—$1 million.

"Genegantslet Dam for continuing the next year of planning, $168,000.

"South Plymouth Dam for continuing the next year of planning, $100,000.

"West Oneonta Dam for continuing the next year of planning, $100,000.

"Copes Corners Dam for continuing the next year of planning, $100,000.

"II. ADDITIONAL COMMUNITIES HEARD FROM

"As pointed out in the brief filed on March 28, the undersigned council represents the largest industrial communities in the State of New York directly affected by the five unbuilt dams on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers.

"Subsequently, the following communities in New York State and Pennsylvania have filed letters with your committee urging that the authorized dams be constructed: Owego, Tioga County, N. Y.; Plymouth, Luzerne County, Pa.; Sayre, Bradford County, Pa.; Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa.; Danville, Montour County, Pa.; Terrytown, Bradford County, Pa.; Athens, Bradford County, Pa; Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pa.; Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pa.

"The mighty Susquehanna River is over 400 miles long and the retention reservoirs on tributaries in New York State would benefit scores of communities in New York State and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, thus justifying the relatively minor expenditure of money in an interstate project, compared to the hundreds of millions which have been spent in other States.

"III. PROMPT ACTION NECESSARY

"The history of building of flood-control reservoirs shows that with the inflationary trend of our times every year's delay means more in the cost of the building of the dams.

"To date, according to reliable advice from the Army engineers, over $500,000 has been spent in the design, planning, field work, and preparation of data by the Corps of Engineers. Any rejection of the dam would be a wasteful throwing away of valuable manhours and materials spent on the projects.

"IV. THE QUESTION OF 'LOCAL OPPOSITION' HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE CONGRESS AND DISPOSED OF

"Prior to the enactment of the 1936 and 1944 acts by which Congress authorized and approved the 5 remaining unbuilt dry reservoirs, hearings were held and the usual 'local opposition' was considered. Congress used the following language:

" 'The projects "are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted in the order of their emergency as may be directed by the President under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, etc." '

"No 'newly discovered' opposition has been presented beyond that which was originally presented. The same type of 'local opposition' is encountered in every public works project whether it be a highway, a bridge, or a dam.

"V. 'THERE ARE NO ALTERNATIVE METHODS'

"Some misguided zealots try to stir up local opposition by saying that there are other methods by which large communities can be protected from excessive flood damages, such as soil conservation and forest management.

"Responsible supporters of the soil-conservation program of the Department of Agriculture do not claim that the development of small watersheds will play a major part in waterflow retardation on the main rivers. Every flood-control measure helps, but soil erosion and harnessing of small streams are minor factors. Soil conservation promotional groups have done such a good job of publicizing their program that now the Department of Agriculture is issuing the warning that soil conservation is not major flood protection.

"Mr. Hugh M. Wilson, soil conservationist of Cornell University, stated: 'While it is not expected that headwater measures will control major floods, they will help reduce damages. However, most of the benefits will be in the immediate vicinity and, until work has been done on all tributaries, cities downstream can expect little benefit.'

"VI. BOTH URBAN AND RURAL POPULATIONS WOULD BENEFIT FROM THE DAM

"It is true that the population of the communities represented by the undersigned council, according to the 1955 New York State Department of Commerce census, is 197,462. It is true that we are an industrial community; that we have a total of 181 industries in Broome County including such outstanding nationwide industries as: Endicott Johnson Corp.; International Business Machines Corp.; Link Aviation, Inc.; Ansco and Ozalid Divisions of General Aniline & Film Corp.; Kroehler Manufacturing Co.; General Electric Co., Aeronautics Division.

"But farmers too will benefit from the proposed dams.

"The following are excerpts from letters received from farmers whose lands are below the proposed dams:

*"Excerpts from letter No. 1*

" 'We own 80 acres in the Susquehanna Valley which has in the last 3 days been about 70 percent under water.'

" 'The East Sidney dam kept back sufficient water to prevent a serious situation. Any dam or dams east of our property would greatly relieve the ever-present threat of summer as well as winter or spring flooding.'

" 'Another foot of water above the recent high point would have flooded our barn and required the movement of cattle and other property.'

*"Excerpt from letter No. 2*

" 'Received your letter concerning the Davenport Center of West Oneonta Dam project. In regard to myself I would undoubtedly be benefited by it. Each year at flood time I lose a good many feet along the river bank of my river flat. Eventually, without control, there will be no river flat at all. I'm sincerely in favor of this project.'

*"Excerpt from letter No. 3*

" 'I lost all the manure on my land and it also washed about 30 feet of land away. We had some benefit by the East Sidney Dam, but I would be benefited just as much or more by the two other dams.'

*"Excerpt from letter No. 4*

" 'On the other hand the high water here does damage the property of several of my neighbors and I would be in favor of any dam that might prevent the flooding.'

*"Excerpt from letter No. 5*

" 'I don't like to see people lose their homes, but if they live by the river they sure think as I do, what if we get a bad flood in the night as we did some years ago. East Sidney took a lot of farms and homes, but it has helped a lot.'

*"Excerpts from letter No. 6*

" 'I have 10 acres of flatland along the river which about 75 percent of it is flooded. Before the East Sidney Dam was built and also the dam removed below Harpursville my flat was completely flooded. This meant washing of the riverbank and the flat also. It always meant a late start for oats, too.'

" 'I certainly believe something has to be done and done soon. If we ever get a flood like Pennsylvania had, it will be pretty hard on Binghamton. I haven't helped you much, I know, only to say I agree with a proposed dam on the river.'

"What better proof can we have that farmers below the dams who would be benefited thereby are in favor of the project?

"Respectfully submitted.

"BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL,

"By the following officers:

"GEORGE C. COUGHLIN,
*Chairman.*

"JOHN BRUNNER,
*Vice Chairman.*

"HEATH D. ANDREWS,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*"

Governor HARRIMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Governor; thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. STERLING COLE. I appear today to show I am a strong supporter of the recommendation advanced by the Governor.

Mr. ROONEY. We are indeed honored to have the distinguished gentleman from New York with us this morning.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and in view of the facts brought out in the hearings held by this committee on the subject, I accept the amendment.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, first of all may I say that I am quite amazed at this amendment and at my very dear friend who is proposing it. I had no idea he was so interested in my district and in that part of the State. I was happy to see that he had a map so that he could really find out exactly where these places are.

Now, of course, we have been talking about this project for many years. This is nothing new at all. The people in Delaware County, the farmers in Davenport Center that my dear friend brushes aside so lightly as being 49 parcels of property or some such thing, constitute a very prosperous farming area of over 300 inhabitants. That, of course, may seem nothing to the House of Representatives. We deal daily in billions of dollars and in millions of population. The people of this part of my district have no intention of penalizing or hurting their good friends in the triple cities. They go there constantly and they have their interests at heart. I go to this district constantly. I have never seen these horrible floods and these holocausts that have been mentioned today. Yes, there has been some flooding, certainly, and there has been some damage but, thank God, nothing like the damage that there has been in other parts of the State where so far absolutely nothing has been done. Already a great part of the property of the farmers of Delaware County has been sacrificed to the Downsville Dam.

Now, what the Delaware County people want—and I support them in their wishes, which I think are perfectly fair and natural—is the opportunity to determine by professional surveys whether or not protective measures, at least as great as those believed to be possible from the construction of this tremendous project, cannot be achieved through a series of small dams and through soil and forest conservation. And, there are many experts who believe this can be done. As against this sensible approach, the construction of the Davenport Center Dam would cost, according to the last estimate I have had from the Army engineers, $12.1 million. It would completely inundate 2,175 acres of good farmland—this is not just scrub land; it is good farmland, the best dairy county in the State of New York—a figure the Corps of Engineers gave me in a letter dated April 7, 1954. It would involve relocating 4 miles of railroad, constructing a railroad station, relocating 2 miles of State highway and various other very costly enterprises. What is most devastating, it would completely take out of operation some of the best dairy country in the East and would mean the loss of livelihood for the entire population of the area. In fact, it has been calculated that the loss of income, if this dam is built, to the people of the area would be $1 million per annum.

Mr. Chairman, I have received hundreds of letters concerning this dam. I have put these letters in the hearings, and may I say to my good friend, I wish he would read them. There are 32 pages of them. I have also included resolutions from the towns and from the supervisors of that entire district. They are all the same. They come from neighboring towns, from Oneonta, from Harpersville, East Meredith, all of whom will suffer if this enormous, gigantic dam is constructed. The people of Delaware County, in opposing this costly venture, are in no sense promoting their own selfish interests. They are as anxious as anyone to see that the people of Binghamton are protected, but they believe it can be done without this tremendous cost and without interfering with the welfare of the residents of that entire area. They belong, I am sorry to say, to that very small segment of the population of our country—and it is unfortunate that it is so small—that believes results can be accomplished without adding still another huge burden to the already overburdened taxpayers.

I respectfully urge this House to give these local people the time to complete their studies before adding to this appropriation bill an item which the Bureau of the Budget has not included and which, to my mind, is completely unnecessary. This item does not appear in the bill. It seems that my good friend in his kindheartedness has gone out and pulled it out of the air. Why not let it go over for the present at least?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentlewoman that I did not pull this project out of the air. Perhaps the gentlewoman does not know that the highly distinguished Governor of the State of New York, accompanied by 20 highly responsible citizens of the area, testified in its behalf before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to my friend that I am fully aware of that fact, but is my friend aware of the fact that I testified also? That may be very unimportant to him, but I testified with 40 people from my district. I can assure the gentleman that my testimony, although it was given less attention, was quite as good as that given by our mutual friend, the Governor of the great State of New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the kindly gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my kindly friend, always.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentlewoman that I read every word of her testimony. After having read it, I admire her more than ever, but I disagree with her as much as ever.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my friend. May I say that I also read the testimony. I would not want my friend to think that I did not know what the Governor had said. I am fully cognizant of it. But I still think it is an unfortunate proceeding to give the people of a district something that they do not want, something for which they will have to pay. And I have always understood that it was rather an unusual proceeding on the part of a congressional committee, that as a general rule that is not the case. And I would like to quote to my friend something that was said at the hearing by my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. He said, at the end of my testimony:

> I might say, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, that we have enough requests for dams for which the people are unanimous in the localities involved and personally I do not intend to go along with any project to which there is local opposition.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the lady yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am still of that very decided opinion. I was present as a member of the subcommittee and I listened very carefully to the lady and her group; and I was also present when the Governor of New York, Mr. Harriman, was present and testified. In my opinion, the Governor and his group made a very poor presentation.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My sympathies are entirely with the people up above who are going to lose their homes because, as the lady has well stated, this is an unnecessary project. It will not help the city of Binghamton because, after all, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will explain later, the testimony will show that the flood control wall itself will amply protect Binghamton. Certainly the whole project is unjustifiable. The lady is to be complimented for the splendid and courageous fight she has made to defeat this project.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I can tell my friend that the flood wall has already helped the city of Binghamton and that the experts of the Corps of Engineers of the Army have told us that the best that the city of Binghamton may expect from the construction of this dam is a maximum control of 2 inches; that will be the maximum and, of course, the minimum will be considerably less.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we expect to complete this bill tonight.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, that

time to be allotted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN objected.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If we adopt a request to limit debate, and I am constrained to go along with such a request, of course, will it prevent me from offering an amendment which in effect might change the amount of the figure which we now have under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. If an amendment is adopted changing the figure, that freezes the figure.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the 20 minutes to be consumed by the four Members who are standing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN was permitted to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. KEARNEY.)

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I oppose in principle the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to provide for the construction of a dam at Davenport Center, Delaware County, N. Y., a county which adjoins one in my own 32d Congressional District, namely Otsego County.

For many years past I have spent considerable time before boards of Army engineers with reference to several flood-control projects not only in my own district but also in areas adjoining my district which projects were directed at districts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. Over the strenuous opposition of the entire three congressional districts of my colleagues named above and myself, we find ourselves in the position of year in and year out opposing projects which would cost at least $45 million—remember, at least $45 million—and which would be of no practical or economic value.

Let me picture to you some data from the United States Geological Survey concerning the Davenport Center project on Charlotte Creek, Delaware County, N. Y.—the one in issue under the present amendment. The report from the Geological Survey shows the maximum streamflows of record on the Susquehanna River at Binghamton above the Chenango River was 61,600 cubic feet per second. The recently constructed floodwalls and other local protection facilities are reported to provide for a flood flow of 80,000 cubic feet per second, or over 30 percent greater than any flow of record. The flood of record—61,600 cubic feet per second—occurred on March 18, 1936, and the next largest of record—60,500 cubic feet per second—occurred on March 22, 1948. Since both those record flows, the East Sidney Reservoir has been constructed which is expected to reduce the flood potential at Binghamton.

The flood flows of record on the Susquehanna River at Vestal just below Binghamton and below the confluence of the Chenango River are reported as 107,000 cubic feet per second in March 1936 and as 114,000 cubic feet per second in 1865, the latter being based on reported high-water marks of that time. The Whitney Point Reservoir in the Chenango River Basin was completed in 1942 and reportedly will reduce flood flows of the Chenango at Binghamton by over 16 percent. The presently authorized local flood protection works for Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, for which construction funds are budgeted for 1957, are to provide for flood flows of 125,000 cubic feet per second or 10 percent greater than flows of record before construction of the two existing flood-control reservoirs.

It is also of interest to note that the Chenango River contributes from 30 to 45 percent of the major flood flows of the Susquehanna at Vestal. The Davenport Center Dam, of course, would have no effect on the Chenango River flows.

The drainage area of Charlotte Creek at Davenport Center is only 164 square miles or slightly over 7 percent of the drainage area of the Susquehanna River at Binghamton above the Chenango River and slightly over 4 percent of the drainage area of the Susquehanna River at Vestal below the confluence of the Chenango River. The Charlotte Creek flows at Davenport Center at the time of flood flows of record at Binghamton were around 5,000 cubic feet per second or less.

Summarizing, it is readily apparent that the Davenport Center Dam would have almost negligible effect on the stage height and flood flows of the Susquehanna River at Binghamton and Vestal.

It should also be noted that based on present estimated cost of $12,100,000, the cost per acre-foot of flood-control storage at the proposed Davenport Center Reservoir is extremely high. If, as has been indicated, the actual cost may be nearly double the present estimate of cost, then the actual cost per acre-foot of storage would be astronomical.

Davenport Center Dam is over 90 miles away from Binghamton and a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second would have no effect at all upon the situation in Binghamton. It is too far away. If all the water that the stream produces came down and was impounded, it would make no difference. On the other hand, the reservoir at Whitney Point was set by the engineers to reduce the flood flow of the Chenango at Binghamton over 16 percent. This would reduce any flood waters down to a point that would be less than 90,000 cubic feet per second on the Susquehanna. This is a 35,000-feet-per-second margin against the 125,000 cubic feet per second of flood protection at Vestal, Endicott, and Johnson City provided in the bill according to the testimony given by the Corps of Engineers and would not make a difference of over 2 inches. Is the cost of this project worth the amount of money requested in this amendment?

Let me go further, if you will, please.

In rallying to the aid of those persons who are pleading for the abolition of the Davenport Center project, I do so with the firm conviction that the carrying out of this planned undertaking would be illogical and economically unsound. The idea of holding back floodwater in enormous dams might be entertained where it is possible to utilize canyons and barren land of little or no value, but in locations such as the Davenport Center area, there are other measures which are much better or equally adequate at a cost which is not prohibitive.

Flood protection for the triple cities, Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City, could be had for a very few dollars by impounding basins in the upper regions of the North Susquehanna River and its branches and by developing reforestation in the hills. This kind of procedure would result in no substantial property loss, no requirement of building bridges, and very little land to acquire. It would cost only about 10 to 15 percent of the dam project, and the reforestation program would also help to replenish our fast-disappearing forests.

The advantages of small basins or reservoirs in flood-control protection are:

First. Speed of construction.

Second. Safety to lives and property.

Third. Flexibility of operations: An acre-foot of suitably apportioned multiple storage—small reservoir—will have an effective control value of 4 acre-feet in a single large reservoir located downstream.

Fourth. Erosion control.

The economic benefits expected, if the dam is built, will be considerably less than the actual losses which are easily determined. Never, except on very rare occasions, have the flood waters of the Susquehanna reached such proportions as to cause more than slight inconvenience to the areas of the Susquehanna. Therefore, it seems that a less drastic method of flood control than the one planned by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, would adequately take care of the situation.

The area involved under this amendment is a rich farming and residential section of New York State. It is dotted with small communities, closely related and interdependent in matters of milk production, school, church and business. It contains the usual network of highways, and a railway which serves the valley. It doesn't take much imagination to realize the hardship that would be caused by the complete and final destruction of a large section of the area to construct a huge flood control dam. In planning such projects, perhaps the Army engineers do not include the sentimental aspects involved. Yet they are important. Consider what it will mean to render several hundred people homeless, the breaking of family ties and friendship, the destruction of ancestral homes, the desolation of cemeteries, the frustrated plans for the future and the necessity to start over somewhere else.

Even if sentiment has no place in the picture, the financial cost of the Davenport Center Dam is sufficient to justify

dropping the plans at once. In addition to construction costs, there is the matter of compensating the farmers, homeowners, and business concerns for their property taken. We should consider the financial problems that would result from the disruption of central school districts, the cost of building new highways, the perpetual cost of maintaining the dam and many other costs which cannot be assessed in advance.

For some time the threat—the dam project—hanging over this area has been doing much damage. Real estate values are affected, public officials and private citizens hesitate to make improvements and are at a loss to know how to plan for the future. I am sure that the Army engineers understand the amount of damage that will be done if the dam is constructed as well as the damage being done by a delayed decision. I therefore suggest that this amendment be defeated.

Only 2 years ago, after several years of hearings, the Army engineers reporting on the north branch of the Susquehanna River and tributaries, New York and Pennsylvania, said, and I quote, "the reporting officers gave further consideration to the matter of a reservoir at Mount Upton on the Unadilla River but in view of the intense local opposition, they do not recommend authorization of a project at this location."

The engineers know that by building small dams and ponds on feeder streams it will save millions of dollars to the taxpayers without the entailing loss of thousands of acres of the best farmland in the State of New York—upheaval of homes—destruction of businesses—resultant loss of taxes—communities wiped out—and people made to start life all over again after having lived in this area for many, many years as their ancestors did. No, my colleagues, the building of a flood-control dam at Davenport Center, in the words of one citizen, "Would be a tragedy of major proportions."

Since March 27, when the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the former chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and myself appeared before the Subcommittee on Public Works, I have been bombarded with hundreds of letters protesting the erection of this dam, and these letters, my colleagues, come from parts of my own district as well as from Davenport Center. This in view of the fact that high officials of the State of New York say that only a few people are against this project. Why are the people of my district opposed to this particular project? For the reason that they fear for the rest of their own areas—fear that once one project is voted by this committee, many others of the same nature in the adjoining areas will be voted and the result, as I have said before, will be chaos—loss of homes—valuable farmland—uprooting of complete communities, and a new start in life somewhere else—the building of unnecessary and expensive projects—and I ask you to vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I understood that I was to have 5 minutes to close the debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was not of that understanding. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would have 5 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. COLE. The request was that the gentleman from New York will close the debate. I also qualify under that characterization, being in support of the amendment; and, under the rules of the House, it is my understanding that I would be recognized to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from New York that a member of the committee is entitled to close the debate if he so desires.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire to be recognized to close the debate?

Mr. TABER. I desire to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, it is a rather unusual and unique experience for me to rise in support of an amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from New York, [Mr. ROONEY], appropriating additional funds for flood control. It is unique because very rarely do I take the floor or vote for amendments to increase appropriations. However, in view of the fact that the people I represent will be benefited by this appropriation, and further in view of the fact that a great percentage of the money to support the appropriations made by this Congress comes from the taxpayers of New York State. I do not mind getting up once in a while and asking for a little aid for the people of New York State.

Then the other reason why this is unique for me is to find myself in such diametric opposition to my good friends and colleagues, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, Mr. FABER, and Mr. KEARNEY, whose districts surround me geographically in New York and who personally surround me this afternoon on the floor with their guns pointed toward me and my people.

I was somewhat amazed by an expression made by one of those who have already spoken. It is understandable that people whose land is being taken away from them for the dam site should protest. It is understandable that they should protest to their Representatives in Congress and that their Representatives should voice here in the House the protests of their constituents. What I do find it hard to understand is that in the expression of such protests they should lose sight of the broader picture; in expressing a view which is narrow and borders on provincialism they lose sight of the benefits and the savings of life and property of thousands and thousands of people who live downstream. They say leave us alone who live upstream and let the people downstream take care of themselves. What crass selfishness!

I was here in Congress and assisted when the authorization for these dams was made 20 years ago, and we did not hear a single protest made by the landowners then. As a matter of fact, 4 or 5 dams have actually been constructed since then and not a word of protest or complaint has been made by the owners of the lands that were used for those dams. It just so happens in the last 2 years because of the recurrence of these floods the people living downstream, the victims of this short, this narrow, this provincial attitude are beginning to be awakened to the danger under which they are constantly living and are asking for the completion of this program laid out by the Army engineers 20 years ago, and asking that the remaining dams be built.

I shall not argue the technical aspects of the engineers' recommendations but am ready to be guided by their advice; in fact I prefer their engineering advice to that given me by Faber, St. George & Kearney, Inc. Whether their specifications ask for 2 inches of flood protection, or half an inch, or even it may be a quarter of an inch, if it is enough to protect the properties of these people from being flooded or being silted up and to save their lives, then I say it is money well invested.

It has been said that it will cost $45 million to complete this project. The truth is that the Corps of Engineers says it will cost only $14 million. And this appropriation today is for $1 million.

But it does seem that after 20 years of patient waiting the people who are to be benefited by this improvement ought not be brushed aside by the selfish attitudes of narrow people.

I would also call your attention to the fact that these are what we call dry dams. All that the Government acquires is the flowage rights, the right to inundate the land in question in case of excessive rainfall. For long periods of time the land is available for use just as it has always been used for centuries. Occasionally, maybe 1 year out of 10, the land is inundated to a depth of some considerable feet for a limited period of time. Eventually that water runs off and the farmer comes back in, he plows his land and sows his crop the same as he has in the past. We are not confiscating valuable dairy land permanently. We are simply buying the right to flood that land with excessive rainwater in order to protect the poor, innocent, helpless victims who live downstream. I do not blame my colleagues for getting up and arguing about the protection of the folks living high and dry on the mountaintops but the rest of us should give attention and consideration to the people living downstream, not only in the Triple Cities area but all the way down the Susquehanna River.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to commend the gentleman for the highly interesting and important statement which he is making and for bringing out his point with regard to the fact that the reservoir land is not taken permanently. May I for the sake of emphasis ask him to answer this question: Is it not the fact that the State of New York in connection with projects such as this does

not take the landowner's title in fee simple away from him?

Mr. COLE. That is my understanding. All the Government acquires is the flowage right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this particular dam, the Davenport Center Dam, is 90 miles upstream from the city of Binghamton. It cannot possibly be of value to the people of the city of Binghamton. The flood walls which this committee is providing in the pending bill before us today will protect the city of Binghamton against 126,000 cubic feet per second. The highest water of record was away back in 1865 when they had 114,000 cubic feet per second recorded at that point.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish the gentleman would repeat those figures for the benefit of the Committee.

Mr. TABER. One hundred and twenty-six thousand cubic feet of water would be protected against by the flood wall.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Just what was the previous high?

Mr. TABER. The previous high was 114,000 in 1865.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In other words, this would be just squandering money?

Mr. TABER. That is all. On top of that since the reservoir at Whitney Point was put in, it has really been effective in holding back water because it will hold back 82,000 acre-feet. It has not resulted in a single high-water period in Binghamton anywhere near the old record; 92,000 is the highest record and that was in 1948.

Mr. Chairman, the picture is just simply this: The damage which would be done as the result of each 1 of these 5 dams that some of these promoters, and that is what it is, want to put across would run a million dollars a year as to each one of these setups. They have had surveys made and estimates made, so they know what they are talking about. The result of the thing would be that these people upstream would have 10 times as much damage as could possibly result to the city of Binghamton.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman agree with me that this is the opening wedge and once the Army engineers get their foot into the Davenport Center Dam, there are to be at least 2 other dams constructed with a resultant cost of between forty-five and sixty million dollars?

Mr. TABER. Well, it will be at least as much as that. But, these dams are absolutely unnecessary and will not serve a good purpose. Now, why should we go ahead and vote for something that will do no good at all and which is backed by a group of promoters who are stirred up by a little fellow from Binghamton?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. I do not care to have the gentleman disclose the identity of this little fellow from Binghamton who is stirring it up, but I would like to have him assure me that he will identify the individual to me at a later time.

Mr. TABER. Why, certainly I will. No doubt about that. Everybody in New York State knows who it is and knows what he is doing. I think he is a great promoter.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Congress will not go overboard and vote to start in on this program. There are three projects in my district, in Chenango County, that they want to put in. The cost of those would be over $50 million. There is one in the district represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], that they want to put in. The cost of that would be enormous. This particular one, before they get through with it, would run to $20 million. Let us not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 87, noes 117.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 80, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are very anxious to finish this bill tonight. I ask unanimous consent that on all further amendments to this section, and all amendments thereto, time for debate on each amendment be limited to 5 minutes, to be consumed by the proponent of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there be 5 minutes on a side, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CANNON. In concurrence with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] I amend my request, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that on all further amendments to this section and all amendments thereto debate on each amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be allotted to the proponent and 5 minutes to the committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Reserving the right to object, by that the gentleman means the opposition on the committee; does he not?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS: On page 16, line 4, strike out "$421,734,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$422,034,000, of which $300,000 shall be for the project 'Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.'"

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I am quite certain that this amendment would have been adopted in the committee on yesterday had our Louisiana Member not unavoidably been absent in Louisiana.

This amendment makes it possible for the Army engineers to do necessary initial work on the Mississippi River Gulf outlet, which is a continuation of the channel from the port of New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico, shortening the distance by approximately 40 miles. This is supported by every area and every group throughout the midcontinent of the United States.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. This project, as my colleague knows, is located entirely within the district which I represent in the city of New Orleans.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. However, the fact that it is in the district which I represent does not indicate that it is a strictly local proposition. It is one of community and nationwide interest, as I believe the gentleman indicates by the fact that he offers the amendment now to have the planning money put into this bill at this time.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I might add in connection with what the gentleman has said that to the best of my knowledge every governor in the midcontinent area of the United States has approved this project. This means that if an explosion or an eruption should occur at the mouth of the Mississippi River, which serves the second port of the United States and the greatest trading area in the midcontinent area of the United States, if that delta area should explode, as has happened in the past in the case of the River Nile and other great rivers in the history of the world, then this great trading area would not be blocked out from the commerce of the world.

May I add that this project has been under active study and consideration by the Army engineers since 1943. It was naturally and unfortunately suspended during World War II. It has now been unanimously approved by both our body and the other body. By the approval of $300,000 today, the work should be able to go forward within the next several years.

Mr. HÉBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is coauthor of this bill. I think it would be wise at this time to inform the House as to the benefit ratio.

Mr. BOGGS. It is very high. I think it is 1.54 to 1. I am certain the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the committee, is familiar with this project. I discussed it with some of my good colleagues here and hope that the chairman of the committee will see fit to go along with this amendment, which is so vitally important to the

whole midcontinental area of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not oppose this amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, here is another case. I am not going to take the responsibility that properly belongs to the majority members of this subcommittee who presented this report to the House. I do think the Members of the House should know that this is an $88 million project which was just authorized in March of this year. There are a lot of other projects with just as favorable benefit to cost ratio which have been authorized for a much longer period of time than this project which are waiting their turn for appropriations by the Congress. I do not find any evidence of the urgent nature of this project which would push this $88 million project ahead of a great many other projects located in other parts of the country, which have been authorized, as I said, for a much longer period of time than this one has been authorized. But, as I said, if the majority members of the subcommittee will not take their responsibility, I do not know why I should be the goat and say, "No." If they are willing to accept it, it is up to them.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman and I think that when the gentleman has time to study the project he will find that this project is of equal importance to the people of Wisconsin, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas and all of the other great midcontinental area States of our Nation as it is to those of us who happen to live at the mouth of the great Mississippi River.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I merely want to say that I favored this project in the committee.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman favored this project.

Mr. RABAUT. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.54 to 1 which is a pretty good benefit ratio.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, unless someone decides to use the last 5 minutes, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: On page 16, line 5, preceding the word *"Provided"*, insert the following: "In addition the sum of $300,000 for engineering, planning and designing for the Overton-Red River Waterway."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this project was originally approved in 1946. Since then there have been appropriations by the Congress in several separate instances. Last year, we approved $175,000 for planning money. This amendment would simply add the sum of $300,000 for planning and that is for the purpose of bringing the planning up-to-date so that the project will be tangible from the point of cost and ability to execute. The project, as I say, was approved by the Army Engineers. It was approved by the Congress in 1946. At one time, Mr. Chairman, we actually had this money for planning appropriated, but the war in Korea came along and we had to surrender the money and turn it back. Since then there have been appropriations of almost $400,000 for planning and this is simply an addition to that amount to bring the planning up-to-date. The Bureau of the Budget approved this project. I think it was overlooked by the committee because the hearings were before two different subcommittees.

But this project is at the point if you do not go forward with it you will lose some of the investment you have already in the planning. It is extremely important that we do this. It provides for a waterway in the Red River Valley—not the Mississippi Valley. It is in the Red River Valley. It would start below the city of Shreveport and follow the valley in a southeasterly direction to the Atchafalaya River; and, when completed, that waterway would provide navigation for the great empire in the southwest. It would cover, for instance, the cities of Texarkana, Shreveport, Marshall, Tex., and parts of south Arkansas and all of north Louisiana. As I say, our purpose in asking for these funds is simply to go ahead with the planning which has been approved by the Bureau of Engineers, the Budget, and everybody. We ask for the $300,000 because that would bring the planning down to the point where the engineers can say exactly what the cost of the whole thing will be. The original cost ratio was 2 to 1. Now we have had the Korean war in the meantime. We want to be fair, so we want to have that cost-benefit ratio reestablished, and this will reestablish that figure.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he will not accept this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that I regret on account of certain features in this that I cannot agree to it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Then I want to use the remainder of my time. This matter has been before the committee and the committee has approved it and Congress has approved it time and time again. The amendment is in order because it proceeds with the planning. It is a most worthwhile project. In that valley, 300 miles west of the Mississippi River, 40 miles south of Arkansas, and 12 miles east of the State of Texas there are many, many cities that are badly in need of navigation. We have found that these cities will provide a million dollars' worth of transportation every year for oil and gas alone in that area. It will provide for millions of dollars of freight from our lumber industry and for other industries in that great area.

It is an extremely important project, and I hope that this committee will go along and give us the planning funds that we need so badly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Much as I regret to go against my good friend from Louisiana, nevertheless here we have the beginning of a project costing at least $88½ million dollars and perhaps considerably more. We have here a project to which there is local opposition, as exemplified by Congressman LONG being against it. We have a project designed for navigation purposes, yet you have three important railroads paralleling that particular route. We have a project which will take a considerable amount of good farmland out of production, and a project to which many local people down there are opposed.

I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Let me say to the gentleman that in the matter of surveys I will read from a letter I have, sent by Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner:

You will note from the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, that on page 552 et seq. that General Hardin, in discussing this project, pointed out that due to the long interval between authorization of this project and the many changes that have taken place in the economy of the region, it is felt necessary and desirable to review the economics of this project before construction funds are requested. The planning funds included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1957 would review the engineering and economics of this project in order to establish current construction costs and benefits.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding as much as he did.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to quote from the testimony of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], which appears at page 912 of the hearings. He states this:

The proposed Overton-Red River project is to be a canal cut parallel to the Red River largely through my congressional district. It is proposed to pump the water out of the Red River into this canal to float barges to Shreveport. It was authorized in 1946.

The land in this area is good farming land and a great many of the farmers, constituents of mine, are objecting to having their farms cut into two separate pieces with probably no bridges to give them access to their divided property. In addition, they complain that they will have to pay taxes on their property to provide the funds the local area must provide for land acquisition, changes in highways and new bridges for existing highways.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, there is no provision at present for local interests in any way to have the necessary taxing authority to permit local contribution, and I certainly hope this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In confirmation of what the gentleman from Minnesota said, I quote the following statement by General Hardin during the course of the hearings on this project:

General HARDIN. The Waterways Commission study has gotten to the point where they

are getting set up so that they can have the taxing authority which will be necessary to carry their share of the undertaking. The legislature which is coming up will consider the enactment of those provisions in the laws of Louisiana.

It seems to me that for this Congress to appropriate money without the necessary authorization and assurance of local participation that is required would be setting a precedent that would come back to haunt us in the years ahead.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is a letter guaranteeing local participation. I do not know whether it is in the hearings or not but there is such a confirmation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But no legislative authorization of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. But a State commission has been set up known as the Overton-Red River Waterway Commission which is a State commission and which is now participating. So in reference to this project the State is participating.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin. Not to the extent of being authorized to provide their financial share of the undertaking.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is a letter of commitment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PERKINS: On page 16, line 5, preceding the word "Provided," insert the following: "and in addition the sum of $1,000,000 for construction funds on Buckhorn Reservoir."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the Kentucky River is navigable for approximately 250 miles subject to frequent floods. There is not a single reservoir or flood-control project in the headwaters of this stream. The Comprehensive Flood Control Act of 1938 authorized the Buckhorn Reservoir on the middle fork of the Kentucky River. The planning survey of this reservoir has been completed and a district Army engineer's office at Louisville, Ky., is preparing the necessary data to advertise for construction contract.

The budget included an item of $1 million for the initiation of this contract work during the coming fiscal year. This amount was deleted by the Appropriations Committee. The sole purpose of this amendment is to restore the amount included in the recommendation of the Budget Bureau for construction purposes. There is no objection to this reservoir in the area in which it is located. The down-river communities are hoping that it will be completed at the earliest possible date as they face repeated flood damage that is ofttimes disastrous. Beattyville alone has suffered more than a half-million dollars' damage from Kentucky River floods.

This reservoir will not only lower the flood crest in the entire Kentucky River Valley from this point northward, but would also have immeasurable effect upon the Ohio River flood stage.

I urge this Committee to approve this amendment so that an early start may be made on the construction of this essential flood-control reservoir.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. Chairman, the committee adopted by unanimous vote, as I recall it, a very salutary provision under which we determined at the beginning of the hearings not to accept any proposal on which there was a poorer ratio than 1.3 to 1. The ratio on this is 1.2 to 1. That means we did not and cannot consider it.

Furthermore, as a result of additional estimates, within this last year the total cost has gone up from $7,020,000 to $9,990,000, a 40-percent increase in the estimate.

And the corps has already spent $70,000 to complete plans for the current year.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PERKINS) there were—ayes 84, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALEXANDER: On page 16, line 24, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That no funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the planning or construction of the Wilkesboro Reservoir, N. C."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. Actually I had intended to strike out the figure "$25,000" which is shown on page 14 of the report for the Wilkesboro Reservoir, but due to the fact that the figures on page 16, line 4, have been amended, it is impossible to do that. The only thing I am asking by this amendment is that no funds in this bill be used for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 11319 provides an appropriation of $25,000 for advanced planning to determine the feasibility of constructing a dam or dams on the Yadkin River, which is in Wilkes County, N. C.

My predecessor, the late Honorable Robert L. Doughton, for many years fought the construction of these dams, due to the fact that it would adversely affect the people living in Caldwell County, N. C., which is in the congressional district I represent, by inundating their homes, schools, churches, and much fertile, agricultural land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not want to be put in the position of being against flood control or soil conservation. I am not. I think, however, that this particular project would do more damage than it would rectify and that the proposed dam is not economically feasible.

It is my understanding, according to the reports of the Corps of Engineers, the proposed dam or dams are calculated to cost approximately $12 million and would partially protect only $5 million worth of agricultural and industrial property below the dams, while requiring $466 thousand annual upkeep.

I have in my possession a petition signed by some 400 Wilkes and Caldwell County farmers, as well as letters from the board of county commissioners and the Lenoir Chamber of Commerce of Caldwell County, and many others, vigorously opposing any further appropriation for the planning or construction of the proposed dam or dams, for which I understand there has already been expended, by the Corps of Engineers, approximately $165,000.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman is completely justified in the position he has taken on the basis of the record which was made in our committee and I hope his amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEORGE: On page 16, line 4, after the sum named, insert "and in addition $100,000 to be utilized for additional planning of Strawn Reservoir, Kans."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this is 1 of 4 key dams located on the upper reaches of the Arkansas River Watershed. This project was originally approved in 1949 and in 1951 extensive planning money was granted. In 1953, after the expenditure of part of the planning money, in core drilling for the dam site it was discovered that there was a fault under the proposed dam. That compelled the Army Engineers to move downstream, to hunt for a new dam site. Fortunately they found one that will cut $10 million from the proposed cost.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the thinking of the gentleman and I trust that his amendment will carry. Because of the delay encountered we can save at least a year in the construction of this much-needed installation.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. We people who live on the Arkansas River Upper Watershed are asking you people to pick up the amount of money granted to us this year, the year that we lost due to no fault of the Army engineers and no fault of the people who live in this river valley. I have

been informed by the Army engineers that this will complete the planning of this one key dam that is located in the State of Kansas. I want to say that water and water conservation in our State is our No. 1 problem. Frankly, in my congressional district I have 4 counties with 12 percent of unemployment. The reason we cannot get large industry to come in there and take up the unemployment is the fact that we do not have an assured water supply for a large industrial development.

Up until 1951 this river valley on an average had two floods a year. So you can see that it is imperative that we go ahead as fast, as expeditiously as we can.

This project has been approved. The Army engineers ask for a budget of $50,000 and I am asking that we have enough money to complete the planning so that we can get into construction if the Committee on Appropriations sees fit to grant us construction money next year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is another case where there is some money in the budget for it. There is still some lingering local opposition to the project, as the committee has been informed. That raises the question as to whether the planning ought to be rushed to completion by an additional $100,000 this year.

I think it is completely proper that there be the $50,000 that the Bureau of the Budget has already recommended in order that the planning can proceed in an orderly fashion, but I would be afraid of rushing this thing through to completion of the planning until such items as the lingering local opposition and the rather marginal benefit-to-cost ratio on the basis of the present plans have been cleared up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GEORGE) there were, ayes 37, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY: On page 16, line 24, strike the period and insert a colon and add the following: *"Provided further,* That none of the funds in this section be used for the construction of Tuttle Creek Reservoir in Kansas."

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor much earlier this afternoon to discuss this amendment I have now offered. I do not want to present any false illusions about this. This is not a new project, as most of you know. The dam is under construction. Nevertheless, I feel constrained to offer this amendment as my district has decided on three different occasions that this project was not to the best interest of the First District of Kansas.

I have been very much interested in the discussion here this afternoon, especially the exchange of remarks between the various Members from the State of New York. In this instance, the name could have been changed from Davenport City Dam to Tuttle Creek Dam. I think all those arguments have been used a good many times on the floor of this House relative to the particular project I am addressing myself to this afternoon. Despite the fact that this was recommended by the subcommittee and included in the bill by the full committee. I am still offering my amendment for the consideration of the committee this afternoon. As I pointed out earlier this afternoon, not only do I think this project is not justified, but I think the House should take another look at the treatment given to displaced persons affected by Federal reservoir projects. That does not apply only to the Tuttle Creek Reservoir in Kansas, but it applies to every reservoir that we have discussed on the floor this afternoon. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly grateful that you are in the chair this afternoon not only because the members of this committee may have the benefit of your wisdom in presiding over the Committee of the Whole but also I have a bill pending before your committee which I think will take care, to a large extent, of part of the inequity that exists in relation to the land acquisition program and displaced persons relative to a Federal project. I am referring specifically to the capital-gains tax angle.

As I said earlier this afternoon, land owners are forced off their land by Federal projects and are treated just the same as speculators in real estate in any State of the Union. I do not think that is fair and I do not think it is fair in the minds of the Congress, if they would stop to consider that point. We are told that land owners must yield to a Federal project in the national interest. I repeat, if it is to the national interest to build these projects, it is certainly to the national interest to reimburse these people justly for the property that is taken away from them by right of eminent domain. As I mentioned earlier this afternoon, there is also a new policy as to land acquisition that was adopted in 1953. The proposition of an easement instead of acquisition of fee title. Under the easement policy, the displaced person cannot get all of his capital out of his investment to relocate elsewhere but is just sort of half choked, I believe is the way to say it. His operations are disrupted, but nevertheless he is still confined to his original site and he cannot relocate to another area. I want to make it clear that this is not the fault of the Army engineers. It is the fault of the Congress because the engineers are only able to operate the land acquisition policy as it is laid down by the law of the Congress and as it is administered by the administrative branch of the Government of the United States. These are two inequities which exist. The third one is that there is no provision for the reimbursement of businessmen who are displaced by a project. Farmers are reimbursed to the extent of the appraised value of their farm. In the case of a merchant who has been in business for 40 years, he is only reimbursed to the extent of the real value of his business. In other words, there is no value attached to what we may call the intangible or what the courts have described as consequential damages. If these projects are as good as we have been told on the floor this afternoon, certainly, a few more thousand dollars for displaced persons would not greatly alter the cost-benefit ratio of any individual project. I certainly implore you, Mr. Chairman, to consider the bill before your committee, and I also hope that the Committee on Public Works will consider the bill pending before their committee to authorize reimbursement to businessmen. There are about 100 of them who are displaced by this project.

As I stated previously, my opposition to the Tuttle Creek project remains unchanged, notwithstanding the unfavorable action of the 1st session of the 84th Congress in appropriating an additional $7,500,000 to continue its construction. I do not have to remind the committee that this action was taken without a favorable report from this subcommittee. There is considerable doubt in my own mind if this reservoir, or all proposed reservoirs, would have materially alleviated the results of the 1951 flood.

Not one independent survey has ever recommended the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam. In 1951 three independent consulting engineers were employed by the State of Kansas to resurvey this dam. The engineers concluded that the project was not economically feasible as a flood-control project. The Missouri Valley Survey Committee, appointed by President Truman, expressed grave doubt relative to the economic justification.

As you no doubt know from the hearings conducted last session of Congress, the Kansas State Legislature in 1953 passed a resolution requesting that no further funds be appropriated for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam. This resolution still stands.

Water conservation and water shortage have always been a topic in this controversy. I want to again emphasize that we are not opposing water conservation, nor are we attempting to say that water shortage is not a matter of serious consideration. On our watersheds we have provided storage for 513,690,012 cubic feet of water, and this was done before the passage of the Hope-Aiken bill by the 83d Congress. The operation of this bill has implemented the storage of water in northeast Kansas, and H. R. 8750, passed by the House, will greatly accelerate upstream water conservation, as it liberalizes the authority of the Department of Agriculture in the cost sharing of upstream water conservation works.

In my district is the only such proposed concentration of dams that I know of in the whole Missouri River Basin. Rainfall cannot be the deciding factor as the rainfall is heavier east of the Missouri and virtually no projects proposed there. It is planned to keep the Missouri River controlled without reservoirs from South Dakota to its junction with the Mississippi at St. Louis, but the Kansas River draining a smaller watershed must be controlled by reservoirs only a few miles from its confluence with the Missouri.

In other words, it appears to me that my district has been designed as expendable for downstream benefits without any cost to them or any negative factor on their economy. I think if they were assessed for a proportion of the cost, their urgent support for these reservoirs would materially diminish.

Since President Eisenhower took this item out of the proposed budget in 1953, omitted it from the budget in 1954, and again in 1955, and no appropriation was made until the public works bill came out of the Appropriations Committee in June of last year, this project is historically and still is today a creature of a Democratic controlled Congress. If it is not, my amendment will be adopted and this item deleted from this bill today. If my amendment is not adopted, you—Democrats—are giving your tacit sanction to the project and are taking full responsibility for it, as your party controls the important Appropriations Committee recommending this project and are in control of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, on one thing; namely, that there should be more equitable treatment given to many of these people who are displaced by these flood-control projects, particularly those businessmen who do not get what they should. I disagree with him, of course, upon the value of Tuttle Creek and its necessity. General Potter, district engineer, who is now going to be the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, no more than 72 hours ago stated that the Tuttle Creek Reservoir was a key project in all flood control in the Kansas River Valley. Construction is already well underway. However, Mr. Chairman, I hesitate at this hour in the evening to impose upon the House again to relate the tragic events of Black Friday, July 13, 1951, which was the darkest day in the history of my hometown of Kansas City, Kans. I have told the story repeatedly here on the House floor and before congressional committees.

Congress has spoken out favoring Tuttle Creek Reservoir on numerous occasions.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. I do not like to take the time of the Committee, but I would like to take this opportunity to say that I join with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] in strong opposition to the amendment to strike funds for the continuation of the construction of this most important dam.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN. I also wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from Kansas in opposition to striking out this fund. I might say that at the time of the flood of 1951 I was chairman of the subcommittee that went out there. Our unanimous recommendation was for the construction of the Tuttle Creek Dam. The subcommittee's report was unanimously approved by the Committee on Government Operations. Tuttle Creek is a vital link in the flood-control program. I certainly hope the work will continue.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk about the churches, schools, homes and farms that this reservoir will displace. Let me tell you this, that these floods on the Kansas River come frequently, almost every year, except that for the last 3 or 4 years we have not had one. Some day we are going to wake up and find a gulley-washer, a frog-strangler coming down that stream, that is going to again raise havoc.

We have lost fertile fields even more fertile than those in the Blue Valley, we have lost factories, we have lost more homes, we have lost more schools, we have lost more churches in these floods than those in the Tuttle Creek area but nobody compensates us; we must rebuild, and redo, and restore at our own cost. Every person to whom Mr. AVERY has referred will be adequately compensated for all the loss they sustained, with the exception, as he pointed out, of some merchants.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the point the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] has brought out about reimbursement in proper value is certainly one that Congress should look into, but not in this particular bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I agree there are some inequities that should be corrected, and I trust such legislation will be enacted.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement this week by Dr. Rusk on foreign aid before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Dr. Rusk is the recognized authority in prosthetic rehabilitation both in this country and abroad. He is not only one of the distinguished physicians of his time but is a writer and author of note and serves on the staff of the New York Times.

FORMAL STATEMENT OF DR. HOWARD A. RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 18, 1956

My name is Howard A. Rusk. I am a physician and chairman, department of physical medicine and rehabilitation at New York University-Bellevue Medical Center; director, Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University-Bellvue Medical Center; associate editor, the New York Times; consultant in Rehabilitation to the United Nations, and president of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples. I am appearing before you today as a private citizen whose primary interest is the rehabilitation of the disabled.

It is my belief that rehabilitation of disabled children and adults is one of the sharpest tools and most effective instruments which we in the United States have for making friends—a tool which can penetrate any iron or bamboo curtain to reach the minds and the hearts of men. It is natural for all of us to take improved agriculture industry and utilities for granted but men often regard these developments as somewhat remote from their immediate problems. Rehabilitation, however, makes a personal and significant impact not only upon the disabled person himself and his family but on those with whom he comes in contact. This as well as all international activities in the field of health are one aspect of our foreign assistance program which meets all yardsticks of economic soundness, simple humanitarianism and political expediency.

In his report to the Congress on our mutual security program covering July-December 1955, John Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, wrote: "The people of the United States recognize the value—economic, social, and moral—of health and the fact that health is a common need. We are also coming to recognize the vital relationship of health programs to any hopes we may have of helping to create conditions of economic progress, political stability, and democratic social development in the many areas of the world outside the United States, where our future national security is deeply involved."

Mr. Hollister then cited estimates from competent authorities that until recently the economic loss from malaria alone in India was $224 million a year, from bilharziasis in Egypt $57 million a year, from malaria and tuberculosis in the Philippines $660 million a year. Also, that we in the United States pay a hidden 5 percent additional cost for our imports from malarious countries because of disease-affection production.

It is, therefore, surprising that our contribution to bilateral health programs was reduced from $43 million in the 1955 fiscal year to $33,767,000 in fiscal year 1956, and that of this amount less than $50,000 was spent on all types of rehabilitation services throughout the world.

From the economic aspects alone, it would seem logical that our investment in international health would be increased rather than decreased. Over and beyond the economic implications, there are great social, moral, and political values in our support of international health activities.

These values are well illustrated by international activities in the field of rehabilitation. In this country and in the other developed parts of the world we have seen a remarkable growth of interest in rehabilitation in the last decade. This interest has not been prompted by humanitarian motives alone. It has resulted from the growing incidence of physical disability resulting from prolongation of the life span, increased public assistance costs because of disability, and our need for manpower in our expanding economy.

But what lies behind the interest of Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Mexico, India, Burma, and Thailand in the provision of rehabilitation services for their handicapped? It is not the need for manpower, for these nations have far more manpower than they can profitably utilize in their present stage of industrial development. It is not to reduce public assistance costs, for few of these nations have any social schemes whereby the disabled become a responsibility of the state. It is not to reduce demands for medical, hospitalization, and social services, for the chronically ill and disabled in most of these nations are wards of their families rather than of the state.

The real reason is that many of these nations, particularly those of the Africa-Asia

area, have, after years of colonization, recently achieved the long-sought dream of political independence. Now they are desperately looking for ways of proving to the world, and more importantly to themselves, that they have the political and social maturity to justify their political independence.

Long before the Government became concerned with international health projects, the Rockefeller Foundation, W. B. Kellogg Foundation, China Medical Board, and other private groups had years of experience in the administration of such programs. As a result, we have more know-how in the conduct of international health projects than in some other forms of technical assistance and are able to administer such projects more effectively.

Health projects are welcomed by the nations in which they are undertaken, for such projects are initiated only at the request of host countries. They are cooperative projects involving both joint planning and administration.

Host countries furnish a part, frequently the major part, of the funds for such projects. The $6 million contributed in 1955 to joint health projects in Latin America by the United States was expanded by $19 million.

Since our Federal technical cooperation health programs, known popularly as point 4 projects, began more than 13 years ago, they have cost our citizens less than a penny a month a person.

It is reported that last year Russia graduated 27,000 physicians from their medical schools and 20,000 the previous year. At the present time we are graduating slightly more than 7,000 in the United States per year. It is granted that the level of education of these physicians is far below that of our physicians, but, even so, the health services they are providing to the country are so superior to those ever before available to the people to them it is considered a miracle.

It has also been reported that at the present time there are more doctors than can be readily absorbed in the health services of Russia, and the physicians are being used for the kind of job that we would ordinarily assign to nurses and technicians. If the production continues and the excess increases, it is rather obvious what the physicians will do. They will carry the skills they have learned along with the concepts of communism to the backward parts of the world. We must meet this challenge, and we can, for our physicians are better trained. By using total professional personnel, therapists, sanitary engineers, public-health administrators, and educators we can do a better job. But time is running out.

Here is one example of what could be done. The Veterans' Administration has, since 1946, conducted an extensive artificial-limb research program which is carried out by nonprofit contracts with universities. The Army and Navy cooperate by supporting prosthetic-research laboratories within their medical services. Work in the universities and armed services has been coordinated by the Prosthetics Research Board (formerly the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs) of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council under a contract between the Veterans' Administration and the Academy.

The need for a research program in artificial limbs became apparent early in 1945 when, at the request of the Surgeon General of the Army, the National Research Council brought together a group of scientists, engineers, surgeons, and prosthetists for the purpose of establishing standards for procurement of prostheses. At this meeting it was soon learned that the development of artificial limbs had proceeded through the years without the benefit of a scientific approach, whereupon it was recommended that the Government support a research program in this field.

As the result of this program our own disabled veterans have prosthetic devices far superior to those found anywhere else in the world.

Just as we are interested in sharing the technical advances in nuclear energy for peaceful purposes with the rest of the world, we could make a significant contribution to the effective understanding of American ideals of democracy and the value we place on human worth and dignity, if through an appropriation of one or two million dollars a year we could share our advances in artificial limbs with the world. Through demonstration centers, consultants, mobile clinics, and the training of foreign personnel in the United States, a magnificent program could be established. With the sum of $1 million a year for 2 years both the administrative and professional overhead cost of such a project could be met; highly qualified American consultants could visit all parts of the world and survey what is available and what is needed; 4 completely equipped mobile prosthetic shops, each staffed by a qualified American prosthetic technician and physical therapist, could be sent to southeast Asia, the Near East, north Africa, and South America to spend 4 to 8 weeks in a given community rendering direct patient services in fitting prosthetics and training wearers in their use; permanent demonstration prosthetic shops and training centers could be established in key parts of the world; and the components to provide modern artificial limbs could be made available to over 40,000 amputees; over 100 trainees could be brought to the United States for training in prosthetics; and all of the available technical literature and visual aids in prosthetics here in the United States could be translated and published in various languages for international distribution.

These prosthetic trainees would then join the 400 health workers receiving advanced training in the United States under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration. They and hundreds of others trained under the auspices of private foundations, their own governments and their own resources, are permanent ambassadors of our democratic ideals. Such persons make particularly effective proponents for democracy because as professional people they work intimately with their handicapped patients and have their confidence and trust.

Somewhere within the spectrum ranging from direct relief to long-range economic projects, there is a need for significant, tangible short-range projects that can be seen and easily understood. The Russians produced such a project when they paved the main street of Kabul in Afghanistan. Our foreign-aid projects there have been of economic importance, but their impact on the daily lives of the people will not be felt for many years. In contrast, several times each day the residents of Kabul have reason to be grateful to Russia.

This is the kind of an imaginative, constructive project which can be easily seen and understood. There are many hundreds and thousands of disabled persons throughout the world, each of whom could also become a living, dynamic example of American democracy. To illustrate their potential contributions, I should like to tell you the story of a little Bolivian boy, age 10. He was born without arms and legs with 4 little, sensitive fingers coming out of each shoulder and 2 normal feet coming from the hip joint but with no bony connection. When he was a year old, he was abandoned by his father, who then deserted the family and has not been heard of since. The boy spent the next 8 years of his life in an American mission in La Paz, where he had love and kindness but could not walk. To get from one place to another, he rolled like a little ball. He was seen there by a young physician from the United States who called me and said he had met this little boy, who was exceedingly bright and who, if he had a chance, he felt, could be a great force in the world. Pictures and case reports were sent and by coincidence seen by the secretary of one of our distinguished citizens. She made possible his trip to the United States.

Two weeks before he arrived, I had the Vice President of Bolivia and the Bolivian Ambassador to the United Nations for luncheon. They knew all about Juanito and were excited about his coming. In the middle of the meal, I said to them, "You know, if we bring Juan here it is going to cost you a very large fee."

In consternation, they said, "How much?" I said, "The fee is this. First, that when he returns, you must promise him the best education your country affords; and second, if we can demonstrate in the most severely disabled child you will ever see what can be done, you will establish a national rehabilitation program in Bolivia."

Without hesitation, the Vice President said, "You take the boy; we pay the fee."

When he arrived, he spoke no English. Within a month, he had a vocabulary of more than 300 words. Special prostheses were designed and he now is walking. He has grown more than twice his height. He is doing well in school and one day soon will be ready to go back and take his place in his own country.

Several months after he was in the United States, the story was published in a national magazine. A few weeks later, a letter came to the editors, which read as follows:

"Congratulations on a brilliant piece of reporting. Am referring to your (February 21) on Juanito Yepez, the congential quadruple amputee from Bolivia. * * * For those of us who are in and out of Central and South America we found your article on Juanito gained us more friends (and respect) than all the millions our government is pouring into these countries. We noted no sudden pro United States of America feeling in Brazil as a result of the $75 million donation (given Brazil by the United States), but we were pleasantly surprised with the many compliments for what the United States of America is doing for Juanito. I do not know what your circulation is in Latin America but can tell you the peons in the backwoods knew all about Juanito within 24 hours after the issue was on the streets. * * *

"E. E. BUTLER, *Master*.

"TAMPICO, MEXICO."

What we need in the United States are friends like Juanito Yepez all over the world, with the recognition that in the United States we believe in the dignity of the individual and because of that belief want to share the things that we have learned in our country. We are not doing this to make friends—we are doing this to give service. If the service and the spirit are there, then we can't help but have their friendship.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

M'GEE BEND DAM

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a few minutes at this point to outline briefly some pertinent facts about the McGee Bend Dam project in east Texas. An appropriation of $4 million is proposed in this public-works bill so that orderly and economical construction can be carried on in the next fiscal year.

There is no other single project in the entire Second Congressional District that is more important to the welfare of this country and to the people of east Texas

than McGee Bend Dam. This dam—a multipurpose project to be located on the Angelina River—was authorized by Congress in 1945 to be the major part of a two-dam system to efficiently control the fresh-water resources of both the Angelina and Neches Rivers. A smaller reregulating dam was authorized to complete the system.

Public hearings were held in November 1945 at Jasper, Tex.—just 10 miles from the actual dam site—and the overwhelming majority of people from every part of the area went on record in favor of the project to provide the entire watershed with adequate flood control, additional electric power, vital fresh-water storage, and, of course, the untold benefits from recreation that a project of this type will offer.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated this project has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.39 to 1, and the vast majority of people in east Texas—both Democrats and Republicans—have continued to support McGee Bend Dam, and they are supporting it now.

During the Korean emergency, the United States Army engineers stated before the House Appropriations Committee that McGee Bend Dam was one of the nine most necessary projects for the Nation's defense and essential civilian economy and the engineers urged the rapid completion of planning so that construction could start.

The smaller reregulating dam was completed in 1951 and last year $1.5 million in initial construction money for McGee Bend Dam was put in the public works appropriations bill in the House committee. This action was taken after the Federal Government had received assurances from the Lower Neches Valley Authority that a total of $15 million would be contributed to the overall authorized project by this local State agency. Congress approved the $1.5 million and the President signed the bill.

This year the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the $4 million appropriation now pending before us be included in the budget so that orderly and economical construction of the project could be carried on during the next fiscal year. The Bureau of the Budget has approved clearance for the Engineers to begin work on McGee Bend Dam immediately.

Members of the House, McGee Bend Dam is not a new project. It was taken under study more than 10 years ago and since that time a great deal of money from both local agency and the Federal Government has been spent toward completion of this critically needed project.

I would respectfully ask that the House consider these facts about McGee Bend Dam as we vote on the public works appropriation bill:

First. The Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the President, and the Congress have approved the completion of McGee Bend Dam as authorized.

Second. Initial construction money has already been appropriated by the Congress and this money is being obligated by the Government at this time.

Third. In spite of the opposition from a handful of timber and paper mill interests, the overwhelming majority of the people in east Texas—representing industry, labor, small-business men, county and city officials, chambers of commerce and civic leaders throughout the area are solidly behind this effort to preserve the precious fresh water resources of our country.

In 1946 Congress appropriated money to begin work on the smaller reregulating dam after receiving assurances from the Lower Neches Valley Authority—a nontaxing, nonprofit, State agency—of local contributions totaling $5 million for the overall, authorized project. The smaller dam was completed in 1951 and the LNVA paid the Federal Government $2 million in cash. In the meantime, initial planning money for the larger, multipurpose dam had been appropriated.

The Neches-Angelina watershed is the sole fresh water supply of the giant petro-chemical industry in Jefferson County, Tex. We have five of the world's major oil refineries, synthetic rubber plants, and many other vital defense industries depending on a guaranteed annual supply of fresh water—and our defense program is depending on these industries being able to produce at full capacity at a moment's notice.

While we are considering this project, the low streamflows of the Neches and Angelina Rivers are allowing salt water to back upstream toward the water intakes of these refineries and the city of Port Arthur. If salt water reaches these intakes the entire production would be shut down. These refineries produce 700,000 barrels of oil per day and since the approval by Congress of initial construction money for McGee Bend Dam, $100 million in expansion of these industries has been authorized by their owners. And it is interesting to note that we pay $80 million per year in excise taxes on petroleum products alone in Jefferson County.

There is opposition to McGee Bend Dam from a handful of timber interests who would stifle and hamstring the future of a half million people in this great east Texas area. After 10 years of public hearings and study by Congress, the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers, this tiny but powerful group has suddenly at this late date proposed an alternate plan for McGee Bend Dam that would reduce the size of the project and take the authorized powerplant completely out. This plan is strangely similar to one which the Public Works Committee held hearings on in 1954 and has already been set aside by the Corps of Engineers, set aside by the Bureau of the Budget, and set aside by the Congress.

While these powerful interests are attacking the inclusion of power in this authorized project, let's look briefly at the facts. The Federal Government has already received two bids for the electric power to be generated at McGee Bend Dam, each of which will more than pay for the incremental cost of installing a powerplant in the dam. If that is not a clear-cut case pointing out the need of additional electric power in east Texas, I would like to hear one. These people have their money on the line.

And I think it is only fair to bring to the attention of the House that both the REA co-ops and the private utilities in east Texas and southwest Louisiana are both cooperating in 100 percent support for McGee Bend Dam with power included.

I believe you would agree with me that it would be unthinkable to break faith with us in east Texas after beginning this vital project, having the reregulating dam already completed, and having appropriated initial construction money last year. The petro-chemical industries, side by side with the smaller communities upstream, are waiting for sufficient fresh water so the rich natural resources which surround them can be developed to their maximum degree. It takes 40,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of paper. It takes 18 barrels of fresh water to refine a barrel of oil. We must have more fresh water.

These communities, as they grow, need fresh water and electricity for their homes and businesses. If we fail to keep faith with these people now we will be locking the door on the future of 500,000 people living in the Second Congressional District.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill includes among the general construction items, as listed on page 13 of the committee report, the sum of $500,000 for construction on the Kalamazoo River flood-control project at Battle Creek, Mich.

This item, which has the approval of the Corps of Engineers and which was included in the President's budget, is the initial request for actual construction funds for a project which had its inception in 1947 with original authorization of engineering studies. The project itself was authorized by Congress in 1954 in substantial measure as a result of the efforts of my able and distinguished predecessor, the late Congressman Paul W. Shafer.

The project, involving a total estimated cost of $7,741,000, has a cost-benefit ratio of 1 to 1.53, and also an unusually high local participation of 40 percent. One striking evidence of the high degree of local interest and support is a recent outright gift to the city of Battle Creek by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of $400,000 to permit expediting necessary land acquisitions for flood control. The city of Battle Creek last year also advanced $125,000 to the Corps of Engineers with the approval of the Secretary of the Army to make the definite project studies.

Besides assuring relief from a dangerous flood hazard in this major city in my district, this program—and the $500,000 appropriation included in this bill—triggers a $25 to $30 million master plan for Battle Creek, encompassing consolidation of two major railroads within the city, elimination of grade crossings, highway improvements and extension, slum clearance, and parking-area developments, all of which hold tremendous import for the future of this community.

I would be remiss were I to fail to acknowledge the excellent cooperation of the Department of the Army, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and particularly the House Committees on Public Works and Appropriations in bringing this project to this present advanced stage. Particularly I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairmen of these two committees; to the ranking minority members of the committees, Mr. DONDERO and Mr. TABER; to Mr. MACK of Washington, former Public Works Subcommittee chairman; to Mr. RABAUT, present chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee; and to Mr. MARSHALL, of the same subcommittee; and to my colleague from Michigan, Mr. FORD, for this assistance and cooperation.

A genuinely bipartisan interest in the public welfare and in the benefits to be gained by this community and my district has made possible expediting this legislation for the protection and improvement of Battle Creek.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, construction of the important Warrior lock and dam, located in the district which I have the privilege to represent, was begun in the fall of 1954 with an initial appropriation of $1,800,000. Congress approved an additional $4,100,000 last year, and I am informed that construction is progressing on schedule. The Corps of Engineers has indicated that $4,580,000 will be required during the coming fiscal year if the lock is to be completed on schedule.

The Bureau of the Budget, the President, and the House Appropriations Committee have approved the $4,580,000, and that amount is included in the bill under consideration by the House of Representatives today.

The Warrior lock and dam is a modern navigation structure that will replace two 50-year-old installations which are now dilapidated, obsolete, and in danger of partial, if not complete, failure. In fact, the present structures are in such condition that they pose serious danger not only to navigation but to the safety of the persons operating towboats and barges on the river. The importance of completing the new structures at the earliest possible date cannot be overemphasized.

The great majority of the people of my district favor the construction of the Warrior lock and dam. The towboat and barge operators, as well as the shippers of commerce on the river, regard the completion of this installation as urgent. The people of the State as a whole recognize the need for it, and in their behalf I earnestly urge the members of this body to approve the full amount of $4,580,000, already in the bill under consideration, so that the orderly construction of the Warrior lock and dam may continue on schedule.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in this appropriation bill as it contains, among many other things, an item for general construction, under the Corps of Engineers, in the amount of $421,684,000. Within this figure, the committee has recommended the amount of $6 million for a channel-deepening project in the Delaware River, from Philadelphia to Trenton.

The district in Philadelphia which I represent borders on the Delaware River from South Street to Frankford Creek. This area is highly industrialized, but its further growth is stymied until an adequate waterway from Philadelphia to Trenton is a reality. Such development will mean more than prestige and monetary return to the city of Philadelphia. It will have far-reaching consequences which will affect the people of the whole country. Consider its strategic value as a bulwark of our national-security program. The tidal reach of the Delaware River at no point between Delaware City and Trenton is closer to the shore than 40 miles. Thus, it enjoys a nominal and natural security in the event of hostile action against our country. It provides a natural fortress for the loading of supplies and the embarkation of personnel. Our military and naval installations, including the Philadelphia Naval Base at the lower end of the Delaware, and the Frankford Arsenal toward the upper end, will be less accessible to enemy attack. Further, the Delaware Valley is centrally located within the northeast industrial quadrant, the vital heart of the Nation's productive capacity.

One of the most important results of this channel project will be an increase in employment. Many of my constituents reside along or near the waterfront and a great number of them make their livelihood in the shipping industry. At the present time, there are a great number of seamen in this area who cannot get employment. With the increase in foreign and domestic trade which is sure to follow the deepening of the channel in the Delaware River, these men will have much better opportunities for employment.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I note by the report that this bill includes $205,000 in planning money for the Carlyle, (Ill.) Reservoir. I am not opposing this appropriation as I feel that it is time to proceed on the Kaskaskia River Valley Basin as this is one of the most important rivers in the State of Illinois. Furthermore, I have no objection to the Carlyle Reservoir as such, but I do feel constrained to report to the House that the Corps of Engineers has been working on a supplemental survey report which is scheduled to be approved later this year. This report recommends that two reservoirs be constructed on the Kaskaskia River. One at Shelbyville, Ill., and the other at Carlyle, Ill. This report was referred to by General Hardin in the hearings when he said:

> Mr. Chairman, this project is associated with a review of the Kaskaskia Basin, and the Kaskaskia Basin report has not been completed.
>
> As an interim measure the Carlyle Reservoir, of course, being an adopted project and having planning funds on it, has been carefully reviewed in conjunction with the Kaskaskia Basin report, and some modifications in the Carlyle Reservoir have been felt to be advisable on account of the overall basin problems which this Kaskaskia report has made obvious.

I realize that the Shelbyville Reservoir cannot be included in an appropriation bill until it has been authorized by law, but I do believe it should be called to the attention of the committee at this time since it appears that the Shelbyville Reservoir will be more than justified by the Kaskaskia River Basin report.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this report by the Corps of Engineers is approved at an early date so that the authorization can be expanded to include authorization of a dam and reservoir on the Kaskaskia River at Shelbyville, Ill., in accordance with this report now being completed by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment the committee for their long and arduous work incident to the presentation of this bill and urge your approval of the appropriations herein for power, reclamation, flood control and flood relief projects that will, when achieved, undoubtedly promote the national welfare.

All of the items and provisions of this bill are, of course, important, and it would be indeed difficult to place one before another. However, the appropriations recommended under the civil functions section, which includes flood-control and flood-protection projects within my area and the Nation, are, in my judgment, of paramount value to the country.

Flood control and protection has, indeed, these past several years become one of our most pressing domestic problems, and the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the various States and municipalities of the Nation in solving that problem is great. The imperative necessity of Federal legislation for assistance in flood control has been projected to the height of national and congressional consciousness because of the extraordinary and unfortunate rapidity with which the ruinous visitations of the wildest elements of nature have followed one upon another throughout the country and particularly in New England.

Right here I would like to take but a moment to most sincerely thank the chairman and members of the committee, on behalf of my own people and I am sure the people of the country, for devoting so much of personal and committee time, well beyond the usual hours, to patiently and earnestly study this flood disaster subject in order to conscientiously recommend the appropriation of sufficient Federal money to grant financial help where it is most needed. It is a trying and difficult job as we, your colleagues, well know, and you have been and are now discharging your obligation in an inspiring manner.

You and I, and all our colleagues here, are, of course, sympathetic with the representatives and to the people of all sections of the country whose homes and industries, and in too many tragic instances lives, have been lost through the sudden eruption of uncontrolled natural elements. Quite naturally and humanly, we are, of course, primarily concerned with the problems and difficulties following these disasters within our own areas and States. Within these past 3 years Massachusetts and New England have been visited in quick succession with an unprecedented series of unparalleled

natural disasters. First it was tornadoes, after which came hurricanes, then raging floods, and finally, 3 of the greatest blizzards in our history within 10 days. Hundreds of families lost loved ones, many businesses were almost wholly wiped out, and thousands of persons thrown out of work for periods of several months. In our area we suffered most particularly and severely from the raging floods. The people and the businesses in the area of my home city of Worcester, Mass., underwent tremendous personal hardships and great financial losses because of the repeated floodings and inadequate control barriers during extraordinarily heavy rainfall and excessive downward flow from upland rivers.

It is most encouraging and heartening, then, to these American taxpayers to realize that some steps are being initiated by the Federal Government to assist them in the construction of projects designed to prevent such terrible disasters from again happening.

In my particular city, the most efficient Corps of Engineers had long recognized the vital necessity of a flood-protection tunnel and they recommended the participation of the Federal Government in the achievement of such a project for local protection. Last January 18 I appeared before the committee to present a detailed explanation of the need and urgency of this particular project for the safety of the people of my city and area, and there was then approved in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill a sum of $60,000 to permit the Army Corps of Engineers to complete their resurvey of this Worcester diversionary tunnel flood-control project. I am not, of course, going to repetitiously recite these details again or unnecessarily intrude upon the time of this House, as all my testimony is contained in the printed hearings, available to you and, of course, to the committee.

It was a matter of modest personal gratification to me that the committee approved the initial resurvey sum and further recommended in this present bill the additional sum of $840,000 to begin construction of the tunnel in this next fiscal year. The engineers testified that this project is of superior justification economically because the benefits that will derive are far greater than the cost and the ratio of annual benefit to annual cost is high above the average that is required. That is the criterion that has been aplied by the committee as the basis for recommending the projects contained in this bill, and that is why I earnestly urge the unanimous approval of the bill by this House so that projects of imperative importance, such as the Worcester diversionary tunnel in my area, and similar projects throughout the country, may soon have a beginning, primarily in protection of the lives of American citizens.

To extend Federal aid in this manner for this purpose is not contrary to any congressional tradition or precedent. In my sincere judgment, the whole history of congressional action in relation to water control and waterpower impressively reveals the continuing legislative conviction and intent that our water resources should be developed and controlled in a manner to assure their greatest contribution to the national economic growth, strength, and general welfare.

In pursuit of that policy and intent the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated their belief that in any regional water-control problem the Federal Government should assume a major share of responsibility when Federal participation is necessary to safeguard the national interest or to accomplish broad regional objectives of national import, where projects, because of size, complexity, or potential multiple benefits, are beyond the means of local communities and private enterprise. Within these principles of Federal Government activity, I believe the great regional New England and national water-control problem lies; and the Federal Government must, with promptness, assume their moral, patriotic, and financial obligation in granting assistance for the solution of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has granted in the past and will soon be called upon again to consider the granting of billions of dollars to assist and encourage the desperate people in foreign lands all over the world. Such reasonable and controlled assistance is certainly a Christian gesture, and in accord with what the American taxpayer can reasonably afford, it is at least a gamble on the side of the Almighty.

However, I submit that the willing, patriotic and burdened taxpayers of our own country have a prior and predominant claim on the resources of this Government, and it will be a national disgrace if the imperative and immediate needs for construction of such flood control projects as the Worcester, Mass., tunnel and other projects throughout New England and the Nation are not provided for through adequate Federal assistance and participation before such disaster strikes again. For the saving of countless American lives, for the prevention of untold economic loss, for the certain promotion of the national welfare, I earnestly urge the adoption and approval of this bill without further delay.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to include as part of my remarks on the pending legislation the statement I prepared for the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Army during hearings conducted on flood-control projects:

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE ARMY

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen; you have already received the necessary factual information concerning the flood control needs in my congressional district. The purpose of my statement is to emphasize the fact that this fast growing area needs special attention at this time. I particularly wish to emphasize the West Covina situation where recent heavy rains cause considerable hardship on thousands of new residents of that area. I wish to include a resolution passed by the West Covina City Council in this regard. The resolution is attached.

I urge that this committee visit my congressional district and survey the flood hazards in person. It is difficult for those in other parts of the country to realize what tremendous growth has taken place in the eastern section of Los Angeles County. I am convinced that if the members of this committee could see the need at first hand, quick approval for full and complete flood protection would be authorized.

I wish to thank the committee for the assistance you have given the people of my congressional district in the past, particularly in the completion of San Antonio and Whittier Narrows Dams. These dams, together with flood control channels now under construction, will help to make it possible for nearly 500,000 people in California's 25th Congressional District to live, work and plan their futures without fear of disastrous floods.

"Resolution No. 750

"Resolution of the City Council of the City of West Covina, county of Los Angeles, State of California, requesting the Congress of the United States to budget the necessary funds for the immediate construction of Walnut Creek system of the comprehensive plan for control and conservation of floodwaters in the said county of Los Angeles, Calif.

"The City Council of the City of West Covina does resolve as follows:

" 'SECTION 1—

" 'Whereas the cities of the East San Gabriel Valley and various interested civic groups have studied the comprehensive plan for the control and conservation of floodwaters in the county of Los Angeles, State of California; and

" 'Whereas the Whittier Narrows Reservoir Basin will be completed this year; and

" 'Whereas the entire East San Gabriel Valley is now developing as a metropolitan community at a phenomenal rate; and

" 'Whereas the present washes are entirely inadequate to discharge the runoff from capital storms and are thus endangering human lives and property; and

" 'Whereas a comprehensive plan for control and conservation of floodwaters for the county of Los Angeles was approved and authorized by the Congress of the United States in 1941; and

" 'Whereas the Walnut Creek system is a portion of said comprehensive plan and the early improvement thereof is vital to the safety of the East San Gabriel Valley: Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate the necessary funds for the construction of the Walnut Creek system of said comprehensive plan at the next regular session of said Congress.

" 'SEC. 2. The city clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution."

"I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted at an adjourned regular meeting of the City Council of the City of West Covina, held on the 5th day of July 1955, by the affirmative vote of at least three councilmen, to wit:

"Ayes: Councilmen Kay, Van Horn, Brown, Sperline.

"Noes: None.

"Absent: Mayor Hurst.

"ROBERT FLOTTEN,
*'City Clerk of the City of West Covina.*

"Signed and approved this 5th day of July 1955.

"JOE HURST,
*"Mayor of the City of West Covina.*

"Attest:

"ROBERT FLOTTEN, *City Clerk."*

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be

agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Abernethy amendment on page 15, line 16; and I ask for a separate vote on the Boggs amendment, page 16, line 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 15, line 16, strike out "$7,962,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,122,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 170, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—179

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Boyle
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Burleson
Burnside
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carnahan
Chelf
Chudoff
Clark
Colmer
Cooper
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Dodd
Dollinger
Donohue
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gordon
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagen
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hayworth
Healey
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Holtzman
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knutson
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
Long
McCormack
McDowell
McMillan
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Metcalf
Mills
Mollohan
Morgan
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rutherford
Selden
Shelley
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Walter
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Yates
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—170

Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Betts
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bosch
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burdick
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chase
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole
Coon
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Derounian
Devereux
Dixon
Dondero
Dorn, N. Y.
Ellsworth
Fenton
Ford
Fulton
Gavin
Gentry
George
Gross
Hale
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Holmes
Horan
Hosmer
Hyde
Jackson
James
Jenkins
Jensen
Johansen
Jones, N. C.
Kean
Kearney
Keating
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McVey
Marshall
Martin
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Morano
Mumma
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Konski
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Schwengel
Scott
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Short
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Young
Younger

NOT VOTING—84

Adair
Allen, Calif.
Arends
Barden
Bell
Berry
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bowler
Buckley
Byrd
Carlyle
Celler
Chatham
Christopher
Cooley
Crumpacker
Davidson
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Diggs
Dingell
Dolliver
Donovan
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Engle
Fascell
Fino
Fjare
Frelinghuysen
Gamble
Granahan
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Gubser
Gwinn
Haley
Hays, Ohio
Henderson
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holt
Hope
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Judd
Kearns
Landrum
Lane
McCarthy
Macdonald
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Mason
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Morrison
Nelson
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Quigley
Robsion, Ky.
Roosevelt
Scherer
Scudder
Sheehan
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Steed
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Velde
Vinson
Watts
Westland
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Wright

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Fascell for with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Fjare against.

Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Dolliver against.

Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Shuford for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Allen of California against.

Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Westland against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Mack of Washington against.

Mr. Granahan for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Holt against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Byrd for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Velde against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Bowler for, with Mr. Hope against.

Mr. Haley for, with Mr. Gubser against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Crumpacker against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Nelson against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Scudder against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Passman with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Quigley with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ALBERT, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. O'HARA of Illinois changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 4, strike out "$421,734,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$422,034,000 of which $300,000 shall be for the project Missouri River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 174, noes 148.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations for more careful and responsible consideration.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill just passed may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to 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. 10875) entitled "An act to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956."

## A DAY OF DESTINY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of destiny for the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Today, the House has reaffirmed the faith which it expressed last year in the great multipurpose plan for development and navigation of the Arkansas River.

For the first time during my service in the House, the great House Committee on Appropriations has initiated appropriations for three major projects in this plan: Oologah Dam, on the Verdigris River, Eufaula Dam, on the Canadian River, and Dardanelle Dam, on the Arkansas River.

Although the funds provided for each of these projects are modest and below requests of the Army engineers, they serve the significant purpose of continuing construction—and they provide an unmistakable green light by this body to the Army engineers, to go ahead with the great plan for the Arkansas Valley which has been authorized since 1946.

Although the overall cost of this program is substantial, its benefits are likewise substantial, from the national point of view.

Engineering estimates in 1955 have placed the annual benefits of the multipurpose program at more than $60 million. Estimated annual tonnage is in excess of 13 million tons, and there are great resources of coal, oil and other minerals awaiting development when the benefits of water freight become available.

There has been some comment today on the floor about the difference between navigation development on so-called "main stems" and "lesser streams."

Let no one question the right of the Arkansas River to classification as a "main stem." It is the greatest undeveloped water artery in the United States, and is recognized as such by the Mississippi Valley Association.

The estimated future tonnage of 13,000,000 tons annually compares very favorably with the 1980 estimate for the Missouri River, of 5,000,000 tons. Yet the projected cost of the Arkansas River multipurpose plan is only a small fraction of the overall cost scheduled for the Missouri River in future years.

During the 19th century the Arkansas River was a great channel of trade and commerce for our Nation, and under this plan it will become an even greater channel in the future.

Nor should the other great benefits of the program be overlooked.

In flood control alone, the program has great significance for 4,000,000 people in 2 States, who have suffered multimillion dollar floods in 21 of the last 35 years. We are going to reduce that damage substantially under this program.

We are going to provide water conservation, and a great and stable supply of water for municipal, industrial and irrigation use—in a valley where annual water waste has been calculated to cost as much as $80,000,000.

We are going to provide opportunities for recreation, and for industrial growth, the benefits of which are impossible to calculate, but which assuredly mean the dawning of a new day in the valley of the Arkansas.

On behalf of the people of Oklahoma, who have long assisted in bearing the great burden of navigation and multipurpose plans in other parts of our country, I want to express my deep appreciation to the Committee on Appropriations for its recognition and endorsement of the Arkansas Basin program.

We are also deeply grateful to the Army engineers, whose careful restudy of the Arkansas program led to its renewed justification last year, and whose capable officers will direct the building of these great projects.

Finally, I want to express my heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to the Members of this House, for generously and fairly responding to our plea for justice in the Arkansas Basin.

With your help, we thus embark on our great undertaking, with confidence that the entire Nation will rejoice in our progress and share in the benefits of basin development under the sound plan of the Army engineers.

Once again, we extend our thanks to the farsighted Members of this House, and to the Divine Providence guiding all our thoughts and actions, for this day of destiny in the Arkansas River Valley.

## RABBI BERMAN'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY IN THE RABBINATE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday in the city of Chicago at a great banquet in the grand ballroom of the Standard Club Rabbi Morton M. Berman will be honored on the occasion of his 30th anniversary in the rabbinate. It will be my privilege and my honor to be present on that memorable occasion. Rabbi Berman, whose fame is international and who is held in warmest affection among the people of Chicago of all faiths, is one of my most distinguished constituents.

I am extending my remarks to include an article in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 21, 1956, entitled "Looking Back 30 Years, Rabbi Berman See Peace Ahead," which I am sure all my colleagues will wish to read. The article follows:

LOOKING BACK 30 YEARS, RABBI BERMAN SEES PEACE AHEAD

(By Hoke Norris)

The ancestors of the salami man of Okinawa are buried on the Mount of Olives, a quarter of a mile from the Garden of Gethsemane.

He's now the rabbi of Temple Isaiah Israel, 1100 East Hyde Park, and holds office or membership in 19 religious and civic organizations and is a past officer or member of 18.

At 56 he's a slim, vigorous, graying, 5-foot-7, 160-pound lieutenant commander in the Navy Reserve, and he's about to celebrate his 30th year as a rabbi.

Such is the mixture that makes up Rabbi Morton M. Berman, the descendant of many rabbis and Chicago's most active and articulate advocate of that Jewish homeland, Israel.

"Where do we start?" he asks a visitor bent on learning something about the man and his work.

USES THIRD PERSON

At the beginning, the rabbi then suggests, and talks and paces for an hour or more, often lapsing into the third person, as if dictating a biography of somebody else.

"Rabbi Berman commented that his most enthusiastic recipients of kosher salami and gefüllte fish on Okinawa were the non-Jewish men."

Very well, then, at the beginning:

He was born in Baltimore, August 23, 1899. His great-grandfather was Rabbi Wolf Samuelson, of Kovno, Lithuania, and there'd always been a rabbi in the house as far back as the great-grandparents' memory and family stories reached into the past.

ANCESTRY TRACED

Rabbi Samuelson had two daughters. Rachel married Rabbi Zvi Hirsch Berman, a native of Volozhin, Lithuania, later rabbi of the Pratt St. Synagog, Baltimore. They had a son, Morris Berman. The other daughter, Bertha, married Rabbi Jacob Aban Frommer, who had served in Riga, Latvia, and later in New Haven, Conn. He had a daughter, Rose Mary.

Morris and Rose Mary were married. They had 5 children, of whom 2, including Morton, became rabbis. Morris Berman is now a retired businessman.

The five children were raised in New Haven. Young Morton went to Yale University on a scholarship, graduating Phi Beta Kappa with his class in 1921 despite 1 year as a private in the Student Army Training Corps during World War I.

ATTENDED SEMINARY

He spent an unhappy year at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York (it lacked, he has said, "any clear direction in its program"). Next, he came under the influence of a man who was profoundly to influence the rest of his life.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, the great Zionist leader, had just founded the Jewish Institute of Religion. Morton Berman was graduated in its first class, 1926, and was ordained a rabbi. As the recipient of the institute's Guggenheimer Fellowship, he studied in Germany and France and at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

He became rabbi of Temple Emanuel in Davenport, Iowa, serving until 1929. He returned then to Rabbi Wise, first as a director of the institute's field activities, later as assistant rabbi at the Free Synagog.

Hitler was rising in Germany, and would slaughter 6 million Jews before his death. Rabbi Berman helped organize the great anti-Nazi protest meetings and parades in New York.

RECALLS EUROPE TRIP

In 1938 he went to Europe on behalf of the joint distribution committee (now part of the United Jewish Appeal). He also visited Russia. "I came away," he said, "sick at heart as I saw the rapid disappearance of Jewish communal and religious life in that land."

But he had been able to visit the old Lithuanian and Latvian synagogs where his grandfathers had been rabbis. And he went to Palestine. Arab riots had been renewed, and he was prevented from visiting the family graves on the Mount of Olives.

Great-grandfather and great-grandmother Samuelson were buried there, in a family plot, just north of the old city, and so were their ancestors and their two daughters and their rabbi husbands.

Again in 1948 and once more last summer, Rabbi Berman was unable to view the graves when he went back to what had become Israel. In 1948 the land was already occupied by Jordan Arabs, and by last summer it had become part of the Jordan kingdom.

CONFIDENT OF PEACE

"My sense of attachment," the rabbi says, "is not just to the State of Israel but is enriched with deep personal ties and associations. * * * Some day, I hope—I am confident—that peace will come between Jordan and Israel and I may be able to make that pilgrimage."

In 1939 he got out of Europe just as the war began, and in May 1943, he became a Navy lieutenant. Eventually he was assigned as a chaplain to the 6th Marine Division, and earned one of his many titles.

He had landed with the troops on Okinawa on April 1, 1945, aged 45—one of the oldest chaplains in the Pacific. In his jeep he carried the Bible of his religion and the kosher salami and gefüllte fish that were gifts from the National Jewish Welfare Board.

In June 1945, Herman Kogan, then a Marine Corps correspondent, now Sun-Times book and drama critic, reported Rabbi Berman's words:

"You've no idea how kosher salami boosts morale, whether the boy who eats it is named Kinkelstein or Riley."

WINS BRONZE STAR

The rabbi was decorated with the Bronze Star on Okinawa. "Often under fire and always an example to the men with whom he came in contact," read the citation, "Chaplain Berman's conduct was in keeping with Army traditions."

Later he went with the 6th Marine Division to Tsingtao, China. He helped reestablish the Jewish community there and provide it with a synagog. Until the Communists occupied the city, he often heard from the friends he had made there.

Rabbi Berman had come in 1937 to Temple Isiah Israel then 85 years old. There he returned after the war, active again in Zionist, welfare and civic affairs.

FATHER OF THREE

His first wife, Grayce Sunshine Hoffeimer Berman, of Richmond, Va., died in 1949. They had one son, John Simon, whose first child, Ronald, is now 2 years old.

In 1950 Rabbi Berman married Elaine Ruth Siegel Levy, and they have a son, 2, and a daughter, 4.

At his synagog, next Friday night, a special service will celebrate his 30th anniversary in the rabbinate. Sunday night he will be the guest of honor at a banquet in the Standard Club.

Then he'll go to St. Louis for 2 weeks of active duty in the Navy.

"I'll tell the story of religion in the Armed Forces," he says. "I'll speak to university, civic, and religious groups to help parents and young people appreciate what the chaplaincy can do and is doing to serve our military youth."

---

## MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, shortly we will have before us the proposed 1957 mutual security program to continue our military and economic aid to friendly, free governments.

In considering our efforts to assist friendly, foreign nations, and particularly the underdeveloped areas, to strengthen and stabilize their economies to enable them more effectively to resist aggression, we should not overlook the role of private capital investment overseas. This thought is very well expressed in an editorial appearing in the April 1956 issue of Fortune entitled "The American Game."

In appraising the economic contest between Russia and America in promoting trade, capital investment, and technical assistance in underdeveloped regions of the world, this editorial says:

The fact is, however, that Government aid, while having a place in the American response to Moscow, is a side show, not the main show. The real source of America's strength lies in its own flexible and dynamic system of private enterprise, and in the projection of that system abroad. What is needed is not another Government plan, by which the Soviets set so much store, but rather a foreign economic policy that will enlist the support of the American people and capitalize on American assets.

Mr. Speaker, I expressed much the same thought in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives entitled "An Affirmative American Foreign Policy"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 3, pages 4209–4214. I then urged that a commission be created with the sole task of identifying artificial barriers to trade and investment abroad and recommending specific measures for eliminating or minimizing those barriers. That problem has not been solved, and the need for a thorough-going study of the character I recommended is as great, if not greater, today than it was then.

Nevertheless, as the Fortune editorial points out, great strides have been made by American private capital in overseas investments since the end of World War II notwithstanding the fact that our Government has not done all it could to create a climate favorable to the investment of private capital overseas, particularly in underdeveloped areas. At the end of World War II, the overseas investment of private capital was about $13½ billion, whereas by 1955 it had reached $26 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to direct the thinking of leaders both in Congress and in the administration to the great potential contribution which private American citizens and United States business can make toward assisting friendly, free countries through private enterprise principles, to develop their resources, to enhance their economic strength and stability and to improve the standard of living of their citizens.

I hope all Members of the Congress will take the time to read the Fortune editorial which I incorporate at this point in my remarks.

THE AMERICAN GAME

Can Stalingrad turn out better and cheaper tractors than Peoria, Ill.? Can Leningrad do a faster and more efficient job of building electric turbines than Schenectady? "Yes," the Russians seem to be saying, as they push forward their much-publicized economic offensive. In their loud offers of trade, capital, and technical assistance to the underdeveloped regions of the world, the Russians, as Secretary Dulles recently put it, seem to be playing the American game. And, added Mr. Dulles significantly, "If we cannot beat them at our own game we ought to be ashamed of ourselves."

We should indeed. Unfortunately neither Mr. Dulles nor other spokesmen for the administration have been too clear as to what the American game is or should be. Nor have the Democrats, who have gone into a

great election-year flip over recent Soviet maneuvers. As a result, most United States discussion of how to meet the new Russian line has centered on the somewhat tired topic of United States foreign aid. The administration believes such aid should be made more flexible (to back projects like the Aswan Dam in Egypt) but should be held to about $4.3 billion in the fiscal year of 1957. Chester Bowles, however, wants a new Marshall plan for Asia. And only the other day former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., turned up in India advocating an immediate $500 million loan to that country.

Mr. Morgenthau is not usually a fountainhead of wisdom, but in one sense he has a point. If the real answer to the Soviet offensive were simply the pouring out of Government money, then the present aid program would indeed be small for a $400 billion economy. The fact is, however, that Government aid, while having a place in the American response to Moscow, is a side show, not the main show. The real source of America's strength lies in its own flexible and dynamic system of private enterprise, and in the projection of that system abroad. What is needed is not another Government plan, by which the Soviets set so much store, but rather a foreign economic policy that will enlist the support of the American people and capitalize on American assets.

O. K., LET'S TRADE

Those assets are already considerable. In his speech to the 20th Communist Party Congress 6 weeks ago, which touched off the current debate on United States foreign policy, Mr. Khrushchev proposed the slogan: "Let us trade." As it happens, the United States does do some trading and that on a considerable scale. In 1955 commercial exports of United States goods and services ran to $19.6 billion, or about 4½ times prewar levels, and imports ran to $17.6 billion. The famous dollar shortage, which so troubled monetary experts after World War II, has to all intents and purposes disappeared; European nations have been accumulating gold and exchange; and world commerce has been rapidly gaining ground. Total world exports outside the Soviet bloc ran last year to about $80 billion, and on the basis of present trends could reach $150 billion in the next 25 years. While no reliable figures exist for Russia's trade with its satellites, the total of Communist exports to the outside world ran in 1954 to only $1.5 billion. It will always be possible for Moscow to engineer highly publicized deals, but such deals are no substitute for a true multilateral system of exchange wherein individuals and corporations expand their own markets.

The main drive of American policy, therefore, should continue to be the reduction of trade barriers, elimination of quotas, and the further promotion of currency convertibility. Such convertibility would not only free up the channels of trade but accelerate capital investment, which is the true key to raising the productivity of other nations. Here again the United States and the West have an advantage that is all too easily overlooked. Of a promised $500 million of economic credits and grants to outside countries, the Communists have thus far delivered only about $23 million in aid. But year in year out United States business invests between $1 billion and $2 billion abroad. And at the end of 1955 its total long-term commitments overseas stood at nearly $26 billion.

Through such investment the American oilman has transformed Venezuela and Saudi Arabia. The steel industry has tapped the iron-ore reserves of South America and Labrador. On the completion of present expansion programs General Motors and Ford will have poured over $1 billion into foreign plants since World War II. And in addition to these major moves, thousands of smaller ones are swelling the stream. Thus Caterpillar Tractor is currently building one of the largest plants in Scotland. Pfizer has spent $30 million in the past 5 years, notably in England and France. The Container Corp. is making a $6-million bid in Germany. Borden Co. recently announced it will build a $3,500,000 methanol plant in Brazil, and B. F. Goodrich International is spending some $6 million in the Philippines.

TIMID DOLLARS?

It is true, of course, that American private long-term investment tends to go where the going is safest, and that some 80 percent of such investment is concentrated in Canada, South America, and Western Europe. Except in oil, private commitments tend to be small in the Middle East, and Far East, where communism is making its most vocal bid. But this fact scarcely argues for pouring Government funds into those areas without seeking to deal with the fundamental causes that impede normal capital flow. These are political instability, a disregard for sound money, and, in the case of India, laws that make private investment subject to confiscation at the whim of the state.

In these underdeveloped and undercapitalized countries, the American answer should be a determined campaign, pressed by diplomatic means, to create a more receptive climate for free enterprise. In support of such a campaign the United States can rely on at least two instrumentalities that have proved their worth. One is the Export-Import Bank, which has helped in capital development chiefly in Latin America. The second agency is the World Bank, which, through loans now amounting to $2.5 billion, has helped set in motion projects worth over $5.5 billion. Thus by lending $10 million to the Industrial Credit & Investment Corp. in India, the bank has sparked a $35 million undertaking. Its loan of $16 million to the Tata Hydro-Electric Power Supply Co. is building a $27,500,000 electric-power installation. And it is now considering a further loan to the Tata Iron & Steel Co. for a new mill at Jamshedpur. This kind of lending involves intergovernmental negotiation, but it works within the framework of accepted business procedure. And precisely because the World Bank has stuck to hardheaded business rules, it now finds itself in the enviable position of being able to float its own bonds in world markets. Thus it acts as a kind of bridge between capitalism and countries that are unwilling or unable to open their doors wide to the private entrepreneur. Such a bridge is well worth maintaining so long as it is viewed as a means of inducing normal capital development rather than as a substitute for it.

AID VERSUS POLICY

Once due emphasis has been placed on what the United States is already doing abroad, the question of further Government aid falls into perspective. In the present fiscal year the United States is giving other nations some $2.4 billion for arms and $1.7 billion for economic assistance. Much of this economic aid is really military in character since it goes to countries like South Korea, Formosa, South Vietnam, and Turkey, which are maintaining relatively large armies in the field. Such countries clearly need and deserve United States help since they are holding a line against Communist advance that would otherwise have to be held by United States troops or given up entirely; and the support of such armies is something that cannot be done by private means and must be done by governments. Likewise justified are expenditures for technical assistance, which has proved itself one of the more successful of Washington's ventures.

Far more debatable are proposals for greatly enlarging the scope of direct government grants for development purposes. Irrigation projects, harbors, and roads can contribute to a backward country's advance, but there are limits to what can be absorbed, and the conditions laid down are all-important. The building of the Aswan Dam across the Nile will benefit Egypt only if inflationary forces are held in check (see Business Globe, p. 78) and certainly United States funds for such undertakings will be dissipated unless other means of financing—public and private—take hold. Indeed, to call what the Government grants in these cases "seed money" is in a way an inversion of terms. For the true seed money of economic advance is not what governments do but rather what private individuals are allowed to do for themselves.

Economic aid, in short, makes sense only within the framework of a much larger policy. Such policy should be to project outward the principles that have built this country from a struggling colonial dependency to the world's foremost power. Those principles are in the first instance moral and poltitical, and are rooted in a deep attachment to freedom and justice. But the necessary corollary to political freedom is economic freedom as opposed to State-imposed controls, and the necessary corollary to justice is respect for private property and the sanctity of contract. In an age of central planning it is not easy to reassert these truths, but unless they are reasserted the inherent power of the United States will never be harnessed to the task that now faces the country. Communism comes before the world with vast promises of economic betterment, which in the end turn out to be an invitation to tyranny. The American mission is to demonstrate by deed as well as word that there is an alternative to this subversion of all human values. The mission will be fulfilled as donation diplomacy gives way to adherence to the basic political and economic philosophy that animates our own flexible and humane society.

## DEPENDENTS' MEDICAL CARE ACT

Mr. KILDAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

## ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRAZIER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees.

## MASS TRANSPORTATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3073) to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, WILLIAMS of Mississippi, MACK of Illinois, ROGERS of Texas, WOLVERTON, HINSHAW, and DOLLIVER.

## BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 410)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning without my approval H. R. 1835, for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.

This bill would have the United States accept as a binding obligation and agree to pay to Sedgwick County, Kans., $259,925.09 as the unpaid balance of taxes for the tax year 1947 against certain real property formerly owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This payment is contingent upon enactment by the Kansas Legislature of a law authorizing and directing acceptance of this amount as payment in full and as a release and forgiveness of all interest, penalties, liens, and charges connected with the taxes.

The property in question was acquired in 1942 by the Defense Plants Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Effective July 1, 1945, the Defense Plants Corporation was liquidated, and the property involved was transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Subsequently, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation declared the property surplus, and on April 16, 1947, the War Assets Administration accepted responsibility and authority for the property. On February 25, 1948, the War Assets Administrator, acting on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, deeded the property to the United States, and custody and accountability was thereupon transferred to the Department of the Air Force, which has retained jurisdiction ever since.

The Federal Government is constitutionally immune from taxation by States upon property owned by the United States. The Congress may waive that immunity, and by general legislation it did so on real property of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With respect to the property involved here, however, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation took the position that the laws of Kansas themselves exempted the property from taxation. To settle this and other issues, the Congress enacted Public Law 5, 82d Congress, which gave the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the claim of Sedgwick County for taxes on this property for the tax years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947. Under this authority the Court of Claims, by decision dated July 15, 1952, determined that there was liability for taxes for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946, but not for the year 1947. The court considered separately the question of taxes for the year 1947. It concluded, in reliance upon decisions of the Kansas Supreme Court, that there was no 1947 tax due prior to the effective date of levy, which under the law then applicable was November 1. Since the transfer from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the War Assets Administration took place in April, no tax could become due for 1947 because the constitutional immunity had revived upon the date of the transfer, April 16.

The transfer of the property from the War Assets Administration to the Department of the Air Force in February 1948 has continued the tax immunity. However, as an interim measure, the Congress last year enacted legislation (Public Law 388, 84th Cong., approved August 12, 1955) which is designed specifically to furnish temporary relief for the calendar years 1955 through 1958 for taxing authorities which have suffered an unexpected loss of revenue as a result of the Court of Claims decision in the Sedgwick County case. The Government is now making payments under that legislation, and I am informed that Sedgwick County has already filed its application for payment in lieu of taxes for the year 1955.

In the light of the foregoing facts, I believe that in considering this bill, which relates exclusively to the year 1947, I must also consider whether a claim for taxes for that year can be differentiated from a claim for the succeeding years up to 1955. The record in the case says that the Government applied for tax immunity for 1948 and subsequent years. Any such application has no bearing on the constitutional immunity. Therefore, I find no basis of distinction. I believe that to approve this bill would be a precedent for approving legislation for the other years, should claim be made. I also believe that to approve a bill for one piece of property, for one particular taxing jurisdiction, and for one particular year, would be to discriminate against other jurisdictions which are known to be similarly situated because of transfers of property from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or because of the Sedgwick County decision.

Furthermore, I believe that approval of H. R. 1835 would be contrary to the principles pertaining to payments in lieu of taxation which this administration has recommended to the Congress following study of the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. That Commission recommended "that the National Government inaugurate a broad system of payments in lieu of property taxes to State and local governments," with particular reference to commercial and industrial property. After careful consideration of this general recommendation, I came to the conclusion that the magnitude and complexity of the problem is such that only a strictly limited program would be warranted at this time. Accordingly, it was recommended that any legislation should be restricted in application to communities which are able to demonstrate financial hardship directly attributable to Federal removal of real property from the tax rolls. It was further suggested by the administration that this limited program be applied prospectively and then only to properties removed from the local tax rolls subsequent to June 30, 1950.

In addition to these general objections to the bill, I believe that the contingency proviso also is objectionable. Approval of any such provision, in my judgment, would imply acceptance of the principle that the United States Government is not immune from interest and other penalties. Federal immunity in these respects does not depend upon State law.

Fairness of treatment, and the same treatment for all similarly situated State and local taxing jurisdictions, must be the rule in any proposal for adjustment or imposition of tax liability upon the United States. Of course, we must also strive to relieve the hardship which may result from unnecessary inflexibility in the law. However, I believe that the enactment of individual, piecemeal bills does not serve the long-run best interests of either local jurisdictions or the Federal Government. If statutory relief is to be granted, the legislation authorizing such relief should be limited as I have indicated and should be of general applicability.

For these reasons, I return H. R. 1835 without my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 22, 1956.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

---

## NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to help meet two of the most critical problems facing our Nation today: The growing shortages in the teaching and science professions.

Today, as we cross the threshold into the nuclear era, we must face the fact that our future strength as a nation rests with the children who are now being educated and who will be educated in the next generation.

Recent magazine and newspaper articles have focused attention on the critical shortage of teachers, but I seriously doubt if the real implications of this scarcity have been realized. When schools opened in September 1955, the United States Office of Education estimated that there was a shortage of more than 140,000 teachers. The projected figures over the next 10 years give us even greater cause to stop and think—and act. The Ford Foundation has pointed out that to maintain the present teacher-student ratio, teaching staffs will have to be increased in the next 10 years more than they have increased over the past 35 years. Colleges and universities will have to add more teachers in the next 15 years than in all previous United States history combined. We will need 1,906,889 new teachers by 1965

to replace those who die or leave the profession, and to meet increased enrollments. If this need is to be met, one-half of all college graduates expected during the next decade will have to enter the teaching field. In past years, only one-fifth of all college graduates have entered this profession.

We all know that when there are not enough teachers to go around, something has to give. What gives, of course, is the quality of our teaching, for class sizes become swollen and unqualified teachers must be hired. Today, 35 percent of all public elementary teachers have had less than 4 years of college, and 6 percent have had less than 2 years.

There are many factors involved in the teacher shortage, which deserve the fullest consideration and study. Not the least of these is the salary scale. Many semiskilled laborers receive better pay than the men and women who teach our children. The problem is not that the salary scale of the workers is too high, but simply that our teachers receive too little. Small wonder that many of them, especially those with families to raise, find that they must leave the profession if they are to make ends meet.

Another factor affecting the scarcity of teachers is that too few of our high-school graduates go on to college at all. More than half of the top quarter in intelligence of our high-school-age youth never go on to college. Surveys indicate that the majority of these students simply cannot afford to continue their education. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that such a waste of good minds is one which our Nation cannot afford.

There has been an increase in the number of scholarship programs developed by industry, philanthropic institutions, and the like. Unfortunately, however, they do not meet the demand—nor the critical need which faces us today and which bears so directly upon our national life. That is why I feel that Government must act now to help meet the emergency.

One of the provisions of my bill would create 50,000 scholarships a year for the next 10 years for students entering the field of education. Before the bogey of Federal control of education is raised, let me point out that this is often only a smokescreen raised by those who are reluctant to act. We have seen during the administration of the GI bill of rights that Federal financing of a student's college education has not resulted in Government control over the policies or curriculum of our colleges and universities. To administer the program of scholarships, there would be created in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the position of Director of Scholarships and a Board of 16 drawn from the professional field who would set standards for the recipients of scholarships, making tuition payments direct to the various institutions, and make subsistence payments direct to the qualifying students. Scholarships would be divided on a statewide basis in proportion to the number of high school graduates in each State.

Directly related to the teacher shortage is the equally critical shortage in trained personnel in the scientific fields. The reason for this is not difficult to find. Twenty-three percent of our Nation's public high schools offer no courses in physics and chemistry. During 1954–55, a total of 7,900 science teachers were needed, but only 3,600 were trained, and of these only 1,700 actually entered the teaching field. According to the National Education Association, the output of science teachers has declined 57 percent from 1950 to 1955. This at a time when science and technology are the very cornerstones of our security and our hope for peacetime prosperity. Yet, how can we expect our young people to become interested in the further study of science when they have been given no chance of becoming acquainted with it.

The second provision of my scholarship bill provides for 20,000 undergraduate scholarships a year for 10 years for qualified students in the field of science.

The president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, J. R. Killian, Jr., stated in a recent article for Life magazine that our shortage of scientists has become the "best advertised shortage of our time" because of the well-known fact that Russia has been producing more trained scientists than has the United States. Mr. Killian went on to propose a series of national scholarships to meet our emergency needs. He did prefer to have these scholarships financed by private sources, but he also felt that until private funds were available the Federal Government should do something to fill the partial vacuum. I certainly agree with Mr. Killian.

Because quality is as important as quantity, my bill also sets up 5,000 postgraduate scholarships a year in the field of science. This should enable some of our gifted students to continue their education rather than face the necessity of having to accept positions after receiving their B. S. degree. Mr. Speaker, we have every reason to be proud of the men and women whom we entrust today with the education of our children. They are doing an extraordinary job under difficult circumstances. But they need help—and the help of tomorrow must be trained today.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, we must face squarely the fact that the scientific demands of our Nation in this highly technological era are falling upon too few shoulders. It may be no exaggeration to say that the outcome of the cold war and America's continued leadership may well depend upon how squarely we face the challenging task before us. For this reason, I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor will consider my proposals as soon as possible. In the life of both people and nations, there comes a time for decision and action. With respect to our future teachers and scientists, that time is now.

---

## REBUILDING THE BRAIN-WASHED, FLOUNDERING SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the time this statement is being prepared, 2 years have passed; 2 summers, with the length of 2 long winters—to paraphrase the poet Wordsworth—since the epochal decision of the Supreme Court overturning a decision that had been followed for 75 years declaring that the doctrine of separate but equal facilities was not a violation of the Constitution.

This decision overturned all precedents and actually amounted to an amendment of the Constitution by one of the coordinate branches of our Government that has no right under the Constitution to amend it. It sought at one fell swoop to destroy the way of life and the social institutions of a great segment of the American people. But only now is the full import of the decision being realized. During the 2 years the determination of the people most vitally affected by the decision has been hardened and its thinking crystallized on the solution of the problem.

Sometimes it is said that the decision of the Supreme Court is the law of the land whether we believe the decision to be legally right or wrong. This is not an accurate statement of the situation. It is true that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States is binding upon all persons who were parties before it in the litigation of that particular case until it is reversed or made ineffective by legislation by the Congress. This is the extent of the authority of the Supreme Court to enforce its decision. It is upon this basis that the South will oppose the destruction of its school system until the people of the United States and every section of this great country come to realize the enormity of the error which the Supreme Court has committed in this civilization-shaking decision.

Many have claimed that we have no right to criticize the Supreme Court or to oppose an application of its unwarranted and erroneous decisions. However, the right of free speech in America extends to the right to criticize even the Supreme Court and its members.

In the first place, by its decision in the school case, the Supreme Court ignored a warning of George Washington in his Farewell Address. I have previously inserted this warning in the RECORD but it is so important that I want to repeat it here. It is as follows:

> If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Recently my own colleague from Georgia, the Hon. E. L. FORRESTER, in a learned and convincing statement to the House referred to and quoted Lincoln's criticism of the Supreme Court after the Dred Scott decision. President Franklin D. Roosevelt on March 9, 1937, commenting on a decision of the Supreme Court said:

> The Court in addition to the proper use of its judicial functions has improperly set itself up as a third house of the Congress—a superlegislature, as one of the justices has called it—reading into the Constitution words and implications which are not there.

We have, therefore, reached the point as a Nation where we must take action to save the Constitution from the Court and the Court from itself * * *.

Our difficulty with the Court today rises not from the Court as an institution but from human beings within it.

I call your especial attention to the last paragraph of the quotation, to wit:

Our difficulty with the Court today rises not from the Court as an institution but from human beings within it.

But the purpose of my statement today has not been to discuss the question of segregation. It is rather to bring to your attention a fact that has been cited by many of my colleagues including some from the Northern States as well as from the South and that is that the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, is not the only decision that shows the determination of the Supreme Court to ignore precedents, to usurp the field of legislation and the power to amend the Constitution. One of the strongest indictments against the Supreme Court is that voiced in a masterly fashion by a former Justice of that Court—James F. Byrnes of South Carolina. In an article in U. S. News & World Report, entitled "The Supreme Court Must Be Curbed," he brings a strong indictment against the Supreme Court for its refusal to follow precedent, and for its invasion not only of the legislative branch of our Government but of the rights of the States to determine their own internal affairs.

In this connection, Mr. Byrnes says:

Tragic as may be the consequences in destroying the public school system in the South, more frightening are the consequences of the trend of the present Court to destroy the powers of the 48 States.

He then quotes the case of *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, decided April 2, 1956, which invalidated the laws of 42 States prohibiting the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by violence as long as there is a Federal law against sedition. As criticism of the other members of the Court, Justices Reed, Burton and Minton rendered a vigorous dissenting opinion. Only 1 week later, the Court in the Slochower case held unconstitutional a New York City charter provision requiring dismissal of employees who refused to answer questions asked by legally constituted bodies.

The Wall Street Journal in an editorial which appeared in that daily newspaper on Thursday, May 17, said that the decision "threw a cloud over similar laws elsewhere, as well as a protective cloak over teachers who choose to be less than honest and forthright." On the Natural Gas Act ruling of several years ago, the minority of the Court wrote that the majority had transgressed the exemption granted producers and that good faith required the Court to interpret the act as "its terms read, and as we have, until today, declared it." There are other minority opinions which criticize the court for its failure to determine the intention of the Congress in framing its legislation and in actually ignoring express statements of the congressional intent. There are also other recent decisions that show the determination of the Court to overstep the functions assigned to it. These have been discussed on the floor of this House during the past few weeks and I do not need to refer to them. A very influential official of the American Bar Association has stated that 90 percent of the lawyers in America have lost faith in our present Supreme Court because of its tendency to ignore precedents, to forget the rule of stare decisis and to arrogate unto themselves the powers and duties imposed by the Constitution upon the Congress as well as because of its effrontery to attempt to rewrite the Constitution and to reinterpret it on grounds other than legal precedent and the laws which express the will of the Congress in any particular field. Not only does former Senator and Justice Byrnes bitingly criticize the Supreme Court but there are many other former jurists of brilliant intellect who are disturbed and alarmed at the tendency of the present Court to upset long established precedents and sally forth upon the uncharted seas of pseudosociology, neo-Freudian psychology and the political and sociological feelings of the present members of the Supreme Court. In this connection, I am including in my statement a letter recently written me by an honored former justice of the Fifth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, that grand old jurist, Samuel H. Sibley, who would have served with distinction on the United States Supreme Court. At 90 years, he is still vigorous and his mind is as clear as ever. His letter to me reads as follows:

MARIETTA, GA., *December 9, 1955.*

Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM,
*Rome, Ga.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have noticed with interest your recently expressed opinion that the decisions of the Supreme Court were not judicial action, but legislative, and in undertaking to regulate the conduct of the schools both in the States and in the District of Columbia, and consequently are not within the competency of the Court to make. I note this morning that the same view was argued last night by Georgia's attorney general at Yale. I feel that this is the true question of all the argument, and not the merits or demerits of segregation itself. I have seen it this way all along, and as a member of the country's high judiciary, I am concerned at the action of our High Court in this matter, adding the capstone to a series of legislative decisions made by the Court in the past 10 years. We old judges, so far as I know, all feel that the Court is ceasing often to act as lawyers declaring the law what it is, and seeking to make the law what they think it ought to be. This is, of course, legislation, no matter who does it. It is forbidden by the first sentence of the Constitution to all branches of the Federal Government except the Congress. "All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in the Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." The Supreme Court has no part in it. Its intrusion into that field is a violation of the Constitution. Yet I have seen no discussion, and no quotation even of this first sentence of the Constitution that stands wholly unchanged. The 14th amendment has no purpose to alter this, for its concluding words are "The Congress shall have power to enforce this amendment," not the Supreme Court.

But supposing that this is otherwise, the 14th amendment has nothing to do with the District of Columbia, and the Court so admits in its decision on the District's schools. The Congress has, as is well established, plenary government over the District, including the right to establish public schools. The Congress exercised that right, and enacted in the original and subsequent laws about that the races had best be segregated. If the time has come to deal otherwise with the schools, the question is so plainly a question for the Congress which established them, that I can see no basis to think otherwise. Congress alone may legislate about it, in those schools.

The judges of the Supreme Court are no doubt sincere men and think they have done right, but they have acted as reformers rather than judges, and exceeded their authority, most plainly in dealing with the District of Columbia. It seems to me that the Congress ought at least to strongly protest this invasion of their powers. I do not think it is a case for impeachment, but it is a case for a strong assertion of congressional prerogative, as expressed in the first sentence of the Constitution, that we all have sworn not only to respect, but also to support. As I am a judge, in commission though retired, I urge that the Congress by some appropriate action assert itself. It has a public duty to do this. It may give pause to those who have not seen the matter in that light.

Let the State schools stand apart for the present. I am talking about the duty of our Senators and Congressmen. They may leave the States and their schools to fight it out as best they can, but can they in duty shut their eyes to a very plain invasion of the rights and obligations of the Congress in respect to the Government of the District? Full thought and discussion of this point may well aid to clarify the whole question of the propriety of segregation, and the need to deal with it by Federal power, and how that need ought to be expressed.

Six months ago I publicly expressed my views on this subject in an address in Atlanta. The last part of it alone deals with the particular matter I am now arguing, but this is my only copy and I don't wish to dismember it. Read and use any of it which you may wish, and then return to me, please. I send it in what I take as the line of a judge's public duty.

With high personal regards.

Yours sincerely,

SAML. H. SIBLEY.

To show the utter confusion in the present Supreme Court and the inability of its members to construe and apply the Constitution and the laws of the land, my own colleague from Georgia, the Honorable PRINCE PRESTON, recently emphasized the present situation in the Court as exemplified in its recent decision in the case of Cahill against New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. Mr. PRESTON brought the glaring light of publicity upon the hesitation and confusion of the Court, by introducing a bill to pay the plaintiff in the cited case the $90,000, that had been awarded him by the lower court and approved by the United States Supreme Court by an order which was later vacated after the defendant in the original suit had paid the judgment to the plaintiff in that suit who, in turn, had already spent much of the money he thought he had won by the original Supreme Court order.

There is no doubt but that the present situation is a most serious one. As former Senator Byrnes has so cogently said, even the destruction of public schools in the South may not be as injurious to the Nation as the uncertainty that prevails

as a result of the vacillation of the Supreme Court and its tendency to forsake the law as it has stood for years and substitute its own whims and vagaries for the established law of the land. No longer does an attorney know how to advise his clients. The law as announced by the United States Supreme Court may be one thing today and directly the opposite tomorrow. Confusion grows worse confounded. As former Justice Byrnes says, the Court must be curbed.

That the Congress does have the right to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and prevent its entering into fields reserved to the States by the Constitution is asserted by Mr. Byrnes in his excellent discussion of the whole problem. In recent days, I have received a most-learned and well-authenticated opinion from the Honorable Eugene Cook, the attorney general of Georgia, establishing without a doubt the fact that the Congress may limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and prevent its overstepping the bounds set by the Constitution and invading the rights of the sovereign States.

Quite often the constituents of southern Congressmen are clamorous in their demands that we do something to overrule the decision in the school cases. Of course, that is a present impossibility due to the fact that the 100 Members of the Congress who signed the recent much-discussed manifesto or statement of our position, just about represents the votes that we would get for any such effort on our part.

Neither do we have the votes today that would be necessary to impeach the present members of the Supreme Court although our people in the South feel so intensely antagonistic to the Court that they demand that we resort to this harsh remedy for the present situation.

But I come before you today not to insist upon any of these impossible remedies but to discuss with you what can be done not to reverse the Court on the matter of segregation but to bring it back into its field of the interpretation of the Constitution and the laws of Congress according to the intention of the Congress and the precedents and established rules of construction of the Constitution.

It is said that more than 70 bills have been introduced into Congress to try to limit the Supreme Court and insist that the Court exercise its own functions and not trespass upon those of the Congress and the States.

One of these bills is H. R. 3, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I think this legislation is demanded and that it is the first step we should take in the effort to force the Supreme Court to consider the intent of Congress and not to flout that intent and treat it with contempt. As Mr. SMITH himself has said, his bill has nothing whatsoever to do with the question of segregation of the races in our public schools. I am heartily in favor of this bill and hope that the people of our country will demand its enactment when they come to realize that more and more the Supreme Court is invading the province of their own States and of their Representatives in the Congress.

There may be other remedies that we can apply and they may be embodied in the more than 70 bills that have been introduced for this purpose. I have not had the time to study all of these bills or to formulate one for myself which would properly limit the powers of the Court.

I believe fundamentally that President Roosevelt was right when he stated that "Our difficulty with the court today rises not from the court as an institution but from the human beings within it." President Roosevelt's remark was probably a prelude to his sinister court packing idea. Apparently he wanted to fill the court with subservient political hacks so that he might dominate it. Fortunately, his court packing idea was defeated but, nonetheless, he did, in a sense, pack the court with the kind of people he wanted on it because of the death and retirement of so many of the justices during his era. Certain it is that we cannot hope for the proper decisions from the Supreme Court if the members of that court are not learned in the law and its precedents. If our court is made up of political hacks as Vice President NIXON has charged, insofar as the Chief Justice is concerned, then we cannot expect sound legal decisions to come from that body. So the fundamental problem is the problem of reconstituting the court. This will be a long and perilous project but, nevertheless, we must undertake it. Recently when I was at home, a friend of mine stated it this way. He said that it had taken 35 years to corrupt the Supreme Court and that it would take that long to clean it up and fill it with men who have had judicial experience and who have the temperament and training to make them render sound legal decisions. I am sure my friend did not mean "corrupt" in the sense that the present members of the court are morally corrupt. In my opinion, the trouble is not political corruption but the corruption of their ideas and concepts of justice. Frankly, I think its members have been brain washed. The brain washing has been done by the alleged sociologist and psychologist, Dr. Karl Gunnar Mydral and his associates. It was in his book, the American Dilemma, that Dr. Mydral stated that the American Constitution was outmoded; and the other dabblers in the field of sociology and psychology to which the Supreme Court turned instead of to legal precedents in the school cases were of like mind with Dr. Myrdal that the Constitution is outmoded. Consequently, the Supreme Court, after its brain washing by this man, Myrdal, and his shocking pink, if not Red, associates—some of them indeed are included as members in Communist front organizations named by our Department of Justice as such—overturned legal decisions by such giants of previous Supreme Courts as Justices Holmes, Taft, and Brandeis. I will not try to document this statement further since it has been done so ably by the distinguished lawyer, my good friend from Dalton, Ga., the Honorable Carter Pittman. To show you that this man Pittman is a distinguished lawyer himself and recognized as such in his profession, the United States Supreme Court has on several occasions used and quoted as authority a study Mr. Pittman made 25 years ago on the history of the privilege against self-incrimination. Mr. Pittman is at present the president of the States Rights Councils of Georgia and has written an article for the American Bar Association Journal entitled "Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," which will appear in the next issue.

As confirmation of my assertion that the Court has been brain washed by these wild Communist-inspired pseudo-scientists not in the field of law but in the uncharted field of psychology and sociology, I refer you to an article written by this same distinguished lawyer, the Honorable Carter Pittman, introduced by me into the daily RECORD of February 28, 1956, at page A1858. To say that the Court has been brain washed is the softest impeachment I can command to designate the present members of the Court.

How, then, is the Court to be reconstituted and cleansed of its aberrations and flights into esoteric fields foreign to the law? Even Mr. Byrnes in his excellent article does not attempt to answer this question, but I am convinced that it must be done by writing into the law qualifications for persons proposed by the President to become Justices of the United States Supreme Court. I know that some have questioned the power of the Congress to in this way circumscribe the President's right to appoint political hacks or other incompetents if he so sees fit. In the other body, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has introduced a bill to require 5 years' judicial experience before appointment to the Court. Senator STENNIS has introduced a similar bill, but, recognizing that some question has been raised as to the right of the Congress to limit the President's power of appointment, he has introduced a bill which would set up standards for the Senate to follow in confirming members appointed by the President to the Supreme Court.

There are absolutely no qualifications laid down either in our Constitution or in the laws of our land for appointment of members of the Supreme Court who have the right to "slap down," so to speak, even the President of the United States, as was indicated in the rebuke to President Truman when he seized the steel industry to end a nationwide crippling strike in that industry. The Constitution does say in article I, section I, that—

> No person except a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of 35 years and been 14 years a resident within the United States.

It is passing strange that no such qualifications for appointment to the Supreme Court have ever been written into the law of our land. Surely if the President must be a natural born citizen, the members of the Supreme Court should at least meet that qualification. Consequently, I have prepared a bill which does set up qualifications up to

which persons must measure before they are confirmed to serve on the United States Supreme Court. Not only do I include in this bill, which I have today introduced into the House, a requirement that Supreme Court justices must be native born, must be at least 35 years of age and have been 14 years a resident within the United States, the identical requirements for the President, but in addition, my bill provides that such intended appointees must have been graduated by a law school approved by the American Bar Association or admitted to the bar of a court of general jurisdiction in any State, Territory, possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia. Such appointee must have practiced law for a total of not less than 5 years after having been admitted to the bar of any court of general jurisdiction as referred to above or must have had a total of not less than 5 years' judicial service.

These requirements may, of course, be changed after hearings by the committee to which it is referred. It will at least form a basis for legislation that will actually do something about the present intolerable situation in the highest court of our land to curb its aberrations, its discursions from the field of law into those of psychology, sociology and mythology and will make sure that its members are well grounded in the law, its precedents and its standards of legal ethics. My bill is the most comprehensive and, I believe, the best considered approach to the long-range rebuilding of the Court.

As the Wall Street Journal said in its excellent editorial on the subject in its issue of May 17, 1956, "There is only a need to curb the use of the Court as a reward for political service or a sinecure for political friends." This excellent newspaper has certainly put its finger upon the very essence of the matter. Vice President NIXON's boast that it was a Republican political Chief Justice who had brought about the infamous school decision has cast a shadow upon the entire Court. All in all, the people of America are not going to be satisfied until the Congress does something to eliminate political hacks from our Supreme Court and fill it with men of legal background and training, of ability, and of such integrity and character that they can rise above the winds of politics, of wild-eyed Socialists, pinkos, and their dreamworld doctrines of social laws, psychology, and even mythology. Perchance by the introduction of this bill I have at least made a start toward the long and uphill battle to restore the Supreme Court to the confidence of our people and the legal reliance of the lawyers of America.

## DR. RAYBURN AND DR. MARTIN AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been delighted to learn from the lips of our able colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], that in Syracuse, N. Y., on Monday, June 4, it will be Dr. RAYBURN and Dr. MARTIN.

The announcement that Syracuse University would on the date indicated confer honorary degrees on these two great American legislative leaders has been hailed by the public and the press. Members of the House and Senate concur in the feeling it is a most timely and deserved tribute.

"What a natural to honor SAM and JOE in this way. What a picture both will make as speakers on that platform at Archbold Stadium at Syracuse," was one Member's comment.

Speaker RAYBURN, Texas Democrat, has had 42 years of service in the House, and former Speaker MARTIN, Massachusetts Republican, can count 32 years of such service. RAYBURN's service as Speaker is a record. The two have contributed much to the legislative history of our country during periods of great crises and every student of the American way of life knows them for their love and devotion to their country.

In scoring this first, I desire to salute the great University of Syracuse on the June 4 honors it plans for the great leaders of this body. In a very true sense Syracuse is honoring the American Congress.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, for a period beginning Thursday, May 24, and ending July 19, on account of official business, attendance as a congressional adviser to the International Labor Organization to be held in Geneva, Switzerland.

To Mr. VINSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. DEMPSEY), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), today and tomorrow, on account of illness in the immediate family.

To Mr. DIXON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for the week of May 28, on account of official business.

To Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, for 7 days, on account of official business.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. CHUDOFF), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VURSELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HENDERSON to revise and extend the remarks which he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER on the matter of the recent directives of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include testimony before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LOVRE to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

## SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 510. An act for the relief of Mary A. Mouskalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 806. An act to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 875. An act for the relief of Angel Marie Olaeta-Goitia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1245. An act for the relief of Agnes V. Walsh, the estate of Margaret T. Denehy, and David Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1273. An act to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1895. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1961. An act to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2341. An act for the relief of Gertrude Heindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2352. An act for the relief of Maj. Luther C. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2690. An act for the relief of William G. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2722. An act for the relief of Fai Hoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2930. An act for the relief of Eladio Ledesma-Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2937. An act to increase from $50 to $75 a month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3011. An act for the relief of Chan Lee Nui Sin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3040. An act for the relief of Gertrud Charlotte Samuelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3058. An act for the relief of Javier F. Kuong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3101. An act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3147. An act for the relief of Elsie M. Kenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3412. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war risk insurance for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3547. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955, (69 Stat. 55), authorizing the sale of certain land by the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3844. An act to amend the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for urban renewal assistance to disaster areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 6, 7, and 8 of the hearings on the study of the antitrust laws of the United States; the Committee on House Administration.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oreg.;

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 4026. An act for the relief of James C. Hayes;

H. R. 4162. An act for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; and

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report relative to the Department of the Navy proposing to donate certain small craft to the United States Volunteer Life Savings Corps to be used in rescue work and training, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 898; 34 U. S. C. 546k); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1882. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 35th Quarterly Report on Export Control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1883. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes,' approved May 18, 1910"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1884. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67), and the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (48 U. S. C. 1632); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1885. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1886. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 101 (c) of Public Law 768, 83d Congress, so as to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6332. A bill to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 10875. A bill to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 (Rept. No. 2197). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 9429. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2195). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee of conference. H. R. 5862. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation (Rept. No. 2196). Ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 616. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 11356. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 11357. A bill to establish a program of scholarships for students in science and education at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 11358. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11359. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11360. A bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover twofold damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11361. A bill to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 11362. A bill for the relief of the Vermont, Ipava, and Table Grove Unit School District No. 2, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 11363. A bill to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 11364. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 11365. A bill to authorize deferment of repayments of certain emergency loans by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 11366. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11367. A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11368. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital of 1,000 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 11369. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 11370. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 11371. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 11372. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1952, with respect to the crediting for civil service retirement purposes of certain service performed by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 11373. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 11374. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11375. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to further extend the special school milk program to certain institutions for the care and training of children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 11376. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 11377. A bill to amend section 504 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to specify certain terms that must be contained in contracts for the purchase or construction of residential property; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11378. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that certain warrantors of housing sold under guaranteed, insured, or direct loans shall procure a performance bond; to authorize the Administrator to refuse to appraise certain residential property; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11379. A bill to provide that the next cruiser commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named the *Brooklyn*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 11380. A bill to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 11381. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands now required for community development adjacent to Cascade Reservoir, Boise Federal reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 11382. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 11383. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 11384. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 11385. A bill to validate certain payments in settlement of unused accrued leave heretofore or hereafter made to certain members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 11386. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, to establish in the Department of Defense an office of Under Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 11387. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11388. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 11389. A bill to amend section 4232 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain places where no instrumental music is provided shall not be treated as cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 11390. A bill for the relief of Josephine Elenora Ambrose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11391. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Luisette Vilela Gomes de Almeida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 11392. A bill for the relief of Jose Trinidad Maldonado Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 11393. A bill for the relief of Petros Ioannou Calengas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 11394. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Burawski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11395. A bill for the relief of Amabile Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 11396. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria del Rosario G. Arocena, Sister Maria Aranzazu A. Mendizabal, and Sister Maria Dolores O. Goyenechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 11397. A bill for the relief of Simon Brill, et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 11398. A bill for the relief of Michele De Bellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1063. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Frank White, Jr., and 44 other residents of Jamestown, N. Dak., and surrounding communities, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and

orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1064. Also, petition of Fred Sjoblom and 38 other residents of Bismarck, N. Dak., and vicinity, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1065. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Clyde J. Jones and 44 other residents of Renovo, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1066. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Albert E. Blasingame, Little Rock, Ark., and others urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1067. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Wendle Bros., Inc., and 45 veterans of Spokane County, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1068. Also, petition of William Tinsley and 44 other veterans of Spokane and Stevens County, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1069. Also, petition of Mrs. Joan Bull and 20 other veterans of Spokane County, Wash., urging immediate enactment of separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1070. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of World War I veterans of Chariton, Iowa, urging the adoption of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1071. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the Pulaski Democratic Club of Hartford, an organization of Americans of Polish ethnic origin, to extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 beyond its expiration date of August 6, 1956, to enable persons escaping from behind the Iron Curtain to find in the United States a haven of peace, freedom, and liberty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Many Notable Dignitaries From Foreign Countries Have Visited the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 22, 1956*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the years many heads of state, important personages and foreign dignitaries from many lands have visited the TVA. Foreign visitors to our country, as well as our own citizens, have come to look upon TVA as a superior example of government at work in the field of resource development and conservation of national resources. Certainly the TVA is a symbol of success of what a great government can do to protect lives and property, advance commerce, industry, and agriculture through cooperative endeavor between the people of a great region and the Federal Government. Because of this achievement and success TVA has become a great national and international asset. It is an international symbol of American engineering achievement—and TVA is visited annually by many notable visitors.

Among the distinguished dignitaries visiting TVA the following are included:

Prince Albert of Liege, Belgium, November 1955.

Prime Minister U Nu of Burma, July 1955.

Ambassador Gaganvihari Mehta, of India, May 1954.

Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard, of the Netherlands, in April 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Eban, of Israel, in May 1953.

Muhammed Khuda, Minister of Defense, of Pakistan, in December 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Feridun C. Erkin, of Turkey, in October 1952.

Adm. Renato Guillobel, Secretary of the Brazilian Navy, in September 1952.

Former Prime Minister Hans Hetoft, of Denmark, and Ambassador Henrik de Kauffmann, of Denmark, in July 1952.

Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, in May 1951.

Prime Minister Joseph Pholien, of Belgium, in April 1951.

President Gabriel Gonzales Videla, of Chile, in April 1950.

Dr. Franz Bluecher, Vice Chancellor of West Germany, in February 1950.

Prime Minister Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, in October 1949.

President Enroco Gaspar Dutra, of Brazil, in May 1949.

Right Honorable Hector McNeil, British Minister of State, in April 1949.

The Khan of Kalat, Ruler of Kalat, Pakistan, in April 1949.

Prince Charles, Regent of Belgium, in April 1948.

The Egyptian Minister of Public Works, in July 1947.

President Miguel Aleman, of Mexico, in May 1947.

## Maritime Day Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, May 22, 1956*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today is that outstanding occasion which, unfortunately, occurs but once a year. It is Maritime Day.

I have just returned from a luncheon given by the Propeller Club, port of Baltimore. While there, I had the great privilege of introducing the guest of honor, our friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Of course, in looking about for an outstanding authority on maritime matters, it was only natural that the Propeller Club would give serious consideration to requesting the Senator from Massachusetts to deliver the Maritime Day address. During that time he did me, the Port of Baltimore Propeller Club, and the State of Maryland the great honor of delivering one of the finest Maritime Day addresses I have ever been privileged to hear. Accordingly, and for the purpose of sharing his remarks with the Members of the Senate and the people generally, I send to the desk a copy of his speech, with a request for unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, MARITIME DAY LUNCHEON, PROPELLER CLUB OF BALTIMORE, MAY 22

Since I certainly don't want to sail into any port, especially Baltimore, under false colors, I think I should say right here and now that you fellows are competitors, strong competitors, of ours in Boston. This rivalry is one of the painful yet stimulating facts of Atlantic port life, and I want you to know that we recognize it as such.

Despite our rivalry, however—and it's a healthy one fundamentally—you in Baltimore and we in Boston have an equal and vital interest in maritime affairs as a whole. It is therefore essential that, as Baltimoreans and Bostonians, but even more importantly as Americans, we do everything within our power to see to it that a dynamic and progressive national maritime policy is maintained and implemented with commonsense, vigor, and foresight. Although we all recognize it, I think we can never overemphasize the dual importance of our merchant marine and our maritime industries to a healthy American economy and to our national defense.

Nearly 100 years of trial and error, marked in great part by the failure to recognize this dual importance of our merchant marine, failed to provide America with a stable maritime policy until Congress drafted the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This act is agreed to be a fundamental piece of maritime legislation, for it establishes a workable basis for maintaining a strong American merchant marine as a private enterprise venture, and at the same time strengthening the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry as an essential arm of our national security and as an indispensable auxiliary of our armed services in event of national emergency.

In time of peace, reliable shipping service at reasonable rates requires that the United States carry a substantial part of its waterborne foreign commerce in American-flag vessels. During periods of economic depression, such as all nations have known in their history, the seafaring people have tended to give priority to their own commerce and their fleets have been instruments of national policy and trade promotion. But even in times of peace and prosperity such as we enjoy today, it is clear that if the strength of our American merchant marine is reduced or, indeed, if we were ever to be without it, foreign maritime powers would be in a posi-

tion—which they are ever ready and eager to occupy—of carrying our goods at times and from ports of their own choosing and at whatever prices the American traffic could be forced to bear. Needless to say, those prices would be boosted sky high. We could not argue, since we could not compete.

Of even greater consequence, however, is the vital role of the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry as instruments of national defense and security. Regardless of ordinary economic considerations, the maintenance of a vigorous merchant marine, available for service as a military auxiliary, simply must be regarded as a necessary cost of national defense to the extent that an adequate merchant fleet and shipbuilding industry cannot, in the light of crippling foreign competition, be self-supporting.

The Congress is repeatedly reminded of these facts by those of us who, by reason of the maritime States from which we come, have a great awareness and knowledge of United States maritime history, policy, and requirements. Fortunately, through the vigorous and unflagging efforts, on a wholly bipartisan basis, of such Senators, among others, as your JOHN BUTLER, Washington's WARREN MAGNUSON, Maine's FREDERICK PAYNE, and this occasionally seagoing Yankee now speaking, the Senate has been regularly persuaded that certain legislation just had to be placed at the top of the Senate's must list of legislation to be enacted. We have not achieved all that we hope to, all that we should—but we refuse to give up the ship!

Most recently, through the spirited bipartisan effort to which I have referred, we were able to record in the Senate a defense of the Cargo Preference Act, the 50–50 law, which we believe in so wholeheartedly and which we feel must be maintained. The very existence of a United States-flag fleet is our only protection against the kind of situation as that in which foreign maritime powers would be enabled, without such cargo preference restrictions, to take arbitrary and costly action where our American cargoes are concerned. Public Law 664, the Cargo Preference Act, is one of those pieces of legislation which prevents such foreign monopoly and yet at the same time fairly provides our friends from abroad with an opportunity to participate in the interest of healthier world trade. Previously, on nine such occasions since 1948, Congress has written this 50–50 provision into various aid programs. Now the Cargo Preference Act has made it unnecessary to repeat that procedure. It has become a part of our general law.

In another area of merchant marine interest and activity, it is pleasing to report that with the approval of Public Law 415 of this Congress, the Secretary of Commerce has been authorized to maintain the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., on a permanent basis.

In a word, we are strengthening the sinews of our merchant marine for the purpose of attracting the best of our young men to the merchant marine and encouraging them to remain in it as career officers.

These actions are typical of the maritime legislation for which we are determined to fight hard in every session of every Congress, and yet these are but a part of a larger effort, a wider program, that must be given effect continuingly if the American merchant marine is, economically and in the national interest, to achieve the goals it seeks.

I have had occasion from time to time to list six specific suggestions as to how our maritime problem may be seen clearly and implemented successfully. The suggestions are these:

1. A full cooperation among the Maritime Board, the shipping industry, and Government based upon confidence and mutual understanding.

2. The prompt determination of reliable indices for construction and operating participation by the Government.

3. The institution and maintenance of an orderly replacement program by appropriate planning and legislation.

4. The common-sense gearing of our maritime policy equally to defense and to peacetime needs.

5. The initiation of a vigorous and comprehensive program of public information and enlightenment.

6. The effective administration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, together with a periodic review of that act to see how it may be better implemented from time to time in order that its purposes may be more effectively achieved.

It has always seemed to me very necessary that our citizens realize that the beneficiaries of a strong national maritime policy are not solely the shipowners and operators or those who man the vessels. The beneficiaries of such a policy are all the people of all the States, for every single region in this country contributes to and shares in the benefits which flow from the construction, the maintenance, and the operation of our merchant fleet in time of peace and in time of war.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, I have worked hard for years to try to help overcome the feast or famine practices that have characterized us in maritime affairs over the years. In time of peace we have, characteristically, been foolishly content to wallow in the trough of the maritime wave. Then hurriedly and apprehensively in time of emergency we have built, at tremendous expense and with no little risk, to achieve a crest of production adequate to those emergency needs.

We hear much these days, particularly as regards airpower and the new era of guided missiles, of research and development, the work of our scientists in private laboratories and in Government installations designed for one purpose: the more rapid and effective improvement of weapons, ships and aircraft. We have had it dramatized spectacularly for men who go down to the sea in ships by the atomic-powered submarine *Nautilus*. This same emphasis upon research and development must be applied to America's merchant marine, to the conception, designing, and building of newer, better, more efficient and more economical commercial vessels and gear.

During World War II, Mrs. Saltonstall was invited to christen the first LST built in the shipyard at Hingham, Mass. That yard was barely a year old and had been created almost from scratch on the Massachusetts shoreline. Just as Mrs. Saltonstall was about to break the bottle on the vessel's bow, the superintendent of the yard said to her, "This ship will go down the ways at a speed of 16 knots and it will never move as fast as that again." That statement often makes me think of the advances that have been made in marine design and engineering in the last decade and of the grim significance of that progress in today's world.

Finally, may I say that, if we intend to keep an effective merchant marine afloat, it is inescapable that our merchant marine will have to be helped financially to compete with foreign-flag vessels. Therefore, a program of Government participation seems to be the only answer to our dilemma. Only through such Government participation can American shipowners maintain up-to-date, high-speed vessels which they can operate on a competitive basis with foreign-flag fleets.

For the same reasons we must continue with the construction subsidy program, which enables American shipyards to retain that vital core of shipyard labor without which we could not build vessels in time of war. A New Englander certainly doesn't spend money he doesn't have to spend. Nevertheless he paints his barn regularly. This is an expenditure, but it is a long-term economy. It is exactly in that sense that we must look upon expenditures where our national security and the merchant marine are concerned.

Let me conclude with these words of President Eisenhower's: "We were caught flat footed in both World Wars because we relied too much upon foriegn owned and operated shipping to carry our cargoes abroad and to bring critically needed supplies to this country.

"America's industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supplies for either peace or war will be safe.

"I consider the merchant marine to be our fourth arm of defense and vital to the stability and expansion of our foreign trade."

These are sentiments of a far sighted and clear-thinking leader with which we all agree and toward the realization of which we are determined to work everlastingly hard together.

---

## Soybeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 22, 1956*

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with a bumper crop of 372 million bushels of soybeans produced in 1955, now selling around $3 a bushel, so far above parity that it hardly can be computed, is the best proof that supply and demand gives the farmer greater profit than can be brought to him by support prices and we are not plagued by any surpluses.

I would like to point out Illinois leads all States, producing 77 million bushels and the total crop of 372 million which brought the farmers about $1 billion.

Research scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture through the years by plant breeding have developed 16 new varieties—all producing 20 percent more oil and 10 percent more beans that the varieties they have replaced.

At this time when we have billions of bushels of surplus wheat, corn, and other products which are depressing farm prices, may I point out that this huge soybean crop is selling far above price supports and we are not plagued with any surplus. One of the reasons is that the research scientists have found many new industrial outlets for this farm crop in addition to feed and food uses.

Today, soybeans provide 70 percent of all vegetable oils used in margarine and 54 percent of all vegetable shortenings.

Marketing research has opened outlets for 221 million pounds of soybeans annually for use as drying oil products, for acids, special resins, in printing inks and paper, textile sizing and automobile tire cord sizing. In plastics alone including linoleums, tile and like products it is estimated 200 million pounds of soybean oil are used annually. Markets in

industry are steadily being expanded which helps to keep the demands for the farmers' soybeans strong in our domestic market.

From July last year to February this year, 55 million bushels of soybeans were exported—40 percent more than a year before.

By finding new markets for this farm product, research has again proven that the small amount of money our committee appropriates for finding new uses for farm products is paying tremendous dividends to agriculture and the economy of the Nation.

## Post Office Department Tries Union Busting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 22, 1956*

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, recent directives of the Postmaster General that have been issued and sent to the major post offices of the Nation for posting appear to be followups on his declarations of the past 2 years that any form of collective bargaining or unionism in the postal service under his administration must be his kind of unionism or suffer the consequences.

Worse than that is the denial to any postal worker the right to express or convey to his Representative or Senator any grievance or complaint without first submitting it to the Department. This order savors very much of real "slave labor."

In addition to the recent directives issued, the Department has served notice that rules and regulations of bygone days will now be dusted off, or better yet, may we say, resurrected and rigidly enforced.

I submit that the new directives enumerated below and the strict enforcement of age-old directives surely do not in any manner display friendly relationship but to the contrary only express and lay the groundwork for a declaration of dictatorship upon each of the postal unions and their officers.

As to myself, I want no part of this type of Government administration and take this means to express my deep resentment and opposition.

Following are a couple of the latest directives that have been broadcast by the Department and clearly make known to the employees its hostile attitude:

Issue 57 of the Postal Manual, dated March 28, 1956. Section 744.442, captioned "Engaging in Campaigns for Changes in the Service," reads as follows:

"(a) Information relating to the policies and decisions of the Post Office Department will be released only through official channels. Employees shall not actively engage in campaigns for or against changes in the service, or furnish information to be used in such campaigns unless prior approval has been obtained from higher authority.

"(b) If an employee has justifiable reasons for favoring or opposing changes in the postal service, he shall contact the proper officials and await specific instructions before engaging in local hearings or activities."

The Postal Bulletin for Thursday, April 19, 1956, reads:

"ALL POSTAL INSTALLATIONS—EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN CONTESTS

"While on duty employees of the postal service may not participate in any contest sponsored by private concerns, associations, or other private organizations, nor accept any prizes from such concerns, associations, or organizations, unless participation is approved specifically by the Department.

"Office of the Deputy Postmaster General."

## Warren G. Harding Council, No. 372, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Altoona, Pa., Celebrates 103d Anniversary of the Junior Order, May 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 22, 1956*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1956, it was my privilege to address the 103d anniversary banquet of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, sponsored by the Warren G. Harding Council, No. 372, Altoona, Pa.

The address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 103D ANNIVERSARY BANQUET SPONSORED BY THE WARREN G. HARDING COUNCIL, NO. 372, JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS, ALTOONA, PA., MAY 19, 1956

It is a privilege to be invited to deliver the principal address at this banquet commemorating the 103d anniversary of the Junior Order United American Mechanics.

One hundred and three years is a long time, but when you look back over the many accomplishments of the junior order in the field of Americanism it is only proper to say that the 103 years represent over a century of progress in the building of a better America.

It is an honor for me as a member of Pride of Mountain City Council, No. 472, to be asked to deliver the address on this occasion.

In choosing a subject, I have decided to talk to you of loyalty to one's country and an adequate national defense as twin weapons in the struggle against world communism.

Before discussing the subject of my discourse, I wish to assure you that I have not changed my position as a strong supporter of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

There are many in Congress who share my views. Thus, I am confident that the effort being made to nullify the present law will not succeed.

Loyalty to our country is one of the virtues of every red-blooded citizen prompting him to utter the prayerful exclamation, "Thank God I am an American."

It is typical of men and women who belong to such a patriotic organization as the Junior Order United American Mechanics to promote love of country, and in so doing warn of the existing dangers at home and abroad.

At the same time we must stress the importance of constant vigilance against those forces seeking to destroy the American way of life.

As a Nation, this year we are celebrating the 250th birthday anniversary of the immortal Benjamin Franklin.

An inventor, statesman, and diplomat, Franklin was well aware of the problems which a young Nation was about to face.

He was a firm believer in national preparedness, which is so strongly advocated by the Junior Order.

It is well to recall what Benjamin Franklin had to say on this subject.

Speaking of preparedness, Poor Richard, as he was known in printing circles, had this sage advice—and I quote:

"Let us beware," said Franklin, "of being lulled into a dangerous security; and of being weakened by internal contentions and divisions; of neglect in military exercises and discipline, and in providing stores of arms and munitions of war; for the expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be necessary to maintain it."

How right Ben Franklin was—and is to this day.

Do we not all remember Pearl Harbor—and how difficult it was for us to get our war effort underway?

Today, we are in the atomic age—and time will work against us.

Preparedness, therefore, is a matter of top priority.

For years the Junior Order United American Mechanics has urged that greater attention should be given in our public schools to the teaching of American history—to let our children know exactly how hard-won were the liberties which we enjoy.

These youngsters should be made aware that they have an inheritance—that is priceless—and they should be training in their early days to be ready to take over that precious gift when they reach manhood and womanhood.

It was Franklin again who had these wise words to say in connection with our youth, and I quote:

"I think with you, that nothing is of more importance for the public welfare, than to form and train up youth in wisdom and virtue.

"Wise and good men are, in my opinion, the strength of the State far more than riches and arms."

Franklin was old and wise enough to know that if children are well trained in their heritage, they will be able to advance it through the arts and sciences and bring even greater glory to the Nation.

The Junior Order United American Mechanics is aware, too, of the evils of communism, and constantly has raised a loud voice about this menace to the welfare of our land.

With some other patriotic organizations, it was a voice in the wilderness because little heed was given until recent years, when communism reared its ugly head publicly by showing itself openly in parades and demonstrations.

The Junior Order had an answer for these public demonstrations and that answer was to emphasize the objectives of this patriotic group by urging greater love of country and loyalty to the Constitution of the United States.

The plea for an alert and educated citizenry must be heeded because it is the only solution to the problem of attacking and defeating subversive elements in our midst.

This positive expression of confidence in our way of life actually has caused public consternation in the ranks of the Communists—and, as a result, their public

demonstrations have faded into obscurity.

But we are not fooled.

The Commies in this country have not disbanded—the threat of communism is still with us and at times becomes arrogant beyond belief.

Wasn't it Mr. Khrushchev who recently said, although he smiled while he said it, that "Communism would one day capture the imagination of the entire world"?

So we must be on guard.

We must continue to teach the American way of life as opposed to a life of slavery and degradation which communism brings.

We must make every American citizen awaken to his civic responsibility to combat this menace.

And we must urge our citizens to take full part in their own Government processes.

That is the message we have for our membership in commemoration of the 103d anniversary of the Junior Order.

Once more let us turn to wise and aged Ben Franklin, a man who was years ahead of his time in his thinking.

The words I quote now could have been uttered yesterday, since they fit so well into our international situation at this time.

Franklin had this to say on the question of world leadership—listen clearly as I quote:

"Europe is on our side of the question, as far as applause and good wishes can carry them—those who live under arbitrary power do nevertheless approve of liberty, and wish for it; they almost despair of recovering it in Europe; 'tis a common observation here, that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own."

Truer words were never spoken in Franklin's day and can be uttered again today.

We are without a doubt the hope of the world if a way of life in which we believe is to be preserved for ourselves and extended to other people.

So we must be vigilant.

We must question those who would foist upon us ideas such as are found in UNESCO education pamphlets, which urge that we rescind our citizenship and join a world organization.

We must guard against those who feel we should sacrifice much of our sovereignty in order to allay the fear of other nations.

None of this need be done.

What we must continue to try to do is to give assistance to those who need it most.

In giving that assistance, we must tell them where it came from, and why we, as American citizens, are able to share our good fortune with others.

If this story can be gotten across in foreign lands, we have no doubt that in time, the people in Communist countries and their satellites will rise in their own wrath and destroy that system before it wholly destroys their precious countries.

Each nation cherishes its own way of life just as much as we do.

No one wants to be dominated by a power whose language and customs it cannot understand.

But there can be a common denominator, where respect for each other will be paramount, and where by an exchange of the necessities of life, we can actually turn swords into plowshares.

Instead of fearing an atomic explosion, we can benefit by the use of nuclear power for the good of all people.

We know that we are in a year in which much will be heard in the way of political propaganda as our two great parties in the United States strive for power.

And though we hear charges and countercharges, we are not alarmed.

When the chips are down, Americans will unite as no other people in the world.

Franklin knew that in his day.

For late in life he said:

"Do not believe the reports you hear of our internal divisions. We are, I believe, as much united as any people ever were, and as firmly."

Ladies and gentlemen, as we observe this 103d anniversary of the Junior Order, let us take to heart the words of Benjamin Franklin.

No matter what one hears, we are a united people working for a better place for each of us in which to live and rear our families in peace.

But we must keep our guard up.

For it is only by constant vigilance on the part of such organizations as the Junior Order that we as a nation can protect the American form of government and thus preserve our cherished legacy of liberty and freedom purchased with the blood of American patriots.

Therefore, let us resolve to continue our efforts to keep the United States strong and free and thus help to guarantee for our children—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which are their rightful heritage.

## TVA Repayments Into Treasury Exceed Statutory Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 22, 1956*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been regarded for many years—by those who are fair-minded—as one of the most efficiently operated Government agencies in our entire Federal system.

This great agency which has contributed so much to our national-defense effort has diligently been repaying into the Federal Treasury the investment in its power operations.

Today, TVA is far ahead of its regular payment schedule and we can only conclude that this has been brought about by efficient management and operation.

Through 1957, a total of $261,500,000 will have been repaid into the Federal Treasury by TVA. The following table of repayments shows accurately the annual revenues and other payments paid by TVA into the Federal Treasury.

The schedule of payments follows:

*Payments made by TVA into the United States Treasury as repayment of investment in its power program*

| Fiscal year | Payment | Total payment |
|---|---|---|
| 1948 | $10,500,000 | $10,500,000 |
| 1949 | 5,500,000 | 16,000,000 |
| 1950 | 5,500,000 | 21,500,000 |
| 1951 | 9,000,000 | 30,500,000 |
| 1952 | 12,000,000 | 42,500,000 |
| 1953 | 15,000,000 | 57,500,000 |
| 1954 | 20,000,000 | 77,500,000 |
| 1955 | 50,000,000 | 127,500,000 |
| 1956 (estimated) | 59,000,000 | 186,500,000 |
| 1957 (proposed) | 75,000,000 | 261,500,000 |
| Repaid into Treasury prior to enactment of statutory requirements prior to 1948 | | 24,000,000 |
| Total payments through 1957 | | 285,000,000 |

## Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 22, 1956*

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the results of a poll conducted among my constituents on questions pertinent to present issues. I am sure that the Members will find the results of this poll quite interesting:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE H. SMITH, SUPPLEMENT TO ISSUE NO. 191 IN THE MILL AT WASHINGTON, MAY 22, 1956

1. President Eisenhower is asking for $4.9 billion in foreign aid:

(a) Do you favor continued military aid? Yes, 976; no, 1,242.

(b) Do you favor continued economic aid in dollars? Yes, 574; no, 1,564.

(c) Do you favor continued technical aid as self-help? Yes, 1,475; no, 668.

(d) Do you favor a 10-year aid program. Yes, 642; no, 1,589.

2. Should our immigration laws be liberalized to permit increased immigration? Yes, 679; no, 1,595.

3. Should the free-world nations supply Communist countries with strategic materials: copper, machine tools, etc.? Yes, 44; no, 2,205.

4. Do you think East-West trade should be permitted? Yes, 983; no, 966.

5. Do you think the free world can coexist with the Communist world, under existing conditions? Yes, 796; no, 1,338.

6. Do you think Red China should be admitted to the United Nations? Yes, 112; no, 2,101.

7. Should the United States vote against Red China's admission to the United Nations? Yes, 1,834; no, 302.

8. Do you think the new Russian attitude indicates a desire to live at peace with the free world? Yes, 86; no, 2,024.

9. Do you think United States aid is stopping the spread of communism? Yes, 737; no, 1,333.

10. Should the United States share its knowledge of atomic energy with other countries? Yes, 688; no, 1,439.

11. Do you favor the soil-bank plan for agriculture? Yes, 1,028; no, 987.

12. Do you approve of the flexible price-support idea? Yes, 1,201; no, 807.

13. Do you approve of 90 percent of parity for all agricultural commodities: milk, corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, peanuts, etc.? Yes, 151; no, 1,936.

14. Do you think a self-help program is advisable for the dairy farmer, with some aid from the Federal Government? Yes, 2,295; no, 291.

15. Do you believe that Congress can solve the farm problem? Yes, 692; no, 1,364.

16. The Federal Government proposes aid to education:

(a) Do you favor the Federal Government providing school-construction funds to States on a matching basis, but under strict State control? Yes, 964; no, 1,128.

(b) Do you approve the Federal Government making long-term, low-interest loans for school construction? Yes, 1,138; no, 673.

(c) Are you against Federal aid to schools in any form? Yes, 965; no, 1,129.

17. Do you approve Federal funds for local library purposes? Yes, 562; no, 1,635.

18. The Federal Goverment proposes a long-range highway program:

(a) Do you think we should pay for it as we go by a gas-tax increase? Yes, 1,162; no, 799.

(b) Should we finance it by bonds? Yes, 858; no, 913.

(c) Should we delay this program to a later date, in view of existing deficits? Yes, 869; no, 1,040.

19. Do you favor a right-to-work law? Yes, 1,921; no, 163.

20. Do you think labor unions should enter political contests, as such? Yes, 96; no, 2,107.

21. Do you think that union funds should be used for political purposes without consent of members? Yes, 21; no, 2,195.

(a) Or with the consent of members? Yes, 281; no, 1,785.

22. Do you favor requiring registration of pension and welfare funds collected by unions? Yes, 2,138; no, 82.

23. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget? Yes, 592; no, 1,645.

24. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet postal deficits? Yes, 1,474; no, 670.

25. Do you favor lowering the social-security age limit for women from 65 to 62 years? Yes, 1,241; no, 961.

26. Do you approve extending social security to all groups of workers not presently covered by this plan? Yes, 1,316; no, 820.

27. Do you approve Federal funds for research in the field of health? Yes, 1,396; no, 770.

28. Do you favor appropriations for public housing? Yes, 401; no, 1,715.

29. Do you favor appropriations for housing for elderly people on a modest basis? Yes, 1,183; no, 982.

30. Do you favor granting pensions to war veterans 65 years of age or older, on the basis of need? Yes, 1,318; no, 878.

31. Please check the 6 issues you think most important today:

Government spending, 1,649.

Maintaining peace, 1,512.

Control of communism in America, 1,460.

Balancing the budget, 1,416.

Taxation, 1,387.

Communists or fifth amendment people in Government, 1,372.

Reduction of debt of Federal Government, 1,330.

Farm prices and policies, 1,254.

American foreign policy, 1,240.

United States foreign-trade policies, 1,205.

Defense and war preparedness, 1,190.

Labor policies, 1,176.

---

# SENATE

## WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1956

*(Legislative day of Monday, May 7, 1956)*

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

Rev. Douglass Carroll, pastor, Central Assembly of God Church, Biloxi, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we lift up our prayer to Thee for faith and courage. We pray that we may never fail nor forsake Thee. As the watchman waits for the morning so we wait for divine guidance. We thank Thee for this great Republic of ours. May Thy blessings continue upon all peoples of the world. May love become the desire of all mankind. O spirit of the living God, give us love and power, with righteousness and peace. May the power of this love cover the earth. Gather up our desires and motives and harmonize them with Thy will, blending them into a volume of spiritual power. Help us in this desire to continue in peace and safety. O loving God, bless, we beseech Thee, the President of the United States, Members of the United States Senate, and all who exercise duly constituted authority in our land, for we ask it in the name of our dear Redeemer. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 22, 1956, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3073) to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, Mr. MACK of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HINSHAW, and Mr. DOLLIVER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 4026. An act for the relief of James C. Hayes;

H. R. 4162. An act for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States of the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; and

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the Air Force and the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. O'MAHONEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee