Lt. Gen. Andrew Davis Bruce, O5857, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Robert Wells Harper, 53A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of sections 504 and 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Lt. Gen. Charles Trovilla Myers, 37A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Air Training Command, with the rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Glenn Oscar Barcus, 87A, Regular Air Force, to be commander in chief, United States Northeast Command, with the rank of lieutenant general, and lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Charles E. Cook, Jr., and 275 other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, which were confirmed by the Senate today, were received by the Senate on July 8, 1954, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Charles E. Cook, Jr., which is shown on page 10057, and ending with the name of Jean E. Phillips, which appears on page 10058.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Claud Russel Robison, Odenville.

ARKANSAS

Ivan L. Kleinbeck, New Edinburg.

FLORIDA

Louis Raymond Adair, Davenport.

INDIANA

Lyle J. Fowler, Bloomington.
Earl B. Schwanke, Demotte.
Norman L. Bent, Fort Branch.
Fred L. Scarce, Fountain City.
Chelcie J. Bebout, Freetown.
Gerald K. Carr, Greentown.
Vernon Hockemeyer, Hoagland.
Dean M. Wakeland, Idaville.
Garrett W. Gossard, Kempton.
Earl R. Reid, Lakeville.
Paul E. Frantz, Liberty Center.
Dewayne Hamilton, Morgantown.
Clyde M. Matthews, North Vernon.
Eldora L. Weigle, Otterbein.
Dean O. Neff, Rochester.
Louie C. Neu, Shelbyville.
Arnold O. Hipskind, Urbana.
Herbert B. Harrison, Winchester.

IOWA

Ralph H. Pilgrim, Greeley.
Frederick D. Lursen, Kesley.
Robert F. Graham, University Park.

MAINE

Charles W. Rogers, Old Town.

MASSACHUSETTS

Donald M. Stacey, Marblehead.

MICHIGAN

Edward C. Schmidt, Springport.
Kenneth L. Patten, Tekonsha.

MINNESOTA

Joseph J. Kovach, Ely.

MISSOURI

Donald L. Davis, Adrian.
Elbert P. Petty, Arbyrd.
William E. Richter, Gilman City.
William C. Pevestorff, Higginsville.
Garfield L. Darnell, King City.
Lloyd H. Thomas, Larussell.
Gussie C. Henneke, Leslie.
Roy O. F. Weber, Lohman.
Otis M. Clouser, Marshall.
Clyde M. Temple, Miller.
Hugh M. Lower, Mountain Grove.
Forest R. Leamer, Polo.
Peter A. Baechle, Ste. Genevieve.
Oren B. Peterson, Urbana.
Willard R. Emo, Vandalia.

MONTANA

William A. Parrish, Paradise.

NEW JERSEY

Gerald E. White, Mount Holly.

NORTH CAROLINA

Blanche T. Nelson, Atlantic.
Daniel F. Sawyer, Jr., Blounts Creek.
Richard W. Hannah, Clyde.
Tullie M. Alexander, Cooleemee.
Elmo S. Orr, Mountain Home.
Floyd Graham Hinnant, Pine Level.
Claude Harris, State Road.

OKLAHOMA

George M. Beeby, Marshall.
Bert A. VanBuskirk, Ripley.
Robert L. Nunn, Stuart.

OREGON

Harold G. Prestel, Grants Pass.

PENNSYLVANIA

James C. Kleckner, Audenried.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Chalmers M. Butler, Hartsville.
George F. Dailey, Society Hill.

TEXAS

Mattie R. White, Avoca.
Ernest M. Spence, Bonham.
Clifton B. Duhon, Buna.
Howard A. Hunt, Dodson.
Arba E. Petty, Farmersville.
Bradley O. Burk, Jr., Kress.
Dorothea B. Hice, Midlothian.
Delmas P. Seidel, Orange Grove.
Fred G. Howard, Pearsall.
Kenneth L. Lee, Perrin.
Claude Irvin Wood, Richards.
Fred W. Lunsford, Rusk.
Joe P. Spalding, Sadler.
William H. Castleberry, Telephone.
Harry Reast, Whitesboro.

VERMONT

Warren Lester Barnett, Cabot.
Paul S. Hinman, Wells River.

WISCONSIN

Elmo C. Cooper, Madison.

WYOMING

Burchal I. Kelley, Reliance.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 17, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, July 2, 1954)

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

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

O Thou whose throne is truth, frail creatures of dust serving out our brief day on the world's troubled stage, we would set our little lives in the midst of Thine eternity and feel Thy greatness and Thy peace: For—

"We fear no foe with Thee at hand to bless,
Ills have no weight and tears no bitterness."

We beseech Thee to keep strong everywhere all souls who strive to maintain the insights of human brotherhood. In this land of liberty may our own lives, freed of pettiness and prejudice and radiant with good will which leaps all barriers, be open channels through which Thy saving grace may flow for the healing of the nations. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 16, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

POSITION OF SENATOR HOLLAND ON CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE FINANCING ACT OF 1954

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on July 13, 1954, during the Senate consideration of H. R. 5173, the Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954, certain amendments were offered by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and were considered en bloc, and were rejected by a yea-and-nay vote of 48 to 31, as shown on page 10363 of the RECORD.

On that date, the senior Senator from Florida was absent by leave of the Senate, attending the Sixth Pan-American Highway Congress at Caracas, Venezuela. I note from the RECORD that my position is shown on other amendments that day and on the bill, but not with respect to this particular vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea"; and I want the RECORD to so show.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Routine business is now in order.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STANDARDS — RESOLUTION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Black Hawk County CIO Industrial Union Council, Waterloo, Iowa, favoring prompt enactment of House bill 9430, and Senate bill 3553, relating to Federal unemployment compensation standards.

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

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF IMMEDIATE ACTION BY CONGRESS ON THE FORAND-DOUGLAS BILLS, H. R. 9430 AND S. 3553, SPONSORED BY 86 REPRESENTATIVES AND 12 SENATORS FOR FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STANDARDS

Whereas present unemployment compensation payments to insured unemployed wage and salary earners are woefully inadequate as to weekly amount and number of weeks duration; and

Whereas substantial and prolonged unemployment in Iowa and in Waterloo and inadequate unemployment compensation payments have caused increases in expenditures for relief purposes resulting in increased drain upon revenues depleted by slackening business activity and income in the community; and

Whereas the amounts of such unemployment payments in Iowa range from a minimum of $5 to a maximum of $26 and are limited to 20 weeks, with weekly payments averaging only 40 percent of the State's average weekly wage of $60; and

Whereas this is far below the average of 50 percent and the maximum of 66⅔ percent recommended to the States last February by President Eisenhower, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security, and the National Conference on Labor Legislation; and

Whereas President Eisenhower, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, and others recommended that the States extend the duration of payments to 26 weeks, but long-term unemployment has resulted in 600,000 insured workers exhausting their rights to payments before being reemployed and such exhaustions continue at the rate of 40,000 a week, making plain the need for an extension to 39 weeks, as proposed in H. R. 9430 and S. 3553, introduced by Representative FORAND, Senator DOUGLAS, 85 other Representatives, and 11 other Senators; and

Whereas these companion bills, if enacted by Congress before adjournment, would implement President Eisenhower's recommendations as to amounts of unemployment compensation payments and would extend the duration beyond his recommended 26 weeks, to 39 weeks, and, at presently anticipated continuing unemployment, would get approximately $2 billion a year of additional purchasing power into the hands of insured unemployed workers and their families for instant high-velocity spending and distribution throughout our entire economy; and

Whereas the House Ways and Means Committee has recently completed hearings on proposed amendments to the Federal unemployment compensation law and has recommended a bill to the House for passage before adjournment; and

Whereas President Eisenhower, at his June 16 press conference, stated that he has no intention of urging Governors to call special sessions of their legislatures to implement his own recommendations, now more than 4 months old; and

Whereas this puts upon the Congress the last hope and full responsibility for action to carry out this vital part of President Eisenhower's legislative program in any way that will mean anything to the unemployed, to our economy and to the budgets of our States, cities, and other political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Black Hawk County CIO Industrial Union Council, meeting on this 13th day of July 1954, urgently requests our Representative and Senators to use their influence and good offices to persuade the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to adopt and recommend the provisions of H. R. 9430 and S. 3553 so that action in both Houses may be completed before the present Congress adjourns; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge President Eisenhower at this session to make congressional action to implement his unemployment compensation recommendations a must item in his immediate legislative program; and be it further

Resolved, That if either committee fails or refuses to report out favorably the provisions of H. R. 9430 and S. 3553, our Representative and Senators support appropriate action such as discharge petitions or the addition of the provisions as a rider to other legislation; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Representative, Senators, the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, and the Vice President as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, with the request that it be treated as a petition under the Constitution and, as such, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Presented this 7th day of July 1954.

CARL G. DAHL,
Legislative Secretary, Black Hawk County Industrial Union Council.

CONSTRUCTION OF COUGAR DAM AND RESERVOIR ON SOUTH FORK McKENZIE RIVER, OREG. (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 1761)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and a minority of the members of the Public Works Committee, I submit minority views on the bill (H. R. 7815) to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Cougar Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork McKenzie River, Oreg., with participation for power by the city of Eugene, Oreg., and request that they be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The minority views will be received, and without objection, will be printed as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JULY 9, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Harry R. Varney, to Jan. 31, 1954, chief of staff	$11,646.00	$970.50
Harker T. Stanton, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Edward P. Guinane, investigator	11,646.00	5,823.00
James M. Kendall, chief clerk	8,824.17	4,412.04
C. M. Mouser, assistant chief clerk	8,735.34	4,367.64
Harriet D. Willey, to June 8, 1954, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,131.47
Therese R. Lepine, from May 12, 1954, secretary to the chairman	$4,091.85	$556.93
Betty M. Mason, clerical assistant	3,996.20	1,998.12
Frances I. Edwards, clerical assistant	4,283.04	2,141.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Cong	8,501.05
Balance unexpended	1,498.95

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JULY 9, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

(Making investigations under S. Res. 127, agreed to July 10, 1953, and S. Res. 218, agreed to March 10, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expendcd by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Congress	$15,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Congress	10,253.80
Balance unexpended	4,746.20

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Thomas J. Scott, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Francis S. Hewitt, assistant clerk	10,732.07	5,365.98
Edmund T. King, assistant clerk	10,732.07	5,365.98
Jarlath M. Slattery, Director, professional staff	11,646.00	5,795.22
Raymond K. Perkins, counsel	11,644.54	5,822.22
Kenneth J. Bousquet, professional staff member	10,649.11	5,324.52
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Herman E. Downey, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Richard W. Eddy, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
John J. Gaines, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
G. E. Johnson, professional staff member	8,990.07	4,495.02
H. Maurice Joyce, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
William J. Kennedy, Jr., professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Cecil C. McDaniel, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Joseph T. McDonnell, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Gordon A. Nease, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Stanley L. Sommer, professional staff member, from Apr. 1	11,644.54	2,911.11
Ernest R. Underwood, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Lawrence H. Wendrich, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
William W. Woodruff, professional staff member	$10,068.45	$5,034.18
Herman M. Zahl, professional staff member, from Feb. 25 to June 15	10,068.45	3,104.40
Gloria S. Butland, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86
Pauline T. Connell, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,181.32
Leon DeVille, clerical assistant	4,091.85	2,045.88
Elva Glaser, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Lois A. Glines, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Laura A. Hawley, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,141.48
Carolyn Macy, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
E. Marea Marshall, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,173.35
Mary T. Savage, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 301954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES		
Paul E. Kamerick, staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Eliot U. Wyman, consultant, w. a. e.	(1)	140.00
Gardner C. Turner, counsel (from Mar. 1)	11,646.00	3,882.00
Leonard E. Edwards, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
Alan J. Kraft, agent (from Feb. 15)	9,073.03	3,427.56
Joseph F. McDonald, Jr., agent (to Jan. 27)	8,644.09	648.30
James E. McVea, agent (to Feb. 15)	9,073.03	1,134.12
Leo C. Nulty	10,068.45	4,965.06
William V. Sinnott, agent	10,732.07	5,365.98
Paul J. Tierney, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
Paul A. Toussaint, agent	9,073.03	4,434.58
Bernard S. Van Rensselaer, agent	10,068.45	5,034.18
Gabriel R. Vogliotti, staff member (from May 10)	10,068.45	1,426.35
Alice S. Dearborn, clerical assistant	3,996.26	1,998.12
Patricia P. Ferrell, clerical assistant (from Mar. 8)	4,187.45	1,314.38
Angela M. Novello, clerical assistant (to Feb. 28)	4,378.64	729.76
Dorothy L. Sankey, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.86

[1] $35 per day.

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report on miscellaneous expenses for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of Dec. 31, 1953	$24,151.49
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1954	0
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954	24,151.49
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 121 and 153 as of Dec. 31, 1953	4,833.30
Additional authorization by S. Res. 243	20,000.00
Total available for expenditure	24,833.30
Amount expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1954	8,692.00
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954	16,141.30

MISCELLANEOUS—Continued

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1954	$343,136.41
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1954	54,763.80
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954	288,372.61

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

JULY 6, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Allen, Philip K., chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,428.61
Atkinson, Herbert S., assistant chief clerk	7,819.96	3,909.98
Braswell, T. Edward, Jr., professional staff member	10,897.97	5,241.60
Dantzic, Maurine E., clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,273.43
Darden, William H., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Earle, Georgia P., clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,585.91
Mudge, Verne D., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Seeliger, R. Sara,[1] clerical assistant	4,378.64	936.00
Schweigert, Esther N.,[2] clerical assistant	4,378.64	1,188.00
Thompson, Helen A.,[3] clerical assistant	4,378.64	696.00
Welker, Mary M.,[4] clerical assistant	4,091.85	1,199.47

[1] Services terminated Mar. 20, 1954.
[2] As of Mar. 24, 1954.
[3] Services terminated Feb. 28, 1954.
[4] As of Mar. 16, 1954.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$10,000.00
Amount authorized by S. Res. 255	10,000.00
Total authorization	20,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	6,915.44
Balance unexpended	13,084.56
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954	3,629.13
Balance unexpended	9,455.43

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING STAFF

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Anton, James, special counsel	$9,073.03	$4,536.48
Cooper, Genevieve, secretary	4,474.23	2,237.10
Engle, Wallace L., investigator	5,716.93	2,858.46
Freese, Mary C., stenographer	4,378.64	2,189.28
Gilleas, Benjamin J., attorney	7,533.19	3,766.56
Johnson, Joanne C., stenographer, to Apr. 30	3,900.68	1,264.34
Linton, Therese W., clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
McDonald, M. Elithe, clerical assistant from Mar. 2 to Mar. 31	3,996.26	321.92
McGillicuddy, Daniel F., Jr., attorney	7,533.19	3,766.56
Miller, Mary M., clerk-typist	4,187.45	2,093.70
Morse, Frank B., attorney	9,570.74	4,785.36
Olson, Sara L., stenographer, to Jan. 3	$4,187.45	$34.89
Rhodes, Fred B., chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Sircom, Edith M., stenographer, from Feb. 15	3,900.68	1,473.56
Waldron, Glenn S., investigator	6,386.08	3,193.02

Funds authorized under S. Res. 86 agreed to Mar. 18, 1953	$167,000.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1953	80,639.72
Amount expended	5,164.34
Balance unexpended Jan. 31, 1954	75,475.38
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure under S. Res. 185, agreed to Jan. 26, 1954	150,000.00
Amount expended to June 30, 1954	37,801.30
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954	112,198.70

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 229, investigation of federal housing programs)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from April 23, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
William Simon, from June 11, general counsel	$11,646.00	$647.00
Thomas T. Kenney, from June 28, assistant counsel	11,646.00	97.05
Harry K. Cuthbertson, Jr., from June 1, staff assistant	8,644.09	720.34
John R. Hancock, from June 1, staff assistant	8,644.09	720.34
Joseph B. Kyle, from May 24, investigator	8,644.09	888.41
Edward F. Lyons, from June 14, investigator	7,150.81	337.67
James H. Walter, from June 16, staff assistant	6,003.71	250.15
Helen M. Naylon, from June 7, clerical assistant	4,283.04	285.53
Idell S. Courtaway, from June 8, clerical assistant	4,283.04	273.63
Lenore V. Beckington, from June 1, clerical assistant	4,283.04	356.92
Margaret McCormack, from June 15, clerical assistant	4,283.04	190.35
Carole S. Keyser, from June 21, clerical assistant	4,283.04	118.97
Marilyn Willmore, from June 15, clerical assistant	3,613.89	160.61
Clarence M. Dinkins, from June 30, assistant counsel	8,644.09	24.01
William H. Cook, from June 29, staff assistant	5,143.38	28.57
Anthony Zabiegalski, Jr., from June 29, staff assistant	6,003.71	33.35

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure 83d Cong	$150,000.00
Amount expended through June 30, 1954	8,591.89
Balance unexpended	141,408.11

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June

30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ira Dixon, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Ray S. Donaldson, staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
A. Lee Parsons, assistant clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Joseph P. McMurray, economic consultant	11,646.00	5,823.00
William F. McKenna, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Norman W. Stevenson, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Florence Barr, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.06
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28
Henrietta S. Chase, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.06
Caro M. Pugh, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong. $20,000.00
Amount expended through June 30, 1954 15,270.39

Balance unexpended 4,729.61

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 42 and S. Res. 182, investigating problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from ——, 195—, to ——, 195—, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John L. Douglas, staff assistant	$8,644.09	$4,322.04
Pauline Chaternuck, through Apr. 30, clerical assistant	5,047.77	1,682.56
Carl H. Wilken, through Feb. 28, staff assistant	8,644.09	1,440.68
Sigmund Timberg, from Feb. 5-9, counsel	11,646.00	161.75
Lucye L. Summers, from Feb. 6 to May 31, clerical assistant	5,047.77	1,612.45
John R. Hancock, Feb. 26 to May 31, staff assistant	8,005.36	2,112.51
Walter H. Moorman, per diem, counsel	32.35	1,488.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong. $66,540.29
Amount expended through June 30, 1954 27,641.41

Balance unexpended 38,898.88

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 25 and S. Res. 183, study of Export-Import Bank and International Bank)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Raymonde A. Clarke,[1] staff assistant	$7,533.19	$2,471.21
Dorothy H. Devine, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,308.77
Marjorie M. Fults,[2] clerical assistant	3,613.89	602.30
Donald L. Rogers, staff assistant	$7,246.41	$3,025.70
Dorothy C. Valeo,[3] clerical assistant	5,238.97	174.63
Dorothy L. McCaffrey, clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,039.48
Harry K. Cuthbertson, Jr.,[4] staff assistant	8,552.84	2,138.19
Henry F. Holthusen,[5] general counsel	32.35	4,852.50

[1] Leave of absence Apr. 1 through May 31.
[2] Through Feb. 28.
[3] Jan. 4-15.
[4] From Feb. 1, 1954.
[5] Mar. 1 through May 31.
[6] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong. $150,000.00
Amount expended through June 30, 1954 50,558.84

Balance unexpended 99,441.16

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert C. Albrook, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Jesse D. Coon, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
William P. Gulledge, professional staff member	11,395.68	5,649.45
Arlene B. Williams, clerical assistant	6,099.30	3,049.62
Ruth W. Bryant, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $10,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Cong 5,613.35

Balance unexpended 4,386.65

FRANCIS CASE,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TRANSPORTATION SERVING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Pursuant to S. Res. 140 and S. Res. 192)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees.

Contract entered into with firm of Ernst & Ernst, accountants and auditors, which was authorized to conduct the investigation.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure, 83d Congress $35,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Congress 34,787.74

Balance unexpended 212.26

FRANCIS CASE,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer, chief clerk	$10,649.11	$5,324.52
Betty Mae Tapy, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Rosemary Voigt, clerical assistant (to Apr. 25)	4,569.81	1,459.77
Evelyn R. Thompson, clerical assistant (from Mar. 10)	4,952.20	1,472.74
Helen Morrow, clerical assistant (from Apr. 5 to June 15)	3,805.08	750.43
Helen Sheffett, clerical assistant (from June 18)	3,805.08	137.40
Janice E. Graybeal, clerical assistant (from Apr. 26)	4,952.20	888.82
Jesse R. Nichols, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,256.78
Serge N. Benson, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Fedele F. Fauri, professional staff (from June 14)	11,646.00	549.95

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong. $10,000.00
Amount expended 4,107.57

Balance unexpended 5,892.43

E. D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

JULY 14, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Carl M. Marcy, professional staff member	11,656.00	5,823.00
Julius N. Cahn, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Alwyn V. Freeman, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
C. C. O'Day, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Pat M. Holt, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Emmett M. O'Grady, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.04
Morella R. Hansen, clerical assistant	6,194.89	3,097.44
Nancy L. Hanschman, clerical assistant (to Apr. 23, 1954)	5,430.16	1,704.45
June C. Pitts, clerical assistant	5,525.75	2,640.68
Mary A. Sames, clerical assistant	4,761.00	2,380.50
Doris B. Covington, clerical assistant (from May 5, 1954)	[1] 5,047.77	785.19
Robert C. Dolan, clerical assistant (from Apr. 6, 1954)	[1] 4,856.61	1,146.68

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 179 agreed to Jan. 26, 1954.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong. $59,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Cong. 15,040.55

Balance unexpended 43,959.45

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(Under authority of S. Res. 126, agreed to July 28, 1953, and S. Res. 193, agreed to January 26, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each

person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Russell D. L. Wirth, Jr., assistant clerk (from June 21, 1954)	$5,525.75	$153.49

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$75,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Cong	34,263.64
Balance unexpended	40,736.36

NOTE.—The detail of certain personnel of the Library of Congress to the subcommittee on a reimbursable basis was authorized by the Committee on Rules and Administration, for services rendered.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

JULY 14, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE STUDYING FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAMS

(Under S. Res. 74, agreed to June 30, 1952; S. Res. 44, agreed to February 20, 1953; and S. Res. 117, agreed to June 11, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Henry F. Holthusen,[1] special consultant (from Oct. 12, 1953, to Nov. 30, 1953)	[1] $32.35	$1,488.10
Lenore S. Dowell, clerk (from Oct. 12, 1953, to Nov. 30, 1953)	9,238.93	1,257.51

[1] Per day when actually employed.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure from June 30, 1952 (S. Res. 74, S. Res. 44, and S. Res. 117)	$75,000.00
Amount expended from June 30, 1952	53,251.20
Balance unexpended	21,748.80

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 1, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATIONS

(S. Res. 184)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No funds expended for subcommittee personnel, and no expenses incurred. Work performed by staff of Committee on Government Operations.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 184	$9,837.84
Amount expended	
Balance unexpended	9,837.84

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Subcommittee Chairman.

Approved:

JOE MCCARTHY,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Donald F. O'Donnell, assistant chief clerk (to Jan. 31, 1954)	9,073.03	756.08
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk (from Feb. 1, 1954)	6,864.04	2,860.00
Richard J. O'Melia, general counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Francis D. Flanagan, chief counsel (to Jan. 20, 1954)	11,646.00	647.00
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member	11,312.73	5,656.32
Eli E. Nobleman, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,791.83
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Katharine M. Ellis (Mrs.), clerical assistant (to Feb. 15, 1954)	4,952.20	619.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended to date	5,473.92
Balance unexpended	4,526.08

JOE MCCARTHY,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1954.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
C. George Anastos, assistant counsel	$8,005.36	$3,908.02
Edith H. Anderson, assistant clerk	5,334.57	2,619.44
Karl H. W. Baarslag, research director	10,068.45	5,034.18
John W. Beck, messenger from Feb. 10	2,432.13	952.55
Daniel G. Buckley, assistant counsel	7,342.00	3,591.32
Maxine B. Buffalohide, assistant clerk	4,378.64	2,157.42
Francis P. Carr, Jr., executive director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Robert A. Collier, investigator from Apr. 14 to May 23	11,646.00	1,326.35
Margaret W. Duckett, assistant clerk	4,091.85	1,998.10
LaVern Duffy, investigator from Mar. 19	6,099.30	1,728.12
Rosemary Engel, assistant clerk	4,187.45	2,093.70
Ann M. Grickis, chief assistant clerk, to Jan. 31	6,864.04	572.00
Herbert S. Hawkins, investigator	8,279.10	4,093.90
Solis Horowitz, assistant counsel, from Apr. 14 to June 30	11,646.00	2,490.95
Ray H. Jenkins, special chief counsel from Apr. 14	11,646.00	2,490.95
James N. Juliana, investigator	10,151.40	4,626.35
Robert F. Kennedy, chief counsel to minority from Feb. 23	11,646.00	4,140.80
Thomas W. LaVenia, assistant counsel	10,151.40	5,006.55
Pauline S. Larrimore, assistant clerk	4,283.04	2,141.52
Charles A. Maner, secretary from Apr. 14	11,646.00	2,490.95
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	6,290.49	3,005.80
Frances P. Mims, assistant clerk	5,047.77	2,523.84
Mary E. Morrill, assistant clerk, from Feb. 1	4,474.23	2,205.24
Donald F. O'Donnell, assistant counsel, from Apr. 14 to June 30	$10,151.40	$3,870.27
Thomas R. Prewitt, assistant counsel	11,646.00	2,490.95
Donald A. Surine, assistant counsel	11,646.00	5,746.83
Nina W. Sutton, assistant clerk, from Mar. 1	5,334.57	2,667.24
Charles E. Tracy, investigator	6,003.71	2,001.20
Ruth Young Watt, chief clerk	5,812.53	2,906.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$231,286.49
Amount expended	126,983.80
Balance unexpended	104,302.69

JOE MCCARTHY,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Kirkley S. Coulter, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk	9,238.93	4,619.47
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff member	11,646.00	3,882.00
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff member	11,646.00	3,882.00
Stewart French, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
George B. Holderer, professional staff member	9,902.55	4,951.28
Marie Mathew, clerical assistant	5,238.97	2,619.49
Rosemary Donnelley, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Thelma C. Leach, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Dorothy A. Davis, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84

Funds authorized or appropriated during 83d Cong. for committee expenditure	$30,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954	20,712.95
Balance unexpended	9,287.05

GUY CORDON,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE AVAILABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS

(Under authority of S. Res. 235, agreed to April 28, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, professional staff (assistant counsel)	$9,902.55	$4,451.28
Cecelia A. Hoban, clerical assistant	4,761.00	1,983.75
Adele R. O'Connor, clerical assistant	3,805.08	1,902.54
Jerry B. House[1] professional staff member	7,533.19	2,239.01

[1] Terminated May 2, 1954.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$50,000.00
Amount expended	37,488.28
Balance unexpended	12,511.72

GUY CORDON,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE FUEL RESERVES OF THE UNITED STATES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Cecelia A. Hoban, clerical assistant	$4,761	$335

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure from prior authority	$9,123.12
Amount expended	5,241.65
Balance unexpended	3,881.47

GUY CORDON,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Pursuant to S. Res. 135, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce, agreed to July 28, 1953, continued from S. Res. 41, agreed to January 30, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to January 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Butz, John R., clerical assistant	$6,003.71	$500.30
Drewry, John M., special counsel	11,646.00	970.50
Woodruff, Franklin, professional staff member	9,238.93	769.91

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (balance January 1, 1954)	$32,722.83
Amount expended	4,627.98
Balance unexpended	28,094.85

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Subcommittee pursuant to S. Res. 173, agreed to January 26, 1954, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bourbon, August J., staff member, from Feb. 15	$9,238.93	$3,079.64
Butz, John R., clerical assistant, from Feb. 2	6,003.71	2,484.83
Drewry, John M., special counsel, Feb. 1 to Mar. 15	1,646.00	1,455.75
Fadely, Catherine E., clerical assistant, began Mar. 1	4,569.81	1,523.24
Lawbosky, Barbara, clerical assistant, Feb. 16, 17	4,474.23	24.85
Murphy, Margaret Mary, clerical assistant, from Apr. 12	4,187.45	918.90
Rogers, Kathryn B., clerical assistant, from June 1	4,474.23	372.85
Thompson, Helen A., clerical assistant, from Mar. 1	5,334.57	1,778.16
Webster, Donald D., special counsel, from Feb. 20	11,646.00	4,237.85
Woodruff, Franklin, professional staff member, Feb. 1 to Mar. 3	9,238.93	846.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$115,000.00
Amount expended	19,625.29
Balance unexpended	95,374.71

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Cecelia M. Cook, clerical assistant	$5,716.93	$2,858.46
Harriet S. Gray, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Edward S. Jarrett, assistant chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Edward R. Jelsma, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Robert D. L'Heureux, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Vera B. Rudolph, clerical assistant	6,290.49	3,145.24
Martha P. Shaffer, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Edward C. Sweeney, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Bertram O. Wissman, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Nicholas Zapple, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance, Jan. 1, 1954	$4,929.33
Amount expended	4,711.65
Balance unexpended	217.68

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES

(S. Res. 326, 82d Cong., and S. Res. 68, 83d Cong., agreed to April 22, 1953; and S. Res. 188, agreed to January 26, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Eleanor C. Guthridge, research assistant and attorney	$10,068.45	$5,034.18
Adele V. Beaton, clerical assistant from Mar. 22, 1954	4,856.61	1,335.54

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$46,903.22
Amount expended	13,548.37
Balance unexpended	33,354.85

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

JULY 14, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

(Under S. Res. 187, agreed to Jan. 26, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$5,000.00
Amount expended	260.78
Balance unexpended	4,739.22

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
J. G. Sourwine, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Wayne H. Smithey, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
George S. Green, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Thomas B. Collins, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
James L. Miller, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Mary I. Rogers, assistant chief clerk	7,533.19	3,766.56
Mildred E. Canon, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Miriam O. Fox, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Carrie Lee Connor, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Naomi Hankins, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Richard F. Wambach, clerical assistant	5,430.16	2,667.26
Costas D. Chrissos, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
H. Joan Sheaff, clerical assistant, to Jan. 31	6,481.67	540.13
Katharine M. Ellis, clerical assistant, from Feb. 16	6,481.67	2,430.58

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$18,987.49
Amount expended	9,923.71
Balance unexpended	9,063.78

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

(Under authority of S. Res. 227, 83d Cong.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
William A. Stevens, clerk, to Jan. 31, 1954, and from May 16, 1954	$5,238.97	$1,027.72
Nannette H. Day, clerk-secretary, from May 16, 1954	2,674.68	334.33
Ina W. McArthur, secretary, to Jan. 31, 1954	4,665.41	388.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$42,285.41
Amount expended	5,891.94
Balance unexpended	36,393.47

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 9, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

(Under authority of S. Res. 172, agreed to January 27, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Baker, Dorothy C., clerk	$6,481.67	$3,240.78
Beaird, Peggy S., clerk (from Mar. 1)	4,091.85	1,363.92
Brown, James M., consultant (from Mar. 11)	8,644.09	2,641.24
Cardiello, James A., legal investigator	3,709.49	1,854.72
Carpenter, Alva C., counsel (from June 1)	11,646.00	970.50
Duffy, Edward R., investigator	8,907.12	4,453.56
Fisher, Herman E., clerk (part time)	3,422.72	1,711.32
Fluegel, Edna R., staff member (part time)	4,761.00	2,380.50
Franks, George W., clerk (part time)	3,709.49	1,854.72
Grimes, Charles P., chief counsel (from Jan. 18)	11,646.00	5,273.05
Haaser, Stephen G., research assistant	8,279.10	4,139.52
Humphreys, Marilyn H., clerk	4,856.61	2,428.26
Humphreys, Robert C., Jr., clerk (from June 1)	2,515.29	209.60
Latimer, J. Austin, consultant (from Jan. 28 to Feb. 28)	9,073.03	831.68
Lowell, William E., editorial director	11,646.00	5,823.00
MacDevitt, Mary J., clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Maher, Maree R., typist (to June 7)	4,856.61	2,117.98
Malaney, Elinor L., clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Mandel, Benjamin, research director	11,646.00	5,823.00
McDonnell, Vyonne G., clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
McManus, Robert C., staff member	11,395.68	5,697.84
Mercer, Doris L., clerk	5,525.75	2,523.84
Somes, Naomi W., clerk	5,334.57	2,667.24
Stravopolos, Mary, secretary (from June 1)	4,856.61	404.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$235,879.55
Amount expended	86,356.43
Balance unexpended	149,523.12

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 9, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

(Under S. Res. 89, agreed to June 1, 1953, and S. Res. 190, agreed to January 27, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Hannoch, Herbert J., chief counsel (to May 1)	$11,646.00	$3,914.35
Beaser, Herbert W., chief counsel	11,646.00	5,231.38
Bobo, James H., assistant counsel	10,566.16	4,723.12
Christiansen, Jane-Barrie, typist (to Mar. 15)	3,805.08	711.22
Chumbris, Peter N., assistant counsel-investigator (from Apr. 12)	8,552.84	1,139.95
Clendenen, Richard, executive director (from Mar. 1)	11,646.00	3,882.00
Gibbons, Richard M., file clerk-liaison (from Feb. 22)	4,187.45	1,500.48
Goff, Donald H., consultant	2,515.29	1,010.23
Hart, Edward, consultant (to Mar. 15, 1954, and from Mar. 23, 1954)	4,856.61	2,333.82
Holloway, Mary F., clerical assistant	5,143.38	2,356.55
Jensen, Floyd A., investigator (from May 15)	6,864.04	877.06
Lankler, Celeste S., typist (to Jan. 15)	3,063.95	127.66
McArthur, Ina W., clerical assistant (from Feb. 1)	4,665.41	1,832.39
Miniclier, Louis M., social services consultant (from Mar. 15 to May 31)	8,990.07	1,897.89
Morris, Charles V., administrative assistant (from Apr. 12)	6,003.71	1,317.46
Mowery, Edward J., public relations consultant (from Apr. 9)	10,566.16	2,406.72
Perian, Carl L., investigator	2,903.37	1,068.09
Schonberger, Claude M., investigator	5,430.16	2,672.47
Sears, Lillian F., clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,141.47
Shawn, E. Luise, administrative secretary	6,864.04	3,288.58
Sullins, Gary W., investigator (from Feb. 22)	5,238.97	1,877.29
Sullivan, Thomas S., investigator (from May 24)	6,003.71	617.03
Tompson, Mary E., clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,117.58
Fredericksen, Walter A., investigator [1]	5,430.16	482.67
Henry, Verner V., investigator [1]	3,613.89	160.61
Klein, Alfred M., consultant [1]	3,613.89	110.41
Lacaire, Anthony S., investigator [1]	5,430.16	648.58
Leonard, Charles W., investigator [1]	6,194.89	843.18
Langlois, Harold V., chief investigator [1]	3,613.89	562.14
McDivitt, C. Boyd, investigator [1]	3,613.89	150.56
Veney, Lawson J., consultant [1]	3,613.89	441.68

[1] Per diem when actually employed.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$189,613.47
Amount expended, 83d Cong	77,383.48
Balance unexpended	112,229.99

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 10, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(S. Res. 48, agreed to January 30, 1953, and S. Res. 181, agreed to January 26, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Arens, Richard, staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Arens, William H., staff member	8,990.07	4,495.02
Ashcraft, Ann, clerk (from Jan. 26, 1954)	3,805.08	1,638.29
Bagley, Carole B., clerk (to June 30, 1954)	4,569.81	2,284.86
Blair, Drury H., staff member	9,570.74	4,785.36
Burton, Robert R., staff member	9,902.55	4,160.76
Cameron, Betty C., clerk	4,569.81	2,284.86
DeGooyer, Franzetta R., clerk (from June 1, 1954)	4,569.81	312.00
McCloskey, Mary J., clerk	5,525.75	4,702.38
Mesmer, Fred M., staff member	9,404.83	4,702.38
Schroeder, Frank W., investigator	9,902.55	4,951.26
Theurer, Gary L., clerk	2,827.14	1,413.54

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$93,370.41
Amount expended	39,751.56
Balance unexpended	53,618.85

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.
A. V. WATKINS,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JULY 8, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WELFARE FUNDS AND PENSION PLANS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from June 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Leece, William A., chief counsel and staff director (from June 16)	$11,646.00	$970.50
Coburn, William H., assistant chief counsel (from June 1)	11,646.00	970.50
Cordes, S. Whitman, chief investigator (from May 16)	11,646.00	1,455.75
Sornson, Louis W., investigator (from June 7)	9,073.03	604.86
MacIntyre, Duncan M., investigator (from June 10)	9,073.03	529.25
Kuhl, Arthur M., chief clerk (from June 1)	5,430.16	452.51
Montier, Gladys E., secretary (from June 1)	4,952.20	412.68
Gilmore, Scally, clerk-stenographer (from June 1)	4,856.61	404.71
Christofferson, Alice R., stenographer (from June 21)	4,091.85	113.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$75,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Cong	11,203.21
Balance unexpended	63,796.79

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Chairman.

JULY 17, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June

30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Roy E. James, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
William H. Coburn,[1] assistant chief clerk (to May 31, 1954)	11,646.00	4,852.50
Richard L. Callaghan, assistant chief clerk (from June 1, 1954)	11,646.00	970.50
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	6,290.49	3,145.20
Thelma W. Blankenship, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Barbara J. Anderson,[2] clerical assistant (to Mar. 31, 1954)	4,952.20	1,238.04
Loretta A. Hogan, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Alice H. Price, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,380.47
Helyn Eagle, clerical assistant (from Apr. 1, 1954)	4,569.81	1,142.43
Helen H. Papps, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Marjorie M. Whittaker, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Michael J. Bernstein, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
John D. Stringer, professional staff member (from Jan. 25, 1954)	8,552.84	3,706.19
William G. Reidy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

[1] Transferred to Welfare Fund Subcommittee, June 1, 1954.
[2] Resigned.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$15,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Cong	9,431.48
Balance unexpended	5,568.52

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 3, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paschal, Frank A., chief clerk and staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Johnson, R. W., counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Brawley, H. W., professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Irwin, Mary, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Bobo, Virginia, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Homan, Colette E., clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
McElroy, Marty, clerical assistant	5,143.38	2,571.66
Paramore, Mary Anne, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24
Sutherland, Mary H., clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Yutenkas, Alice,[1] clerical assistant (from Apr. 12)	4,846.61	1,065.73

[1] Under authority S. Res. 221 agreed to Apr. 7, 1954.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,132.66
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954	5,867.34

FRANK CARLSON,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE
INVESTIGATING THE POSTAL SERVICE
(Under S. Res. 49, agreed to March 6, 1953, and S. Res. 197, agreed to February 1, 1954)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 3, 1954, to March 31, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Compton, Glenn C., investigator-analyst (to Jan. 31)	$11,646.00	$970.50
Fadely, Catherine E., clerical assistant (to Feb. 28)	4,856.61	809.42
Healey, Frank G., investigator-analyst (to Mar. 31)	6,003.71	1,500.90
Kitchen, Annelle, clerical assistant (to Mar. 15)	4,856.61	1,011.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$100,000.00
Amount expended	76,377.58
Balance unexpended as of Mar. 31, 1954	23,622.42

FRANK CARLSON,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to July 1, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bassett, Ellsworth W., professional staff	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Fox, Thomas F., clerical staff	6,003.71	2,928.61
Kapnic, Charles N., chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Luschyk, Mary, clerical staff	4,569.81	2,284.90
Martinez, John L. (minority), clerical staff	6,481.67	3,240.83
Ortiz, Frances (minority), professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Porter, Eloise, assistant clerk	7,437.59	3,718.79
Sneed, Theo W., professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$35,000.00
Amount expended	6,104.78
Balance unexpended	28,895.22

EDWARD MARTIN,
Chairman.

JULY 1954.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bookwalter, William F., chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
St. Clair, Darrell, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
McLachlen, Ann E., clerical assistant	6,003.71	2,954.01
Jackson, Elaine H., clerical assistant	6,003.71	2,691.15
Gavin, B. Floy, clerical assistant	6,003.71	3,001.80
Greene, Eleanor L., clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,141.49
Ware, Wellford H., professional staff member (to May 19)	11,646.00	4,496.65
Hill, Burton S., professional staff member (to Mar. 31)	10,815.02	2,703.75
Kemp, L. Stanley, professional staff member (to May 15)	$8,990.07	$3,371.26
Berkovitch, Boris S., professional staff member (from June 15)	11,646.00	517.60
Strain, Mary L., assistant chief clerk (to May 15)	5,716.93	2,143.84
Troiano, Thelma M., assistant chief clerk (from June 16)	4,665.41	194.39

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended, 83d Cong	2,140.54
Balance unexpended	7,859.46

WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman.

JULY 1954.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Benson, John W., investigator (to Apr. 4, 1954)	$7,819.96	$2,041.86
Cervantes, Hector H., investigator (from Jan. 11 to Feb. 22)	5,430.16	633.51
Garcia, Raymond B., investigator (from Jan. 11 to Feb. 17)	5,430.16	558.09
Gustafson, Howard S., investigator (from Jan. 11. to Feb. 17)	5,430.16	558.09
Kemp, L. Stanley, chief investigator (from May 16)	8,990.07	1,123.75
Majeski, Emma M., clerical assistant (to Apr. 4)	4,665.41	1,218.17
Philbin, Richard E., investigator (to Apr. 4)	8,005.36	2,090.27
Sanders, Evelyn P., clerical assistant (from Feb. 10 to Mar. 31)	3,613.89	511.95
Scott, Marilyn E., clerical assistant (to Apr. 4)	4,091.85	1,068.40
Smalley, Patricia N., clerical assistant (from Feb. 10 to Mar. 31)	3,613.89	511.95
Strain, Mary L., clerk (from May 16)	5,716.93	714.61
Troiano, Thelma M., clerical assistant (to June 15)	4,665.41	2,138.29
Webner, Ruth M., clerical assistant (to Jan. 3)	4,091.85	34.09

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (S. Res. 137, Aug. 3, 1953, $37,500; S. Res. 234, May 21, 1954, $50,000)	$87,500.00
Amount expended	40,161.07
Balance unexpended	47,338.93

WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1954.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Byrne, Elizabeth A., assistant chief clerk	$5,621.34	$2,810.64
Forsythe, Robert A., professional staff member:		
Jan. 1–15	10,897.97	5,791.83
From Jan. 16	11,646.00	

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Henderson, Laurance G., professional staff member (to Apr. 6)	$11,646.00	$3,105.60
Harvey, Matthew J., clerical assistant (from Mar. 12)	5,525.75	1,673.04
Humphrey, Katherine J., clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,332.68
Jehle, Philip F., professional staff member	8,552.84	4,276.38
Laskey, Sara Betty, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Novak, Gertrude C., clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,237.10
O'Connor, Blake, professional staff member (from Apr. 7)	10,068.45	2,349.28
Ruppert, Minna L., chief clerk	9,653.69	4,826.82
Stults, Walter B., professional staff member:		
Jan. 1–Feb. 15	10,815.02	5,719.12
From Feb. 16	11,646.00	
Tucker, Margaret W., clerical assistant (to Mar. 11)	4,474.23	882.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 83d Cong. $10,000.00
Amount expended None

Balance unexpended 10,000.00

EDWARD J. THYE,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1954.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

(Pursuant to S. Res. 115, agreed to July 8, 1953)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Alfriend, Kate W. B., professional staff member	$5,047.77	$2,523.84
Amis, William D., investigator	9,321.88	4,660.92
Harvey, Matthew, professional staff member (to Mar. 11)	5,525.75	1,089.78
O'Connor, Blake, professional staff member (to Apr. 7)	10,068.45	2,684.89
Woodruff, Franklin, professional staff member (from Mar. 14)	9,321.88	3,029.60

Funds authorized or appropriated from June 12, 1952, to June 30, 1954, for committee expenditure (S. Res. 329 and 115) $92,000.00
Amount expended 78,335.24

Balance unexpended 13,664.76

EDWARD J. THYE,
Chairman.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3766. A bill to provide that the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for the 1955 crop of wheat shall be held not earlier than August 14, 1954, nor later than August 28, 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. CASE:

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to establish a Federal Highways Commission to make recommendations with respect to transcontinental and midcontinental highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

REFERENDUM RELATING TO NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA FOR 1955 WHEAT CROP

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, requires that a referendum be held to determine whether our farmers favor marketing quotas on wheat. To qualify for price supports, a farmer must comply with the wheat acreage allotments established by the Secretary of Agriculture.

This year's referendum is scheduled for July 23, and, as yet, the American wheat farmer does not know at what level wheat price supports will be established. I feel that our farmers are entitled to know what they will be offered in the form of price supports if they choose to accept marketing controls. Such information should be available before the farmer votes on the referendum.

Several days ago I requested Secretary Benson to postpone the referendum until the Congress has completed action on the farm bill. The Secretary advises me that he has no authority under the law to extend the referendum date.

Therefore, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which will serve to delay the holding of the referendum until Congress acts on the question of price support levels.

It is our hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will consider this proposed legislation without delay.

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

The bill (S. 3766) to provide that the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for the 1955 crop of wheat shall be held not earlier than August 14, 1954, nor later than August 28, 1954, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REVISION OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED—AMENDMENT

Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3690) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

GRANT OF RETROCESSION TO A STATE OF CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7111) to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I make this request for the reason that after initial study by the Committee on Public Works, it was believed that the bill deals with a matter which should properly come before the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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. KEFAUVER:

Statement prepared by him containing extracts from a report and appraisal entitled "Anti-Semitic Activity in the United States," the report prepared and issued recently by the American Jewish Committee.

NEED FOR REINSTITUTION OF BEEF PURCHASING PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the recent extreme heat and lack of rainfall in Kansas are causing the forced marketing of cattle and for this reason the market on these cattle is being forced to ruinously low prices.

Last year our section of the country went through a very disastrous period as far as the livestock producers were concerned and for the very same reason, and I sincerely hope we will not have to go through it again.

So far as the purchase of livestock is concerned, during the past few days I have received many telegrams, letters, and calls from people in our State urging that the Federal Government immediately reinstitute the beef purchase program.

I have discussed this subject with the Secretary of Agriculture, and am advised that the Department is greatly concerned about the situation and that it is sincerely hoped that we may expect some action in the very near future.

In my opinion, the beef purchase program, in order to be effective, should start at once. It would do much to sustain the price of cattle at our livestock markets. I am urging the Secretary to take immediate action.

Mr. President, I wish to include in the RECORD as a part of these remarks a copy of a recent telegram from Mr. M. J. Flynn, president of the Kansas City Livestock Exchange, and a copy of a

letter from Mr. A. G. Pickett, secretary of the Kansas Livestock Association.

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

KANSAS CITY, MO.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building:

Recent high temperatures and low rainfall resulting in large number cows and calves coming to our market. Water shortage contributing to forced movement of livestock. Some 5,500 cows received at our market this week as large number as any week in June or July 1953. Values on cows and other young cattle in canner and cutter flesh approaching the lows of last year. This can rapidly develop into a very bad situation on this class of cattle. It would seem some plans for emergency action should be under consideration.

M. J. FLYNN,
President, Kansas City Livestock Exchange.

TOPEKA, KANS., *July 13, 1954.*

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

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The following night letter was sent to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, July 13:

"Record heat 114° common yesterday. No rain past 2 weeks in most of Kansas. Crops and grass are burning. Stock-water situation becoming critical. Forced cattle marketing started. Some truckers report bookings 2 weeks ahead. Beef purchase program, to be effective, should start at once. Price paid for beef should warrant stronger cattle prices. Contracts should be for delivery dates requiring immediate purchase by processors."

KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
A. G. PICKETT, *Secretary.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

THE ATOMIC GIVEAWAY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the remarks I am about to make are based on such study of the bill as I have been able to make since the report on the bill was submitted on Tuesday afternoon.

The bill is a highly complex and highly technical one. I believe its provisions and implications are not understood by the great majority of the Members of the Senate. I believe the bill is so far-reaching in effect, and will so greatly control the destiny of the utilization of atomic energy in the United States for so long a period, that it should be studied most carefully by the Senate, not during a period of 2, 3, or 4 days, but for many times that period. During the short length of time that has been available or will be made available to us for study of the bill, there has not been, and will not be any means by which anyone could acquaint himself, even reasonably well, with all the highly technical provisions of the bill, or could evaluate with any degree of usefulness the widespread and long-term implications of this measure.

Mr. President, I am afraid that the American people have little conception of the far-reaching issues and the long-range impact of the proposed amendments to the Atomic Energy Act.

This bill before us, Mr. President, completely rewrites the McMahon Atomic Energy Act of 1946. It contains scores of provisions which will affect our lives and our children's lives and the lives of generations yet to come. It will set an entirely new pattern of atomic energy control and development, radically different from that set forth in the McMahon Act.

This is in spite of the fact that in his special message of February 17 to Congress, President Eisenhower stated that, in general, the McMahon Act "is still adequate to the Nation's needs."

President Eisenhower recommended two separate sets of amendments, one providing for a broader exchange of atomic information with our allies, and another to provide for greater participation by private industry in the atomic-energy-development field.

I have no quarrel with either of these two objectives, although obviously the most urgent question is that of permitting a freer flow of essential atomic information between ourselves and our allies. This is essential to our national security. This is essential to the maintenance of our precious unity with our allies. This is necessary in order to build up atomic military strength within the free world.

I agree that legislation accomplishing this purpose should and must be enacted at this session; it cannot wait; nor is the proposed legislation to accomplish this purpose so complicated that it cannot be carefully considered, debated, and enacted without delay. In this respect, the pending bill, in its present form, does not satisfy me; nor does it satisfy the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], as is brought out by that distinguished member of the joint committee in his statement of separate views. The provisions dealing with exchange of atomic information with our allies should be appropriately amended and passed.

But, Mr. President, the other aspect dealt with by President Eisenhower in his message of February 17, and dealt with in the sweeping proposed legislation before us, namely, the peacetime development of atomic energy, is far more complex. It also has a far wider range of implications for the welfare, prosperity, and economic development of our country. It can, and may very well, determine the complete direction of our economic institutions.

This, Mr. President, is not a matter to be considered lightly, briefly, or superficially. This is a matter in which each Member of the Senate bears a heavy responsibility, of which he cannot divest himself, and which he cannot pass on, in the last analysis, to any committee or group of Senators.

This affects my State so powerfully that I cannot let this proposed legislation go by without the most searching analysis, without the most comprehensive study on my part, without demanding and insisting upon the most comprehensive debate on each jot and title of this aspect of the legislation.

Mr. President, the whole economic form and structure of the Nation, the foundation of the American economic way of life, the assembly line, mass production, mass transportation, mass communications—all depend on the availability, in vast amounts, of low-cost sources of energy. To meet this need we have been using wood, coal, petroleum, natural gas, and falling water.

For most purposes these sources of energy are converted into electric power, and, by and large, electric power is the driving force of our entire economy and is the basis of the comforts and conveniences we enjoy in our home lives as well.

Now we have this new source of energy, of still unplumbed potentialities, beyond the scheme and dream of any of us even today—atomic energy.

In 10 short years, atomic energy has been translated from a theoretical concept, a mathematic equation, to a pressing reality, the most overriding fact of our present age.

The legislation before us deals with atomic energy, and the development of its peacetime uses, in a definitive, a patternmaking manner. The provisions of the McMahon Act dealing with this subject were rudimentary. In the pending bill these aspects are given such concrete form and substance as to control and determine the management and uses of atomic energy for many years in the future, perhaps for all time. The pattern we set today may and probably will, control what we can practicably do in the future.

The technological and industrial developments in the atomic energy field may come so fast—just as they have come in the past few years—that even the next Congress may be unable to unmake and reverse or radically modify the pattern that is being laid down so specifically—and so mistakenly in my judgment—in the pending bill.

Mr. President, we are dealing with a matter so vast in importance that I feel it requires, as I have already said, not a hasty 3 or 4 or 5 day debate, following within 24 hours of the submission of the bill, itself, and the majority report thereon, but rather a debate of weeks, following an opportunity of several months, if possible, of study, not only by us, but by all the experts in this field in the country, and by all those who are or might be affected—and by that I mean the whole American people.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me. I think this bill should be the subject of satisfactory and full debate, but I wish to invite the attention of the Senator to a fact which, undoubtedly, he knows, namely, that the bill and all its provisions are, in effect, the cumulative effort of approximately 8 years of intensive and continuous study by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and that the verbiage of the bill is the result of intensive hearings devoted specifically to these revisions. The hearings began in the

early part of last year and have continued up to this time.

I am not in any way saying that the Senate should not debate the bill fully and understandingly, but I wish to give assurance that the legislation now proposed is not the result of any hasty or precipitate action on the part of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa that I have the highest respect for and confidence in the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, as well as the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I know how conscientious they are. But, after all, even in the report, a very considerable difference of opinion is expressed with regard to many of the most important issues involved. Every Member of the Senate has a very heavy responsibility. The report on the bill was submitted to the Senate on Tuesday afternoon, I believe, and the debate began the following day. I cannot help but emphasize again the complexity and importance of this proposed legislation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not mean to minimize that attitude at all. As I say, the bill should be thoroughly understood and debated by Members of the Senate. The only point I am speaking to is that I want the assurance to appear in the RECORD that, so far as the joint committee is concerned, this subject has not been approached lightly. The action of the joint committee has not been precipitate. It is the result of a cumulative study of 8 years of constant observation; and the verbiage of the bill is the result of hearings which began last year and have continued to this time.

By no stretch of the imagination would I want to be considered as urging that the Senate not give ample time and discussion to one of the most vital problems in the world today. So I am not objecting to discussion. I merely wish to reassure the Senate and the Senator that the bill itself is not the result of precipitate action.

There are some fundamental disagreements. I say "fundamental." They are not really fundamental. They are disagreements on the question of the present expediency of taking or not taking certain action. The subject has been given considerable thought by the committee, and I earnestly hope the Senate will give it adequate thought.

Mr. LEHMAN. The remarks made by the Senator from Iowa are exactly what I would expect him to say. I know of his very great consideration for his colleagues in the Senate and his desire to see that every question of importance is debated for such length of time as may be necessary in order that a wise resolution of the problem may be made. I mention that fact merely to show that even though I have the highest respect for members of the Atomic Energy Commission and members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, there are differences of opinion, as outlined in the report.

Essentially, we are debating a question of what the basic energy and power policy of the United States is to be for decades to come. It is a fact that in the unleashed energy of the atom there is more power potential than that contained in all the unmined coal in the United States, more than that contained in all of the developed and reserve oil pools in the United States, more than that produced by all the hydroelectric plants now in existence.

Yes, Mr. President, the policies and programs which we are asked to establish through the passage of this bill will directly affect every man, woman, and child in our Nation as long as they may live—and certainly our actions will be judged by unborn generations when they consider whether we, in 1954, fulfilled our obligations in this field or avoided them because of the complexity of the subject and the pressure to pass something before adjourning.

In my opinion one of the fundamental questions before us is whether the Congress of the United States, in setting the policy for the unleashing of electric power from the atom, is planning for the welfare of all of our people, or for only a privileged few.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that the bill now before us contains one of the greatest giveaways of the people's investments and rights in a fundamental power source that has ever been proposed in the Congress.

This bill, in its fullest implications, far transcends the infamous giveaway of the offshore oil bill. The power potential of the atomic-power giveaway transcends a million times the threatened giveaway of the water-power resources of the Niagara Falls development—a giveaway against which I have been fighting for many years.

Mr. President, this is not a million-dollar giveaway, or a billion-dollar giveaway. This is a giveaway of such proportions as to dwarf the imagination, and to beggar any numbers which are used to describe it.

I say, Mr. President, on the basis of what study I have been able to give this bill in the limited time at my disposal, that we are giving away the public's right in a source of energy which was discovered and developed by the accumulated brains and resources not only of all the people of the United States, but of other nations, too.

To refer to the financial investment in atomic energy, the American people have invested $12 billion in this development. It has been officially estimated that when the Atomic Energy Commission completes its present expansion program, it will have a gross capital investment, in property and equipment, value at $8 billion. This is more than the combined investments of Du Pont, General Motors, and United States Steel.

Yet it is here proposed that the Congress surrender and give away the public's rights in the peacetime development of atomic energy to a few private monopolies.

Oh, Mr. President, how will we answer to the American people, and to the generations still to come, for the action that is here proposed, for this vast surrender, for this act of unconscionable divestment of the rights of the American people.

Mr. President, I am not opposed—far from it—to private participation in the development of atomic energy for industrial uses. I am strongly in favor of it. I believe in private enterprise, in its genius, and in its unlimited horizons. But I am opposed to unjustified public subsidy of private enterprise. I am opposed to abdication of the public interest in favor of private profit.

The public has original and prior rights in atomic energy. The rights to its development are the property of all the people. It is perfectly proper to share those rights with private enterprise, but the Government must at all times protect the public interest and reserve those powers over atomic energy, in any of its aspects, which are necessary to protect the public interest.

In this bill, Mr. President, it is proposed to grant licenses to private companies—to a very few very large and monopolistic private companies—to develop industrial atomic power, from what is, by its nature, a public domain—atomic energy, made possible—and I emphasize this—by public investment and national genius mobilized in the public service.

It is proposed to grant these licenses, Mr. President, without even a recapture clause, without the right to recapture from private enterprise that which fundamentally belongs to the public. In every license granted to a private company for the development of hydroelectric power, there is such a recapture clause. In every license granted to a radio or TV station for the use of the ether, there is a renewal and cancellation clause.

Yet in this bill, there is no provision for recapture, by the Government, of the rights granted by the license for the development of atomic energy.

This bill provides further, Mr. President, for compulsory patents on developments in the atomic-energy field, to remain, to some extent, under public control. But there is in this bill a 5-year limitation on the public control of such patents. That is an utterly inadequate protection of the public interest.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the understanding of the Senator from Illinois correct that with respect to private patents there is a normal 16-year limitation?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the 5-year limitation is approximately a third of the length of time which is granted on private patents.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; and the hands of the Government are completely tied at the expiration of 5 years. I thank the Senator from Illinois. We have only scratched the surface in the atomic-energy development field. The reservation of the public interest should be of indefinite duration, pending a further review and determination by Congress. I would accept, although with mental qualms on my part, a 10-year or somewhat longer limitation, as proposed in the minority views. Beyond that I would not go. I desire to say, however, that my very definite preference would be to have no limitation on the reservation on patents.

Mr. President, these provisions in the bill, in themselves, constitute a giveaway which is intolerable and unjustifiable. This is a giveaway in the grand manner, in comparison with which any other giveaway this Congress has enacted pales in magnitude.

And this is just a beginning of the evils, the unjustifiable shortcomings in this bill.

The bill practically prohibits the Atomic Energy Commission from developing power even for its own uses, as well as for commercial uses.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator whether his statement is borne out by section 44 of the committee report, issued by the majority, which on page 15, line 5, provides:

> This section * * * does not permit the Commission to enter the power-producing business without further congressional authorization to construct or operate such commercial facilities.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his contribution. I shall refer to that point later in my speech. That is what would tie the hands of the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with the use of power resources without further congressional action, and would set a pattern which would be controlling, undoubtedly, for years, if not decades and generations to come.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Gladly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to have a comment from the Senator from New York on the argument which is made, that since this material, presumably uranium, will be leased to private power-producing facilities, such leasing will lead to competition, and that the competition will be self-regulating and will serve to keep prices to consumers down.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no provision with respect to a competitive basis in this bill. So long as the Government is prevented from producing atomic power for the use of all the people of the Nation, there cannot be any yardstick or any actual competition with private industry.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the Senator from New York would check my understanding as to the cost of installing atomic power facilities. Does he understand, as does the Senator from Illinois, that the probable cost of an efficient reactor to produce power is somewhere around $900 to $1,000 per kilowatt, and that probably a plant which would produce power most efficiently would have to have a capacity of somewhere around 200,000 kilowatts or 250,000 kilowatts? Therefore, the minimum investment required to produce electric power from atomic materials would be in the neighborhood of from $180 million to $250 million. Does the Senator from New York believe that the figures cited by the Senator from Illinois are approximately correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no knowledge of the exact figures. However, the figures given by the Senator from Illinois have been repeated time and time again by others, many of whom are experts in this field. Therefore, there is no doubt in my mind that, generally speaking, the figures given by the Senator from Illinois are accurate. There is also no doubt in my mind that the cost of installing a reactor would be very great.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under those conditions can we picture great numbers of people in large cities, such as in New York City, rushing forward with $180 million or $250 million in their pockets and saying, "We want to get a license to lease fissionable materials with which to produce electricity"?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I certainly cannot imagine that. My experience would teach me that I would be unreasonably optimistic if I believed anything like that. There is another reason why there would be no benefit to the people of the State of New York, because there is no provision in the bill for preference, or any safeguards, which are so necessary in order to obtain power at a reasonable price.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the leasing provisions of section 44 would, therefore, result in the Atomic Energy Commission's leasing this material, presumably uranium, to a series of regional monopolies and that there would not be competition within any one of the regions?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Illinois is completely correct in that premise. I wish to point out another thing, namely, that as I interpret this bill, the Government guarantees to sell uranium at fair rates to private customers and to buy plutonium at reasonable rates in return. That, in my opinion, constitutes a built-in subsidy for the large companies who might avail themselves of this privilege.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is sometimes said, I believe, by the senior Republican member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that the leasing provisions of the bill provide for free competition under the private-enterprise system. Would they not have the effect of providing monopolistic private enterprise?

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no doubt about that. They would inevitably, in my opinion, ultimately tend to foster the development of monopolistic enterprise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. From a sentence which the Senator from New York dropped, in which he spoke of the value of a public plant as a yardstick, I take it that what the Senator from New York is arguing is that the Atomic Energy Commission should at least have the authority to produce power if, in the opinion of the Commission and the Congress, that seemed to be desirable, so that the cost could be compared with the price charged by private utilities and a greater degree of competition could be introduced into the manufacture of power and its distribution.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully agree with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What the Senator from New York is advocating is a competitive system of enterprise rather than a monopolistic system of enterprise.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am; and in order to consummate that objective and make it a reality I have an amendment, which is on the desks of Senators, and which I intend to call up, providing for exactly the considerations which have been outlined by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A similar amendment has been drafted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], which I hold in my hand, identified as 7-16-54-C. The amendment of the Senator from New York is, I believe, identified as 7-15-54-D. So the same idea seems to be occurring to a number of Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. The amendments are all very similar, and any one of them, I believe, would further the purposes outlined by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that the Senator from New York is not opposing the leasing of this material, presumably uranium, to private industry. He is merely saying that when it is done it should be under proper conditions, and that should not be the only way in which this material should necessarily be used.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have already said that I am not opposed to private enterprise. I should like to see private enterprise share in this development, but under the proper safeguards. What I particularly object to is any surrender on the part of the United States Government of the interests of the people of the country whose sacrifices have alone made this development possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that if Congress did not wish to have the AEC sponsor an electric powerplant it could always prevent such action by refusing to appropriate?

Mr. LEHMAN. To go further than that, I think it would require congressional approval for any change in policy, but certainly, under any circumstances, Congress could control it through appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So we should not put a legislative prohibition in the bill which would tie the hands of the Atomic Energy Commission for all time or until such time as the present act could be amended or repealed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Exactly. There is no question about that. The Senator from Illinois has stated the problem very clearly. I thank the Senator for his very useful contribution to this debate.

Mr. President, the only power the AEC is permitted to develop is that which is developed incidental to its research activities. Yet the AEC is the greatest consumer of power in the world.

Here the AEC has developed the potentialities of atomic power. But this bill prohibits the AEC from utilizing its own discoveries to develop atomic power to help meet its own power needs. This is an unconscionable provision, Mr. President, another giveaway provision.

The AEC should have the right, and should even be directed to develop power to help meet its own power needs. This

would be a healthy check on private power development. I shall dwell more on this aspect, in relation to commercial power development, in a moment.

The accomplishments of the Atomic Energy Commission to date have been most impressive. We know the great strides in the development of strategic and tactical atomic weapons—a development which surely has helped preserve the safety of the free world, and which act as a powerful deterrent to would-be aggressors. We have learned of the wonderful application of atomic byproducts in the treatment of disease and in medical research.

Only recently we have been told of the development of an atomic engine which has operated for a time equivalent to powering a submarine around the world without refueling. These and many more inventions and products are the public's dividends resulting from the great public investment in atomic research and development.

Not the least of these developments is the potential development of atomic power reactors which will be able to produce electric power in commercially usable quantities, and at rates which will permit sale of this power to the public.

How does the present bill plan to open this new electric power source for the benefit of the American public? What guaranties are there that the great investments which the public has already made will be for the public interest?

What is to be the true nature of the economic relationships between those companies and groups which will be licensed to produce electric power from atomic energy and the Atomic Energy Commission which will act on behalf of the Government and the people in licensing these companies?

These are questions which must be answered—and, in my opinion, must be answered in legislation which will clearly protect the long-range interests of the American people.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from New York for having put his finger on what I consider to be the essential point at issue in the pending bill. The discussion during the past few days has concentrated itself almost exclusively upon the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. With criticisms of the contract I have found myself in agreement, but it seems to me to be unfortunate that so much attention has been concentrated on that and so little attention has been fastened on the important question of how atomic energy is to be used and the consequences of such use. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New York for bringing the debate of the Senate at last to the crucial issue presented by this bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I have felt that although the Dixon-Yates contract was important as an administrative matter, its importance is small as compared with the vital considerations which I have described and which the Senator has been good enough to emphasize, because these considerations go to the heart of the subject, and we must realize that they will affect the American people for generations to come.

I thank the Senator for his great contribution.

Mr. President, we have a detailed and workable precedent available to us in measuring the standards set by this bill against a sound public policy in the utilization of sources of electric power which belong to the public. I speak of the precedents found in the Federal Power Act which prescribes how hydroelectric resources may be developed and utilized. In my opinion, this act—and the historical developments behind its adoption—provide the clearest parallel with the problem we are now faced with in legislating for power produced from atomic energy. We should look to the Federal Power Act as a partial standard against which we can measure the proposed atomic-energy bill.

We know that the Federal Power Act was designed to protect and safeguard the public's interest in the energy resulting from falling water on the rivers and streams of our Nation. The safeguards established in that act and in the Flood Control Act of 1944 were based on the fundamental assumption that the water resources of this Nation are a public resource and must be conserved and developed for the best possible use for all the people.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the late Senator George W. Norris, who, I think, with the passage of time, is coming more and more to be regarded as perhaps the greatest Senator of the last generation, if not of the whole history of the United States, always referred to the question of the Federal control of falling water in streams in this way: First, that the water came as rain from heaven; that it was the gift of God, not the property of any individual. Second, that the water moved in streams which had been adjudged navigable and, therefore, fell under the control of the Federal Government.

Mr. LEHMAN. I share the very high opinion of Senator Norris which has been expressed by the Senator from Illinois. I may say that one of the things in which I take the greatest pride in my service in the Senate is that I am one member of a group of Senators, of whom the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the great Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are members, who are fighting, day and night, to conserve the natural resources of the United States, than which there is nothing more important, and without which this country will not continue to go forward.

On page 121 of the separate views on S. 3690 filed by Representatives HOLIFIELD and PRICE, we find a listing of the safeguards set forth in the Federal Power Act which prescribe how hydroelectric resources may be used. They are worth repeating here:

First. Safeguard for the prior right of Federal development of the resource in any specific case where this will best serve the public interest.

Second. Safeguard for the prior right of public bodies and cooperatives, as against a private applicant for a license for any specific development of the resource.

Third. Safeguards for the right to public hearing in connection with any application, with specific provision for admission of interested States, State commissions, municipalities, representatives of interested consumers, or competitors as parties. That is covered in an amendment which is now on the desks of Senators.

Fourth. Safeguards for the right of Federal or other public recapture of any development by a private licensee at the end of the license period on payment of no more than the licensee's net investment in the project. I wish to point out again that the bill which we are now considering is completely lacking in any such provision.

Fifth. Safeguards for reasonable rates to consumers by provision requiring licensees as a condition of any license to agree to Federal regulation where States have provided no regulation of electric rates, with further provision that in any rate proceeding the licensee can claim no more than net investment in the development for rate base purposes.

Sixth. Safeguards for the preferred position of public and cooperative electric systems to obtain power supply from Federal development of the resource.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In order that my position may be made clear, I wonder if the Senator from New York would permit me to make a brief statement at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should be very glad to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not go so far as Representative HOLIFIELD and Representative PRICE in saying that the Federal Government must have a prior and preferred position in the use of fissionable material which is used for electrical energy, but I say that the Federal Government should have an equal position. As a matter of fact, I look forward to the development of electrical energy from atomic power primarily by private companies, since approximately four-fifths of the electrical energy now produced in the United States is generated and distributed by private companies. But I would not foreclose the field to the Federal Government to develop it. It would seem to me that the amount of Government development would be a minor share of the total development, but it would be a very valuable yardstick by which the actual costs of private companies could be checked.

I mention this because words are tricky things, and failure to demur at this point might be regarded as acceptance.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I am in agreement with

what he has said. I certainly do not wish to see private enterprise eliminated from this field. What I have been trying to emphasize—and I am very glad indeed the distinguished Senator from Illinois is in full agreement with me—is that the Federal Government must not surrender its rights or yield its rights beyond recovery.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. As stated by Representatives HOLIFIELD and PRICE, the amendments to the Atomic Energy Act which we are now debating in this bill are wholly lacking in any of the above-listed safeguards.

To me this fact alone is sufficient reason to vote to send ths bill back to the joint committee for further study and revision.

I would hope, Mr. President, that my State of New York—the power authority of New York State—as well as the many publicly owned municipal electric utility companies throughout the State of New York—would be given a preference in the consideration of a license for the construction of nuclear power reactors to be built in New York State.

I would hope that there would be placed in the bill a provision for due notice to the power authority of the State of New York, and other State, municipal, and nonprofit groups, prior to the issuance of any license to produce commercial power from atomic energy. There are no such requirements in the bill as it is now written.

I believe that where the interests of any State, municipality, or cooperative come in conflict with a private interest wishing to develop a nuclear power plant, preferred consideration should be given to the public body.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I demur slightly at this point and emphasize that what I desire is not preferred consideration, but equal consideration to be given to public bodies.

Mr. LEHMAN. I can see that that question is very fully open to argument. I feel that in the development of a public resource some preference, at least, should be given to public bodies, and that safeguards should be thrown around the issuance of licenses.

It is inconceivable to me that the public, having invested over $12 billion in the great undertaking which has now provided the opportunity for nuclear energy to be transformed into usable electric energy, is now going to be placed in the position of having to take second place to private utility companies in the granting of licenses for atomic power plants. Certainly the State and local agencies which are presently established to produce electric power—agencies owned by all the people—should be the primary benefactors of these new discoveries.

I understand the Senator from Illinois is objecting, as I am, to the elimination or surrender of the Government's rights.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New York has referred to the enormous public investment of $12 billion in the great undertaking of the development of atomic energy, which was originally designed, of course, to produce weapons. But the development may have, as a by-product, the utilization of atomic and thermonuclear energy for industrial purposes. Is it not true that it would have been impossible for private industry to have made any such investment as this?

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, quite impossible, of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since sometimes Government officials are censured for the mistakes they make, is not great credit due to President Roosevelt, who authorized, I believe, the expenditure of more than a billion dollars, almost $2 billion, for experimental purposes in order to determine whether the development of atomic energy would be a success.

Mr. LEHMAN. I cannot emphasize too strongly my full agreement with the comments of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I have often said that, in my opinion, among the most heroic, among the most courageous acts in all history was the personal direction given by President Roosevelt to the development of the atom bomb. If it had failed—and there was a great possibility of its failure—President Roosevelt would have been damned from one end of the country to the other. It would have been said that he had acted beyond his authority, and that he was responsible for the waste of almost $2 billion. But that did not deter him. I have never known a more courageous man than Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He went ahead, almost on his own initiative, of course, taking advice from a certain number of experts, and authorized the expenditure for and the development of this powerful weapon. I am very grateful to the Senator from Illinois for bringing that fact out in the debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that many persons would have probably demanded impeachment of the President if the experiment had failed? Since the experiment succeeded, have we noticed that much praise has been given to former President Roosevelt for that contribution to our national welfare?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I have not noticed that much praise has been given to him for that and for many other actions which took great courage.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May the Senator from Illinois inject a local note into this general theme?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator from New York probably knows, experiments were carried on at the university to which I was formerly attached, the University of Chicago. The first successful atomic reaction was developed at that university. If that experiment had failed, the university would have been blown completely to pieces, and a large portion of the south side of Chicago would have been destroyed. So I should like to point out that my university took a great deal of risk in that experiment also and hazarded its very physical existence upon the success of the experiment.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very much interested in that bit of history. I had not heard it before, and I was not acquainted with that fact. I congratulate the university and my distinguished colleague for the part both of them took in that development, which has been a great asset to the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I took no part in that experiment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it is important that this need for preferences to public agencies be established for another reason. At present there is no yardstick by which the cost of developing and producing electric power from nuclear energy, and the charges made for that power, can be measured. The bill prohibits the AEC or any other Federal agency from entering the field of powerplant reactors and commercially selling the electric power. I think this is wholly wrong. I think it is a dangerous prohibition. If we do not make provision for some publicly developed electric power from the atom, there will be no yardstick against which the privately owned systems can be measured. Thus, we may be retarding and hampering the ultimate development and utilization of atomic electricity for many, many years.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRIPPA in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I share the able Senator's concern regarding the prohibition against the Commission. I am not sure that it would not be the better part of wisdom to create another agency with the specific assignment of the task of developing experimentally the generation of power from atomic energy in commercial quantities. I have not given that possibility sufficient thought to reach a final conclusion. I share the concern of the able Senator over the prohibition of the Commission's entering this field unless at the same time there is established some agency, instrumentality, or means for doing so. The question I raise with the able Senator is whether it would be the better part of wisdom for the Commission itself to enter into such activity, or to create another agency and give it that specific assignment.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have not explored that possibility at all. It seems to me that such an arrangement might have great merit; I do not know. What I am trying to emphasize in my speech is my great distress and fear that, under the bill, if it should be enacted, the United States Government would, to a great extent, yield whatever rights it may have now or at some future time to develop atomic energy for industrial and other purposes. If it were proved or shown to be in the interest of the public, there might be another agency than the Atomic Energy Commission which might enter into that activity. Perhaps the

TVA would be competent to do so. Certainly the matter should be explored.

Mr. GORE. I did not mean in any way to suggest that the TVA would be the proper agency to enter into that activity, and I think the able Senator from New York was using that agency only as an example by way of reference. I share fully the concern of the distinguished Senator from New York that at the time this resource, which has cost us such vast amounts of money, is to be made available to those concerns that have sufficiently large financial resources to enable them to enter the field, we may at the same time refuse the Commission authority to do so and fail to create any other agency to enter into this activity. It seems to me when those two possibilities are coupled together, we are not providing sufficient protection for small business concerns that cannot invest $250 million in a plant such as is contemplated, and at the same time we are not giving protection to the municipal power systems and the rural-electrification systems of the country.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am in entire agreement with the Senator from Tennessee. Those are matters which have disturbed me ever since I started to study the report, which was only a few days ago. Members of the Senate, except members of the committee, have not had a chance to study the report. However, I think the danger which has been mentioned should be uppermost in the minds of the American people, because it is very real. It is being proposed, by reason of conditions which exist, to give a virtually monopolistic control to a few powerful interests, and at the same time to shut off the possibility of any governmental action if it should prove to be necessary.

I thank the Senator for his contribution.

In conclusion, Mr. President, it is my hope that the Congress will withhold its action on this all-important legislation until the Congress and the people of the Nation have had an opportunity fully to comprehend and understand the issues and problems involved in this far-reaching legislation, only a few aspects of which I have touched in my remarks today.

I have not discussed such vital aspects of the pending bill as the special authority proposed to be vested in the Chairman of the Commission, thus tending to break down the present pattern of organization.

I have not discussed the patent provisions, the antimonopoly aspects, the military control provisions, and many, many others.

This is a bill of almost numberless issues, each one of which should and must be carefully considered.

I agree that the provisions of the bill dealing with the pooling of international information on atomic energy should be passed at this session. I have not dealt with this aspect, but I subscribe to many of the views expressed in this matter by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. These provisions should be debated. They should be amended. They should be passed.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to commend the Senator from New York for the very able and strong speech he has made. He has emphasized and made most clear that the pending bill is, first and foremost, a power bill. Of course the international arrangements and features of the bill are most important; but the bill is primarily a power bill, and many of its provisions indicate that it is in line with the policy of the administration to break down, impair, chip off, and, in the end, destroy the great power policy we have had, and which we have been building and strengthening through the years since the days of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. Is not that true?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is absolutely true.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York, in the course of his very timely and eloquent speech this morning has raised a warning signal. Certainly we should beware, and should stop, look, and listen, before we enter into this great, new, vast, almost undreamed of field of power, to make sure that we do not tear down the great power policy which had its beginning 50 years ago, and which we have sought to carry through, build upon, and strengthen through the years.

So, Mr. President, I wish to heartily congratulate the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I express my sincere thanks to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, let me say a final word. The other aspects of the bill, aside from those dealing with the pooling of international information, are too pregnant with danger to be approved with so little study, consideration, and debate. Too much is at stake. We dare not trifle so superficially with the public interest in this most fundamental aspect of the problem of atomic energy. It is for this reason that I shall feel compelled to vote against this bill, or at least to vote to recommit it, hoping, however, that we shall have an opportunity to vote separately on the provisions dealing with the international pooling of atomic information, as recommended by President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, let me say that I have been very glad to be able to participate in the debate. I hope to have at least stimulated some thinking. What has been done and what is being done on the floor of the Senate, under the leadership of such Members as the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], among others, have been of tremendous service to the thinking of the people of the United States and, what is just as important, if I may say so, to the thinking and education of the Members of Congress, for I believe that on last Wednesday morning, at the beginning of this debate, which these Members have largely carried on, only a handful of the Members of the Senate really knew the implications of the bill and its dangers and ramifications, and how it would affect the lives of hundreds of millions of persons in the United States over the next several generations.

As a result of the debate, I believe that today a very substantial number of the Members of this body have at least a reasonably good appreciation of what is contained in the bill and its implications. So I desire to express my very great appreciation for the manner in which the debate has been conducted.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. At the moment, the junior Senator from Tennessee happens to be the only one of the three members to whom the able Senator from New York has made such generous reference, who is on the floor. So, upon my own behalf, and I presume upon behalf of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I wish to thank the able Senator from New York for his generous remarks. Although I fear they are undeserved, particularly on the part of the junior Senator from Tennessee, nevertheless they are very much appreciated.

I, in turn, wish to thank the senior Senator from New York for his able and valuable contribution to the debate.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Ervin	Lehman
Anderson	Ferguson	Lennon
Bennett	Flanders	Martin
Burke	Goldwater	Morse
Bush	Gore	Mundt
Capehart	Hayden	Murray
Carlson	Hendrickson	Payne
Case	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Clements	Hill	Schoeppel
Cooper	Holland	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Crippa	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Thye
Duff	Knowland	Watkins
Dworshak	Kuchel	Williams

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. BOWRING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr.

KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

LONG-TERM CHARTER OF TANKERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3458) to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President is hereby authorized to undertake the construction of not to exceed 20 tankers. The tankers shall be of approximately 25,000 deadweight tons each, shall have a speed of not less than 18 knots, and shall be constructed in private shipyards within the continental United States. The construction of the tankers shall be, so far as practicable, of materials and equipment produced or manufactured in the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150 million for the construction of the foregoing vessels.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the construction of tankers."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who is absent on official business, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3458) to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed, as previously announced, to a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, beginning where the last call ended, which was Calendar No. 1797, Senate bill 2601, and that we now begin with Calendar No. 1798, H. R. 6882, in addition to two bills which have been added to this week's calendar call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The first bill which is in order will be stated.

FLOYD C. BARBER—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2815) for the relief of Floyd C. Barber was announced as first in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LIMIT ON TAXICAB LICENSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 880) to amend the license law of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I desire to speak for about 3 or 4 minutes in opposition to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. The bill provides, in proper legal language, that the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia shall be vested with power to restrict the number of taxicabs which may be operated in the city of Washington.

One object of the bill is to create a monopoly in favor of those who are now engaged in the taxicab business, as against those who may hereafter wish to engage in the business.

This is the fifth time I have been a member of a legislative body, and the same arguments have been made on this occasion in support of the bill as I have heard on all other occasions. Whenever a group of persons is already engaged in a business, attempts are made to create a monopoly by excluding other persons from the business.

The first argument is that if the number of taxicabs in Washington is limited, those already operating taxicabs will make more profits. I believe that is not a valid argument. If I and 99 other persons were given the exclusive privilege of practicing law in North Carolina, I agree that I and the other 99 would be much better off.

The next argument is that if the number of cabs is limited, the character and ability of those who operate the cabs will be of a higher standard. I do not object to the desire to promote better character and ability, but I do not believe Congress has a right to deprive a person of his right to earn a livelihood. Everyone has the right to his choice of occupation in order to make a living.

The third argument is that taxicab operators are engaged in operating a public utility. I do not think they are engaged in the operation of a public utility in the real sense of the term. I admit that the operation of a taxicab is an occupation clothed with a public interest, and the public has a right to have the industry regulated to the extent to which it is necessary in order to protect the public.

In the city of Washington, so far as taxicab operation is concerned, I think the public is sufficiently protected by the existing laws which require the carrying of liability insurance, which prescribe the fares to be charged, and which provide for the examination of drivers. I do not think it is necessary, in the public interest, to go any further.

In closing, I say that if a Senator believes that Congress should create a monopoly for those already engaged in a business, by excluding from that business, which is one of the ordinary avocations of life, those who may hereafter desire to enter into the business, then such Senator should vote for the bill.

But if a Senator shares the view which I hold, that Congress should not bar from one of the ordinary occupations of life those who may hereafter desire to enter into that occupation, he should vote against the bill.

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

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from North Carolina is speaking in behalf of free enterprise. As I understand the able Senator, he says that somewhere, somehow, some avenue of activity should be left open into which the ordinary citizen can enter.

Mr. ERVIN. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. I share the Senator's feelings in that regard.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that, contrary to any opinion which may have been expressed, the committee held extensive hearings in connection with the measure. The committee heard witnesses from almost every field of activity. The bill received the support of the Public Utilities Commission and, if my memory serves me correctly, of the representatives of the governing bodies of the District generally.

The committee was exceptionally careful to make certain that amendments were written into the bill to the extent that the full protection would be provided to the individual operators—the independent operators—and that those who chose to continue in the business would not, in any way, shape, or manner, be deprived of that right.

The committee, through its staff, also wrote into the bill protective features, so that the larger companies operating in the District would never be able to develop a monopoly in the taxicab business, because it was the feeling of members of the committee that such a situation definitely should not obtain under any conditions.

The text of the bill does protect the rights of the independent operator, and does maintain the same relationships and ratios between the number of so-called large operators and so-called independent operators within the District of Columbia. I do not have available to me at this moment the figures, but the

number of taxicabs available per capita in the District of Columbia, as compared with other communities throughout the country, is greatly out of proportion. If my memory serves me correctly, under the present licensing system, in the District of Columbia the ratio is 1 taxicab for every 94 persons, whereas, generally speaking, in cities of comparable size throughout the Nation the ratio is 1 taxicab for as many as 900, 1,000, or 1,200 persons.

So the bill does not in any way, shape, or manner provide for a monopoly for the large operators. It protects definitely the relationship and existing ratio between the large operators and the independent operators who are presently licensed.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, by request I object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. I withhold my objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate, this is one of the bills which has been cleared by the majority policy committee. So at an early date, when the unfinished business has been disposed of, it is my intention to move the consideration of the bill.

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

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONSTRUCTION OF VERMEJO RECLAMATION PROJECT

The bill (H. R. 6882) to amend the act of September 27, 1950, relating to construction of the Vermejo reclamation project was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may we have an explanation of the bill for the purpose of the record?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this bill would permit a reclamation district, newly organized, to take bonds which it had heretofore pledged to the RFC and transfer that indebtedness to the regular reclamation fund, and make payments in regular fashion, the same as any other reclamation district. This would comply with the usual reclamation law.

This district was a specially organized district.

This is in accord with the usual, customary practice, and it has been endorsed by the Secretary of the Interior and other agencies.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Am I correct in understanding that the effect is to waive interest?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. The reclamation fund law provides for 40 years without interest, whereas the bonds held by the RFC bear interest, but that is a very small amount compared with the total indebtedness.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELIUM-BEARING GAS LANDS, NAVAHO RESERVATION, N. MEX.

The bill (H. R. 130) to amend section 1 of the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189), was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. The purpose of the bill is to resolve a controversy between the Navaho Indians and the Federal Government as to the rights of the Indians under a helium lease. At the time the original helium lease was granted, very little was known about the commercial possibilities of helium. The United States was interested in certain types of aircraft. There was no other source of helium in a satisfactory amount. The Government asked the Navaho Indians to let its agents go upon the reservation and extract the helium. The Government paid the Indians $40,000 in cash and $30,000 or $40,000 in advance rentals and proceeded to operate from that time on.

A part of the lease was assigned to one of the oil companies for the purposes of development. When the lease expired the oil company surrendered the lease to the Government instead of to the Navaho Tribe, and a controversy followed which resulted in a loss of some money to the Navahos. They want to go into the Court of Claims and assert their rights. The Department of the Interior agrees the procedure is proper. Section 3 of the bill provides for a special privilege, and was written exactly as the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice wanted it written, so the Navaho Tribe will have an opportunity to assert their rights. However, the rights of the Federal Government are fully protected.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from New Mexico indicate to what extent, in his opinion, the United States Government may have either violated or trespassed upon its proper fiduciary responsibilities back in 1942?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a little difficult to answer, but I shall try to respond by saying that the Navaho Indians at that time did not have as good legal services as they now have. They have become wealthier from uranium leases, oil leases, and from various other sources, and they now have several million dollars on deposit in the Treasury of the United States. They now have enough business to enable them to maintain a business advisory council composed of persons outside the tribe.

At the time the lease was made in 1942, the advisory council was not checking the lease, and when the Continental Oil Co. surrendered it, it surrendered the lease to the United States Government. If the Indians had had proper legal advice from the Government, they would have been advised that the lease should have been surrendered to the Navaho Indians and not to the trustee. It was because of that conflict, the surrendering of the lease to the Government when it should have been surrendered to the Navaho Indians, that the controversy arose. The Government admits it made a mistake, and that it should have advised that the lease should have been surrendered to the Navaho Indians; but, somehow, no one noticed it.

The Department of the Interior is willing to concede the case should be handled in the way provided in the bill. The provision will permit the Navaho Indians to go into the Court of Claims and assert the rights which they would have had if the Federal Government had properly protected their rights and seen to it that the lease was properly surrendered.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from New Mexico is seeking to justify the waiver of the statute of limitations on the ground that the Government of the United States in 1942 was delinquent in its fiduciary responsibility to the Navaho tribe?

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly. I may say that the law of 1947 was relied on as being sufficient. It was not until the Navahos proceeded under the law of 1947 that the council discovered the surrender had been improper. Then it was too late to proceed under the law of 1942. Had it been known at the time the 1947 law was being considered that an improper transfer had been made in 1942, that mistake would have been taken care of in the 1947 legislation.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, no attempt is being made to waive the statute of limitations in other respects, but the bill would merely permit the Navaho Indians to go into the Court of Claims because of the deficiency in advice on the part of the Government at the time the lease was surrendered?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 130), to amend section 1 of the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189), which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, after line 23, to insert:

SEC. 2. Said act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189), is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section to be designated section 3 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the Court of Claims to determine, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or laches, in any suit instituted pursuant to section 1 of this act, (1) whether the assignment dated December 1, 1942, accepted and approved December 17, 1942, of oil and gas lease 149-ind-5337, covering the land denominated '1942 lands' in section 4 of said

agreement dated December 1, 1945, as amended, should in law or in equity, taking into consideration such fiduciary relationship as may exist between the United States and the Navaho Tribe, have been accepted by the United States for the account of the Navaho Tribe instead of for its own account, and, if such assignment should have been so accepted, whether the property interest or any part thereof covered by such assignment was taken by the United States from the said tribe at any time prior to the effective date of said agreement; (2) whether, and in what amount, if any, the Navaho Tribe is entitled on the basis of such determination to compensation for the acquisition or taking, by the United States, of the property interest or any part thereof covered by such assignment; and (3) whether, and in what amount, if any, the United States is entitled to credit against such compensation for rentals on such lease or for other expenditures, borne by the United States, for the benefit of such lease prior to any such acquisition or taking by the United States; and to enter judgment in accordance with such determinations. No offsets shall be deducted by the court from any net sum, and the interest thereon, if any, that the court awards under this section. The provisions of the last two sentences of section 1 of this act shall be applicable to any judgment entered pursuant to this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189)."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE SISKIYOU JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 6975) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Siskiyou Joint Union High School District, Siskiyou County, Calif., was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this bill would authorize the transfer, without compensation, of about 27.58 acres to Siskiyou Joint Union High School District, California, which land would be used only for public school purposes, with the provision that the land shall revert to the United States if used for any other purpose.

The land in question is a portion of a tract uncovered by the lowering of Tule Lake in connection with a Federal reclamation project. All such land was ceded by the State of California to the United States without compensation.

Favorable reports have been made by the Department of the Interior to the House committee and by the Bureau of the Budget to the Senate committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not object to the bill, but for the record, I wish to say that it does not conflict with the Morse formula. This was land owned by the State of California, and it is land which is going back to the State of California. There has been no investment whatsoever on the part of the Federal Government. In my judgment, the bill meets the Morse formula.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6975) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED TO NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 2235) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over to the next call of the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4213) to authorize works for developing and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, Central Valley project, California, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another bill I desire to study between now and the next call of the calendar, and I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 620) to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to study this bill also. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

LANDS IN THE OWL CREEK UNIT OF THE MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4721) to provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to lands in the Owl Creek unit of the Missouri Basin project was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another bill I should like to study between now and the next call of the calendar. I give the Senators from California assurance I shall study the bill over the week end, and will be ready at the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Oregon thinks we ought to have a unanimous-consent agreement that the bills to which he has objected be included in the next call of the calendar.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to a unanimous-consent request that they be included in the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Objection being heard, the bill (H. R. 4721) will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO MOVABLE PROPERTY TO IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

The bill (H. R. 8026) to provide for transfer of title to movable property to irrigation districts or water users' organizations under the Federal reclamation laws was announced as next in order.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, when Mussolini came into power in Italy, he started vast public-works projects for draining the Pontine marshes and other unhealthy areas of land. The only difficulty was that constitutional Italian governments which preceded him had also been carrying on great drainage projects, except that they chose to drain the land which it was important to reclaim for farmland, while Mussolini chose to reclaim the marshes which were closest to the main highways where everyone could see them.

When Lenin became the ruler of Russia, members of the inland Asian tribes came to Moscow and worked out in tribal dances the coming of the "Lenin light" to their dark cabins. The only difficulty was that the "Lenin light" was the familiar electric light which had been developed not by a man named Nikolai Lenin, but by a man named Thomas Edison.

When the New Dealers came into office in 1933, they set up a vast project for control of the floods in the Tennessee River Valley, and manufacture of power as a sort of a side line. The only trouble was that the United States was far ahead of all the nations of the world in its development of what Europe called "white coal." All of that progress, from the kerosene lamp and the gas light, had been achieved by private citizens, working under American conditions of political and economic liberty, without any help from Government.

The TVA started with some modesty to build a few dams on one river system, but the limitations were soon lifted, and the original chairman of the board was summarily released to make room for Board Member David Lilienthal as Chairman.

I do not believe anybody really knows what are the ramifications of the original today, and what powers they exercise, beyond the sight of Congress, through the use of war funds and other unchecked funds appropriated to the President but spent by the bureaucracy.

President Eisenhower has attempted to reverse the colossal growth of TVA, and to increase the role of the private enterprises, working without tax funds or Government direction of their employees.

Naturally, the supporters of socialism have protested bitterly against this interference with unlimited growth of their favorite showpiece of what Govern-

ment spending can do. Every foreign student, foreign journalist, and visiting potentate who comes to this country as a guest of the United States is taken sooner or later to TVA, to see how completely the United States is committed to Lenin's doctrine that the Government must control the commanding heights of the Nation's economy, or free enterprise will quickly grow stronger than Government enterprise.

My people in the State of Indiana are not fooled by the propaganda and stage management of the welfare state. They know that TVA is a great showpiece of the Socialist economy because the people of 44 States have been taxed to make a monument to Government management of the economy.

The Socialists believe the people are too dumb to be bothered with state industrialization, if the story can be all mixed up in balance sheets, hidden costs, technical terms, and general undesignated appropriations. They do not guess how wrong they are. My people in Indiana, and the people in most of our States, have learned that a dollar taken in taxes from our people and sent to Washington shrinks on the way. The benefits we receive add up to only a very small part of what we pay.

President Eisenhower's proposal to bring private industry into the TVA picture means that private citizens in my State and the other States can keep their own earnings, invest them as they please, and build industrial enterprise which may have economic power but do not have the police power. Such enterprises can never be assembled, when the crisis comes, by ambitious men who have made the legal and financial network of TVA into potentially very dangerous forms of unseen governmental power

The people of my State, and the American people generally, I believe, are unreservedly behind President Eisenhower in his efforts to dismantle part of the colossus on the Potomac, and restore to the American people the right to control their own economic activities.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO MOVABLE PROPERTY TO IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 8026, to provide for transfer of title to movable property to irrigation districts or water users' organizations under the Federal reclamation laws?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that if I felt the Tennessee Valley Authority needed defense from an attack such as the one we have just heard, I would be delighted to supply such a defense. Not entertaining such a feeling, I now request an explanation of House bill 8026.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to clarify the authority of the Department of the Interior to transfer title to movable equipment and similar property to water users' organizations at the time these organizations take over the operation and maintenance of works constructed under Federal reclamation laws.

The Bureau of Reclamation normally operates a project or distribution system for a few years after construction is completed, prior to turning it over to the water users; and the equipment and property referred to in this bill is that which has been acquired by the Government during the time it operates the project works. Although arrangements can be made to transfer use of the equipment to the organization, it would be to the advantage of the Government to transfer title, as by so doing, the maintenance of property and accounting records could be dispensed with. With respect to the financial arrangements relating to title transfers under this bill, the value of the property would be repaid to the Federal Government under a contract with the organization except in those cases where the property was purchased by funds originally advanced by the water users.

Under this arrangement, provision is made that title to the property shall always remain in the United States, even though the entire cost of the project is repaid.

In connection with the construction and operation of these projects, the Government has on hand certain movable property which has been paid for or will be paid for by the water users' associations. Title to this movable property also remains in the name of the United States. Being in the nature of personal property, it is, of course, very difficult to have it repaired and taken care of, even though it is turned over for the use of these associations and districts. Such property involves a great deal of bookkeeping.

It is to avoid the bookkeeping and to permit the water users who have title to the property to use it, that the bill has been introduced. It has been reported favorably by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and favorable reports on the bill have also been received from the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 8026) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE ARMORY BOARD, STATE OF UTAH

The bill (S. 3561) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the Armory Board, State of Utah, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in the year 1867 the Federal Government set aside in Salt Lake Valley a tract of land, which was known as Fort Douglas. After the end of World War II the Federal Government decided that that fort, one of the old Indian war forts, no longer would be maintained by it; and in 1946, the Federal Government transferred 260 acres of the reservation to the Veterans' Administration. On the 260 acres, the Veterans' Administration has constructed a very large neuropsychiatric hospital; but, obviously, 260 acres are not required in order to provide space for a hospital.

The National Guard of Utah has asked for 35 of the 260 acres, to be set aside as a site upon which it can build an armory and drill hall, supply warehouses, four motor vehicle storage buildings, and a maintenance shop. The purpose of the bill is, with proper provisions and restrictions, to transfer the 35 acres to the Utah State Armory Board, for the purpose of the construction of an armory.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am in sympathy with the purpose of the bill, particularly so since last year I introduced a similar bill regarding a veterans' facility in my own State.

However, the bill I introduced contained—and I believe such a provision is customary in the case of such bills—a reservation of the mineral rights to the Federal Government. I should like to have the Senator from Utah state his reaction to that suggestion.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no objection to having such a reservation included in the bill. Certainly it was not my intention to try to alienate the mineral rights of the United States Government.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "reservation" to insert "Fort Douglas Station."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I sent to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 21, before the word "contain", it is proposed to insert "shall reserve all mineral rights, including gas and oil, to the United States, and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I took up the bill with the office of the Senator from Utah; and the bill is in line with the so-called Morse formula, because—as I have said in the past, in the case of similar bills—in my judgment the Federal Government derives a great benefit in the field of national defense from the development of State guard activity of the type involved in this bill.

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 and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3561) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey, without monetary consideration and subject to the conditions in section 2 of this act, to the Armory Board, State of Utah, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of 35 acres of land, more or less, situated in the western end of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Fort Douglas Station, Salt Lake City, Utah, the exact legal description of which shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance authorized under the provisions of this act shall—

(a) provide that such tract shall not be alienated in whole or in part by the Armory Board and shall be used only for training, civic, and related purposes;

(b) provide that, if such tract is so used in any manner that, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or his designate, interferes with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital located on land contiguous to such tract, such interference shall cease immediately upon notice thereof to the Armory Board by the Administrator or his designate;

(c) provide that, if either of the conditions prescribed in clauses (a) and (b) of this section are violated, title to such tract shall revert to the United States; and

(d) shall reserve all mineral rights, including gas and oil, to the United States, and contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF MUSKOGEE, OKLA.—BILL ORDERED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 8983) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla., was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I request an explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested of Calendar 1807, House bill 8983.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, to be called at the conclusion of the call today.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 9709) to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this bill obviously is not calendar business. So I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

NICOLE GOLDMAN

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, at this point, while the majority leader is on the floor—and let me say I have spoken to him regarding the measure to which I shall now refer—I ask unanimous consent that Calendar 1698, House bill 7012, for the relief of Nicole Goldman, a bill to the consideration of which I objected at the last call of the calendar, be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7012?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, though I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, I want it to be understood—and I am sure the Senator fully agrees with me—that my action is not based on the merits of the bill. I have not had an opportunity to study it. I made no commitment on behalf of our Calendar Committee or anyone else, but I merely wish to extend to the Senator from Tennessee the courtesy of having called today a bill to which he objected at the previous call of the calendar.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I have also discussed the matter with the majority Calendar Committee, and have related to them the humane element involved in this case.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the light of all the circumstances involved in this case, I think the bill should be considered at this time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to state the reasons for my objection when the calendar was last called.

Perhaps in the eyes of some, the junior Senator from Tennessee has been arbitrary, but in the consideration of measures on the calendar it is necessary to have some broad rules. I have been objecting to the passage of bills which admit to this country female immigrants of fertile age who are feebleminded. I believe that is a proper protection for the United States. In this particular case there are unusual circumstances involved. As the case has been described to me, this young lady is not feebleminded in the usual sense of the word. She is not feebleminded by inheritance, but rather because of internment during the war in a camp in Germany. A head infection ensued, and the result is her present mental condition. It is the result of an infection, rather than an inherited feebleminded condition.

Her family is now here. They vouch for her care. Without her admission to this country her care would not be vouched for.

Because of the unusual circumstances, and because the case calls for humane treatment, I withdraw my objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7012) for the relief of Nicole Goldman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTION OF AMENDATORY REPAYMENT CONTRACT WITH THE PINE RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, COLORADO

The bill (H. R. 7466) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory repayment contract with the Pine River Irrigation District, Colorado, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, Calendar 1809, House bill 7466, represents one of a series of actions taken by the Department of the Interior in amending contracts for repayment of construction charges. Over the years, since the enactment of the Reclamation Act of 1902, there have been a number of such instances. They were more frequent in the earlier years. As experience has been gained, such cases have become less frequent.

Congress has recognized the condition, and has provided authority for the Secretary of the Interior, when a contract made with a district for repayment of charges has been found to have been based upon erroneous information as to the character of the land, the kind of crops a particular land will produce, the capital invested, or the ability of the water user to repay, to amend the contract. Whenever errors are made, the present law permits the Secretary of the Interior to amend the contract on the basis of an offer to the district, which may or may not be accepted. In this instance, such an offer was made to the Pine River Irrigation District in Colorado, and by an election, the offer was accepted.

In this case there is more at issue than merely an error with respect to the type and characteristics of the soil. There was a misunderstanding between the district and the Government with respect to what should be reimbursable and what was nonreimbursable. The question has been before the Congress on a number of occasions. The present contract determines that question, because an election has been held and an amount has been agreed upon. The present contract provides for the payment of the reimbursable portion so agreed upon, except for one-sixth of it, and as to that, it applies to portions of the reclamation project which are located within an Indian reservation, and are therefore nonreimbursable under general reclamation law.

Mr. GORE. As I understand the bill, it reduces the obligation of repayment by $250,000. Do I correctly understand?

Mr. CORDON. It reduces the amount that was contended for by that sum.

Mr. GORE. What does the Senator mean by "contended for"?

Mr. CORDON. I refer to that portion of my explanation with respect to the contention between the district and the Interior Department as to the reimbursable figure.

Mr. GORE. The Senator means that there was a disagreement between the reclamation district and the Government?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. As I read the report, the Department acknowledges that the contention of the reclamation district is not without merit, though it does not concede its correctness.

Mr. CORDON. One might place that interpretation upon it. The Department agrees that, under the circumstances, and for the purpose of obtaining a settlement which will avoid the necessity of litigation, this particular figure, in the opinion of the Department, represents a sound basis for reimbursement.

Mr. GORE. Even so, the Department does not recommend against the bill.

Mr. CORDON. No. The Department is in favor of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7466) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8027) to amend the act of March 6, 1952, to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3114) to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. This is obvicusly not a calendar bill, although I agree that it is a very fine piece of legislation. It should be brought up on motion and debated. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

PURCHASE OF OR PAYMENT FOR REMOVAL OF IMPROVEMENTS ON PUBLIC LANDS IN THE PALISADES PROJECT AREA, IDAHO

The bill (H. R. 6786) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Palisades project area, Palisades reclamation project, Idaho, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I notice on the floor the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. I wonder whether he will explain the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The report of the committee explains the purpose of the bill, which is to authorize the Secretary of the interior to make payment in two specific cases to persons who in good faith placed improvements on Government lands which will be inundated by the Palisades Reservoir, now under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. As introduced, the bill was general in nature. Upon advice from the Department that there were only two cases involved, the bill was amended to so limit it. In involves a payment of $400 to one person, and a payment of $3,000 to another person. The Department of the Interior makes no objection to the enactment of the bill and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection.

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

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. GORE. From the Senator's explanation it seems clear that these citizens for whose benefit the bill is sought to be passed suffered injury either through misrepresentation on the part of an agent of the Federal Government or because of an erroneous survey. Is that correct?

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct. The report states that in the second case an inaccurate survey was made by a Forest Service ranger at the time the house was built. The Senator is entirely correct.

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

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would the Senator from Idaho object to an amendment to place a prohibition on attorneys' fees?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I would not.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. 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 LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, immediately before the period in line 2, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That no part of any payment provided for herein shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection therewith, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6786) was read the third time and passed.

INTERSTATE COMPACT BETWEEN KENTUCKY AND VIRGINIA RELATING TO THE BREAKS INTERSTATE PARK

The bill (S. 3168) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the creation, development, and operation by the States of Kentucky and Virginia of a park to be known as The Breaks Interstate Park was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I notice on the floor the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. He is one of the coauthors of the bill. I wonder whether he will be kind enough to explain the bill and the necessity for it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the bill proposes to grant the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the creation, development, and operation by the States of Kentucky and Virginia of a park to be known as The Breaks Interstate Park. This compact has been accomplished pursuant to authority granted by an act of the 83d Congress, Public Law 275, approved August 14, 1953, wherein the 2 States were authorized to negotiate and enter into a compact. The interstate compact now before the Senate is the result of that authorization, and has been approved by the Legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky.

The Department of the Interior, in commenting on this proposed legislation, states that such a compact should lead to the development and operation in the public interest of a desirable interstate park. The proposed park area possesses high scenic qualities and has considerable tourist appeal. The Department further comments that every encouragement should be given to the States of Kentucky and Virginia to develop this park area so as to serve that particular region.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3168) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the creation, development, and operation by the States of Kentucky and Virginia of a park to be known as The Breaks Interstate Park which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to The Breaks Interstate Park Compact between the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the Commonwealth of Virginia. Such compact reads as follows:

"BREAKS INTERSTATE PARK COMPACT

"Pursuant to authority granted by an act of the 83d Congress of the United States, being Public Law 275, approved August 14, 1953, the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the Commonwealth of Virginia do hereby covenant and agree as follows:

"Article I

"The Commonwealth of Kentucky and the Commonwealth of Virginia agree to create, develop and operate an interstate park to be known as The Breaks Interstate Park, which shall be located along the Russell Fork of the Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy River and on adjacent areas in Pike County, Ky., and Dickenson and Buchanan Counties, Va. Said park shall be of such area and of such character as may be determined by the Commission created by this compact.

"Article II

"There is hereby created The Breaks Interstate Park Commission, which shall be a body corporate with the powers and duties set forth herein and such additional powers as may be conferred upon it by subsequent action of the appropriate authorities of Kentucky and Virginia. The Commission shall consist of 3 commissioners from each of the 2 States, each of whom shall be a citizen of the State he shall represent. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Governor. Vacancies shall be filled by the Governor for the unexpired term. The term of one of the first commissioners appointed shall be for 2 years, the term of another for 3 years, and the term of the third for 4 years. Their successors shall be appointed for terms of 4 years each. Each Commissioner shall hold office until his successor is appointed and qualified. An officer or employee of the State, a political subdivision or the United States Government may be appointed a Commissioner under this act.

"Article III

"The Commission created herein shall be a joint corporate instrumentality of both the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the Commonwealth of Virginia for the purpose of effecting the objects of this compact, and shall be deemed to be performing governmental functions of the two States in the performance of its duties hereunder. The Commission shall have power to sue and be sued, to contract and be contracted with, to use a common seal and to make and adopt suitable bylaws, rules, and regulations. The Commission shall have the authority to acquire by gift, purchase or otherwise real estate and other property, and to dispose of such real estate and other property. Each Commonwealth agrees that it will exercise the right of eminent domain to acquire property located within each Commonwealth required by the Commission to effectuate the purposes of this compact.

"Article IV

"The Commission shall select from among its members a chairman and a vice chairman, and may select from among its members a secretary and treasurer or may designate other persons to fill these positions. It may appoint, and at its pleasure remove or discharge, such officers and legal, clerical, expert and other assistants and employees as may be required to carry the provisions of this compact into effect, and shall fix and determine their duties, qualifications and compensation. It may establish and maintain one or more offices for the transaction of its business, and may meet at any time or place. A majority of the commissioners present shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The commissioners shall serve without compensation, but shall be paid their expenses incurred in and incident to the performance of their duties. They shall take the oath of office required of officers of their respective States.

"Article V

"Each Commonwealth agrees that the officers and departments of each will be authorized to do all things falling within their respective jurisdictions necessary or incidental to the carrying out of the compact in every particular. The Commission shall be entitled to the services of any State officer or agency in the same manner as any other department or agency of this State. The Commission shall keep accurate records, showing in full its receipts and disbursements, and said records shall be open at any reasonable time to the inspection of such representatives of the two Commonwealths as may be duly constituted for that purpose. The Commission shall submit annually and at other times as required such reports as may be required by the laws of each Commonwealth or by the Governor thereof.

"Article VI

"The cost of acquiring land and other property required in the development and operation of The Breaks Interstate Park and constructing, maintaining, and operating improvements and facilities therein and equipping same may be defrayed by funds received from appropriations, gifts, the use of money received as fees or charges for the use of said park and facilities, or by the issuance of revenue bonds, or by a combination of such sources of funds. The Commission may charge for admission to said park, or make other charges deemed appropriate by it and shall have the use of funds so received for park purposes. The Commission is authorized to issue revenue bonds, which shall not be obligations of either State, pursuant to procedures which shall be in substantial compliance with the provisions of laws of either or both States governing the issuance of revenue bonds by governmental agencies.

"Article VII

"All money, securities and other property, real and personal, received by way of gift or otherwise or revenue received from its operations may be retained by the Commission and used for the development, maintenance, and operation of the park or for other park purposes.

"The Commission shall not pledge the credit of either Commonwealth except by and with the authority of the general assembly thereof.

"Article VIII

"This compact may be amended from time to time by the concurrent action of the two Commonwealth parties hereto."

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to The Breaks Interstate Park compact."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, there is a companion House bill to the bill just passed by the Senate.

The companion bill is H. R. 8549, granting the consent of the Congress to The Breaks Interstate Park compact. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 8549, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 8549. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the procedure suggested is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend my distinguished colleague and good friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], for his initiation of this proposal, which is very important to the State of Kentucky and to Virginia.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 8549) granting the consent of Congress to The Breaks Interstate Park compact was considered, ordered to a third heading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, in view of the passage of H. R. 8549, which is a companion bill to S. 3168, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which S. 3168, granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the creation, development, and operation by the States of Kentucky and Virginia of a park to be known as The Breaks Interstate Park, was passed be reconsidered.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that S. 3168 be indefinitely postponed.

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

INVESTIGATION OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS

The resolution (S. Res. 271) providing for an investigation of critical raw materials by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was announced as next in order.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without amendment, and subsequently had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 3, line 5, after the numerals "1953", to insert "and Senate Resolution 171, agreed to January 26, 1954", and in line 9, after the word "committee", to insert "for obligations incurred during the period July 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955, inclusive", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed (1) to (continue) investigate and study the accessibility of critical raw materials to the United States in time of war and for the expanding economy in time of peace; (2) to make a full and complete investigation and study of new developments and discovery of matetrials including synthetics which may be used as substitutes and replacements of critical materials, and further to study the progress of research programs, pilot-plant operations, processing and beneficiating methods of critical materials and minerals including fuels; (3) to make a full and complete investigation and study of the best means, methods, and devices to foster the greatest measure of self-sufficiency of critical materials that can be produced within the United States and the Western Hemisphere and to expand and develop the strategic minerals industry; (4) to make a full and complete investigation, and study the status of the stockpile program, its goals, methods, and amounts of acquisition, storage, warehousing, and rotation programs; (5) to make a full and complete investigation and study the available fuel reserves of the United States and the

Government regulations affecting such resources and to formulate and recommend a national fuel policy to assure maximum availability to meet the needs of the peacetime economy and for the national security in time of war; and (6) to report to the Senate at the earliest possible date, not later than January 31, 1955, the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, or of qualified private organizations and individuals. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $34,000, together with any unexpended balances remaining from the authority of Senate Resolution 143, agreed to July 20, 1953, and Senate Resolution 171, agreed to January 26, 1954, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee for obligations incurred during the period July 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955, inclusive.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that there is a misprint in the resolution on page 2, line 7. The word "minerals" should read "materials."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada offer that as an amendment?

Mr. MALONE. I ask that the resolution be amended on page 2, line 7, by striking out the word "minerals" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "materials."

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

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 270) to amend Senate Resolution 225 of the 83d Congress relative to investigation of employee welfare and pension funds under collective bargaining agreements, by increasing funds therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare without amendment, and subsequently had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$201,100" and insert "$125,150", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 225, 83d Congress, agreed to April 28, 1954 (authorizing an investigation of employee welfare and pension funds), is amended (1) by deleting "funds under collective-bargaining agreements" in the first sentence of the first section and inserting in lieu thereof "plans and funds subject to collective-bargaining", and (2) by deleting "$75,000" in section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof "$125,150."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STANDARDIZATION OF RATES ON HOUSEHOLD GOODS SHIPPED BY THE GOVERNMENT—BILL PASSED OVER TO NEXT CALENDAR CALL

The bill (S. 904) to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if we could have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The purpose of the bill is to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees.

Section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act provides special shipping privileges of many varieties to the Federal Government. Among them is the privilege of having household goods moved by the lowest bidder irrespective of the published rates of common carriers. This amendment would not eliminate bidding, but it would prohibit rates lower than published rates.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Gladly.

Mr. GORE. Why should rates lower than the published rates be denied the Government if the Government is able to contract for the shipment of household goods at such rates? I do not quite understand the necessity for the bill, or why the Government should be prohibited from contracting for the shipment of household goods in the most economical manner. Was the Senator going to explain why that is the case?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I was going to continue with the explanation of the bill. However, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that, while the bill was considered by the subcommittee of which I am chairman, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is on the floor, is the author of the measure. When I finish my remarks I shall be very happy to have the Senator from Colorado join in a further explanation of the one feature of the bill to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred.

In the Transportation Act of 1940, section 321, the Congress stated in substance that it was no longer necessary to secure bids from lawfully operating motor carriers; however, this left a purely permissive situation under section 22 for the obtaining of bids.

In 1946 the 79th Congress adopted Public Law 600. The net effect of such law was to remove the Federal Government as shipper of household goods for its employees of civilian departments and substituted therefor an allowance for such expense. Public Law 600 has proven successfully but only in its limited application to civilian departments of government.

This same Congress adopted Public Law 604 providing that household goods shipments may be made for members of the armed services by rail, water, or van without regard to comparative costs. Public Law 604 was adopted at the request of the armed services which apparently was seeking a lawful method for transporting household goods of its personnel without the requirement of bids or section 22 quotations. However, and again because of the remaining privilege under section 22, conflict, confusion and destructive competition have continued to the detriment of the members of the armed services whose prized household goods and effects are being offered for transportation to the lowest bidder without any responsibility for safe carriage by the Government to the owner. I would paraphrase that by saying, without due consideration for the safety and the manner in which such goods have been and are being handled.

The amendment to section 22, among other things, will have the effect of accomplishing the purpose of Public Law 604 and will eliminate the confusion caused by the conflict between section 22 and Public Laws 600 and 604.

The amendment will not deprive the Government of using the several levels of rates lawfully on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission applying to moving services, nor will it deprive the Government of its right of appeal to the ICC as to the reasonableness of any such rate structures.

It was thought, Mr. President, that when the Interstate Commerce Commission established the rate schedules on the various and sundry classes of goods, after due notice and full hearings, then, in order to insure proper and orderly transportation methods, even under competition, we should have this type of an amendment to the act. It was the consensus of opinion of those who heard the matter in the subcommittee that this change should be made.

I would say candidly to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that some questions were raised as to the propriety of not giving the Government the right to have reduced rates without the benefit of following the schedule of rates published by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but it was also shown fairly definitely that complaints have been increasing by the thousand with respect to damages which have been incurred by the present type of handling. The claims in 1952 developed to a point where they amounted to half a million dollars, to say nothing of the thousands and thousands of claims because of the redtape involved in going through the proper legal channels to recover.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Are the carriers not insured? It seems that the Government could recover damages from the insurers of the carriers.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I think they are insured for a very nominal amount of money. If they want additional insurance they have to furnish it. It is a nominal insurance, as it is with reference to any public carrier.

Mr. GORE. I had not understood that public carriers could get by with only nominal insurance. I thought it was more substantial than that.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will look at the published rates of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I think he will understand what I have in mind. The ordinary passenger declares a value of approximately $100, or less. If he declares a higher value he pays a higher price. Sometimes, even by contract, recovery is limited to 5 percent of the value. The fact is that the Government is paying these claims, and a bureaucracy has been built up within the Pentagon solely for the purpose of handling the claims. It is a very expensive operation.

Mr. GORE. To illustrate the magnitude of this problem and to illustrate, also, to what extent the Government is moving employees about the country and transporting their household goods, one-sixth of the huge transportation involved is transportation paid for by the United States Government.

Mr. BUTLER. I am certain that the Senator does not want to advocate on the floor of the Senate that the large users should have a cut rate.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have some time left of my 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Tennessee would not advocate on the floor of the Senate that because a person is a large user he should have a cut rate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am not at the moment advocating anything. I am trying, first, to find a justification for the bill and, second, to try to determine whether it is of a sufficiently controversial character that it should not be passed on the call of the consent calendar.

Mr. BUTLER. The bill involves little expense. I do not believe the cost would be more than a million dollars a year, and we would get rid of a much greater expense in the form of payrolls in connection with claims which are piling up and becoming more numerous all the time. The bill would require the Government of the United States to pay what an ordinary individual pays when it comes to moving household goods.

Mr. GORE. What does the Senator mean by an ordinary individual? An individual may have a very small shipment, and the Government may have going from the city of Washington to the city of Philadelphia a rather large shipment of household goods.

Mr. BUTLER. A householder could not in any sense have a large shipment. Those affected by the bill are individual persons; they are householders; they are Government employees.

Mr. GORE. What I am trying to say is that there may be a shipment of household goods belonging to several householders going at one time from Washington to Philadelphia.

Mr. BUTLER. That is perfectly true.

Mr. GORE. Should we deny the Government the right to make the best bargain possible, so long as it contracts with a certified and licensed public carrier with the necessary insurance?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think the Government should pay less than the published rate simply because it has a large number of shipments. I do not think the Government should pay a lesser rate than that which is paid by other persons using the same service. Furthermore, as it has been pointed out by the Senator from Kansas, the contract is made with persons who are irresponsible in the sense that they have to take the shipments at such a low price that the goods arrive damaged and large claims arise out of the shipments.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has said the bill would save a million dollars a year in damage claims——

Mr. BUTLER. No; I said it would cost probably a million dollars, but, on the other side, we could deduct the cost of handling the numerous claims.

Mr. GORE. The report says the Defense Department has estimated it would cost that Department alone $11,600,000.

Mr. BUTLER. I refer that question back to the Senator from Kansas. I think those figures have been shown to be entirely erroneous and that they have been picked out of the air.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say, in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Tennessee that at one phase of the hearings officials of the armed services testified that it would cost approximately $11 million. A year previously, they had testified that the cost would be approximately $1 million. I might say very candidly to the Senator that when the hearing on the bill was conducted, and the matter was checked into, they could not substantiate in any degree the $11 million figure, which led the committee to believe that the $1 million figure was somewhere nearly in line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee object?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as the author of the bill, I feel strongly that it proposes good legislation. It is similar to a bill which passed the Senate previously, in 1952, but did not reach the House in time for passage by the House and final enactment.

There are these facts with respect to the matter which appeal strongly to me: First, I do not know why the Government should have any better rate than an individual has. Congress has created the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine rates, and the Commission determines rates by holding hearings in a public way, to ascertain what the rates shall be. The rates are then established for everybody, small shippers and large shippers. Also, there are carload rates and less-than-carload rates. They are established by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The bill would also help the small trucker. Is it not true that the large trucker can take these shipments at a loss? He can simply advertise that he handles Government business, and that will cut the small trucker out completely, because he cannot compete and do business at a cut rate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That, of course, is true, but I cannot see the fairness in having one rate for the Government and another rate for a private citizen. The rates should be the same for everyone. It is said that there should be a differential in favor of the Government because of the volume of Government shipments. The shipments of household goods are made individually. The Government does not hold shipments of household goods until there is a sufficient amount for a carload; it proceeds to ship household goods on an individual-shipment basis. So I cannot see any force to the argument that the Government should receive a lower rate because the Government does more business.

Another point which should be emphasized is the injustice which is done to the Government employee. He has nothing to say about his shipment. Someone advertises that he can do the work, and then he is cut down to the very lowest contract price which the Government can get. As a result, the carrier does not give the proper protection to the shipper, and the employee of the Government suffers because of the inferior service.

The committee has been advised that there are claims amounting to $400,000 or $500,000 as the result of bad condition of or injury to household goods, caused by damage which has been done to them in shipment. As has been stated by other Senators, there is in the Pentagon a very large group of employees who are busy handling claims of this character and making contracts.

If the truth actually were known, I think it would be found that the Government is losing money through this operation. The victim is the person who owns the household goods, because his goods are being destroyed by inferior service. These shipments do not receive the same kind of attention which the regular carriers of household goods give to shipments for which they are responsible.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. It used to be said in the old days that three moves were equal to a fire. In this case, one move is equal to a fire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true. Three moves were the equivalent of a fire. If an employee has the Government arrange for moving his household goods under the cheap rates which are now paid, of course, one move, as the Senator says, probably would be equal to a fire.

I think the bill is perfectly reasonable. If the rates on household goods are too high, the matter should be taken care of through the regular channels in the ICC, and the Commission should determine the rates. The Commission has determined rates in the past, and has found what reasonable rates are.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am not prepared to object to the passage of the bill, but serious questions are involved. Senators have said that they do not understand why the Government should enjoy one rate, and the citizen another. That argument has appeal, but it can be carried too far. For instance, the Government has one rate of interest on the borrowing of money, while a citizen cannot borrow money at that rate.

In view of the fact that the general counsel of the Army, Mr. John G. Adams, has registered objection to the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over at this time, but to be called at the next call of the calendar. That will afford time for a study of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

PRIVATE FINANCING OF NEW SHIP CONSTRUCTION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3219) to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to facilitate private financing of new ship construction was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. BUTLER. The purpose of the bill is to facilitate private financing in new ship construction. The calendar indicates that a report, Report No. 1804, accompanies the bill. As a matter of fact, the report has not yet been printed.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over, but that it be considered on the next call of the calendar, not as having been passed over, but as a new item on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the request of the Senator from Maryland that the bill be included in the next call of the calendar?

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, and without objection will be included in the next call of the calendar.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

The bill (S. 3713) to give effect to the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. I ask for an explanation.

Mr. DUFF. The purpose of the bill is to give effect to the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952.

The convention provides for the preservation of the fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean through the cooperation of the three great fishing nations of the area—the United States, Canada, and Japan. As with our other fishery conventions, the treaty calls for joint study by the three nations of fisheries of common concern in order to determine the conservation measures required to maintain such fisheries at their maximum sustained level of productivity. It provides further for the recommendation of such measures for adoption by the signatory governments. The North Pacific Convention goes further, however, than our other fishery conventions. Concerning itself with some of the most strictly regulated fisheries in the world, it introduces the new principle of abstention into international conservation practice. This principle is, in very brief terms, that a nation ought to abstain from newly entering a fishery if the stock of fish concerned is already fully fished and is regulated and conserved by another nation or nations. Under this principle, it was agreed that Japan should abstain from fishing salmon, halibut, and herring in certain waters off the coasts of North America, and that Canada should abstain from fishing salmon in certain waters off the Bering Sea. In return, the United States and Canada, with reference to the Japanese abstention, agreed to continue necessary conservation regimes with respect to the stocks of fish concerned.

The convention contemplated the establishment of an international commission composed of 3 national sections, each of not more than 4 persons, to be appointed by the respective governments. Each national section has one vote, and all decisions of the Commission must be unanimous. The four United States Commissioners already have been appointed as is also true of the Commissioners from Canada and Japan. It is understood that implementing legislation, also, already has been enacted by Canada, and that Japan is prepared to carry out, and is carrying out, its obligations under the terms of the convention.

The implementing legislation is similar in almost all respects to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 which implemented the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, and with other legislation to implement similar fisheries conventions.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3713) to give effect to the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952, which has been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, line 22, after the word "five", to strike out "or" and insert "nor"; on page 3, line 19, after the word "individual", to insert "appointed from private life"; on page 4, line 9, after the word "Commission", to strike out "to amend the Annex"; on page 9, line 12, after "haec verba", to strike out "as long as Alaska shall remain a Territory", and at the beginning of line 14 to insert "of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I send 2 amendments to the desk and ask to have them stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the Senator from Tennessee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 20, after the word "Commissioner", it is proposed to strike out the word "appointed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 21, after the figure "3", it is proposed to strike out "(a)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "North Pacific Fisheries Act of 1954."

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term—

(a) "Convention" means the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean with a protocol relating thereto signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952;

(b) "Commission" means the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission provided for by article II of the Convention;

(c) "United States section" means the United States Commissioners to the Commission;

(d) "Convention area" means all waters, other than Territorial waters, of the North Pacific Ocean which for the purposes of this act shall include the adjacent seas;

(e) "Fishing vessel" means any vessel engaged in catching fish or processing or transporting fish loaded on the high seas, or any vessel outfitted for such activities.

SEC. 3. The United States shall be represented on the Commission by not more than four Commissioners to be appointed by the President, to serve as such during his pleasure, and to receive no compensation for their services as Commissioners. Of such Commissioners—

(a) one shall be an official of the United States Government; and

(b) each of the others shall be a person residing in a State or Territory, the residents of which maintain a substantial fishery in the convention area.

SEC. 4. (a) The United States section shall appoint an advisory committee composed of not less than 5 nor more than 20 members and shall fix the terms of office thereof, such members to be selected both from the various groups participating in the fisheries covered by the convention and from the fishery agencies of the States or Territories, the residents of which maintain a substantial fishery in the convention area.

(b) Any or all members of the advisory committee may attend all sessions of the Commission except executive sessions.

(c) The advisory committee shall be invited to all nonexecutive meetings of the United States section and at such meetings shall be granted opportunity to examine and to be heard on all proposed programs of study and investigation, reports, and recommendations of the United States section.

(d) The members of the advisory committee shall receive no compensation for their services as such members. On approval by the United States section, not more than three members of the committee, designated by the committee, may be paid for transportation expenses and per diem incident to attendance at meetings of the Commission or of the United States section.

SEC. 5. Service of any individual appointed from private life as a United States Commissioner pursuant to section 3, or as a member of the advisory committee appointed pursuant to section 4 (a), shall not be considered

as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, and 434 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from acting or receiving compensation in respect to matters directly relating to the convention, this act, or regulations issued pursuant to this act.

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to (a) accept or reject, on behalf of the United States, recommendations made by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of article III, section 1, of the convention, and recommendations made by the Commission in pursuance of the provisions of the protocol to the convention; and (b) act for the United States in the selection of persons by the contracting parties to compose the special committee provided by the protocol to the convention.

SEC. 7. Any agency of the of the Federal Government is authorized, upon request of the Commission, to cooperate in the conduct of scientific and other programs, and to furnish, on a reimbursable basis, facilities and personnel for the purpose of assisting the Commission in carrying out its duties under the convention. Such agency may accept reimbursement from the Commission.

SEC. 8. (a) The provisions of the convention and this act relating to abstention from fishing in certain areas by the nationals and vessels of one or more of the contracting parties shall be enforced by the Coast Guard in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Customs.

(b) For such purposes any Coast Guard officer, any officer of the Fish and Wildlife Service, or any other person authorized to enforce the provisions of the convention and this act referred to in subsection (a) of this section may go on board any fishing vessel of Canada or Japan found in waters in which Canada or Japan has agreed by or under the convention to abstain from exploitation of one or more stocks of fish, and, when he has reasonable cause to believe that such vessel is engaging in operations in violation of the provisions of the convention, may, without warrant or other process, inspect the equipment, books, documents, and other articles on such vessel and question the persons on board, and for these purposes may hail and stop such vessel, and use all necessary force to compel compliance.

(c) Whenever any such officer has reasonable cause to believe that any person on any fishing vessel of Canada or Japan is violating, or immediately prior to the boarding of such vessel was violating, the provisions of the convention referred to in subsection (a) of this section, such person, and any such vessel employed in such violation shall be detained and shall be delivered as promptly as practicable to an authorized official of the nation to which they belong in accordance with the provisions of the convention.

(d) Any officer of the Coast Guard, any officer of the Fish and Wildlife Service, or any other person authorized to enforce the provisions of the convention and this act referred to in subsection (a) of this section, may be directed to attend as witnesses and to produce such available records and files or duly certified copies thereof as may be necessary to the prosecution in Canada or Japan of any violation of the provisions of the convention or any Canadian or Japanese law for the enforcement thereof when requested by the appropriate authorities of Canada or Japan respectively.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior may designate officers of the States and Territories of the United States to enforce the provisions of the convention and this act insofar as they pertain to fishing vessels of the United States and the persons on board such vessels.

SEC. 10. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person or fishing vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to engage in the catching of any stock of fish from which the United States may agree to abstain in the waters specified for such abstention as set forth in the annex to the convention, or to load, process, possess, or transport any such fish or fish products processed therefrom in the said waters, or to land in a port of the United States any fish so caught, loaded, possessed, or transported or any fish products processed therefrom.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person or fishing vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States knowingly to load, process, possess, or transport any fish specified in subsection (a) of this section or any fish products processed therefrom in the territorial waters of the United States or in any waters of the convention area in addition to those specified in subsection (a) of this section, or to land in a port of the United States any such fish or fish products.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person or fishing vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States knowingly to load, process, possess, or transport in the convention area or in the territorial waters of the United States any fish taken by a national of Canada or Japan from a stock of fish from which Canada or Japan respectively has agreed to abstain as set forth in the annex to the convention or any fish products processed therefrom, or to land such fish or fish products in a port of the United States.

(d) It shall be unlawful for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to aid or abet in the taking of fish by a national or fishing vessel of Canada or of Japan from a stock of fish from which Canada or Japan has respectively agreed to abstain as set forth in the annex of the convention.

(e) It shall be unlawful for the master or owner or any person in charge of any fishing vessel of the United States to refuse to permit the duly authorized officials of the United States, Canada, or Japan to board such vessel or inspect its equipment, books, documents, or other articles or question the persons on board in accordance with the provision of the convention, or to obstruct such officials in the execution of such duties.

SEC. 11. (a) Any person violating subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 10 of this act shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000, and for such offense the court may order forefeited, in whole or in part, the first concerned in the offense, or the fishing gear involved in such fishing, or both, or the monetary value thereof. Such forfeited fish or fishing gear shall be disposed of in accordance with the direction of the court.

(b) Any person violating subsection (d) of section 10 of this act shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000.

(c) Any person violating subsection (e) of section 10 of this act shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000 and be imprisoned for not more than 1 year or both, and for such offense the court may order forfeited, in whole or in part the fish and fishing gear on board the vessel, or both, or the monetary value thereof. Such fish and fishing gear shall be disposed of in accordance with the direction of the court.

(d) Section 10 of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1067; 16 U. S. C. 989) shall not apply to violations for which penalties are provided in this section.

SEC. 12. For the effective execution of this act, sections 7 (a) and (b), 9, 10, and 11 of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1067; 16 U. S. C. 986, 988, 989, 990) shall be deemed to be incorporated herein in haec verba as long as Alaska shall remain a Territory provided that regulations authorized by section 7 (a) of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act shall be adopted by the Secretary of the Interior on consultation with the United States Section and shall apply only to stocks of fish in the convention area contiguous to the territorial water of Alaska.

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes and provisions of the convention and this act, including—

(1) necessary travel expenses of the United States Commissioners without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Travel Expense Act of 1949. or section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 73b); and

(2) the United States share of the joint expenses of the Commission; provided that the Commissioners shall not, with respect to commitments concerning the United States share of the joint expenses of the Commission, be subject to the provisions of section 262 (b) of title 22 of the United States Code insofar as they limit the authority of United States representatives to international organizations with respect to such commitments.

(b) Such funds as shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for research and related activities shall be expended to carry out the program of the Commission in accordance with recommendations of the United States Section.

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons shall not be affected thereby.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE HOG ISLAND TRACT BY THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

The bill (S. 3630) to permit the city of Philadelphia to further develop the Hog Island tract as an air, rail, and marine terminal by directing the Secretary of Commerce to release the city of Philadelphia from the fulfillment of certain conditions contained in the existing deed which restrict further development was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation.

Mr. DUFF. The purpose of the bill is to relieve the city of Philadelphia from certain obligations, including payment of an annual ground rent, contained in the deed of July 23, 1930, whereby the United States transferred to Philadelphia title to a tract of approximately 950 acres of land, known as Hog Island.

Hog Island was bought from the United States for a total price fixed at $3 million. A downpayment of $450,000 was made, and the balance secured by an annual ground rent of $76,500 for 10 years and $153,000 per year thereafter. This ground rent must be paid until the balance of $2,550,000 is extinguished. Since 1930, the United States has received a total of about $3 million, including the downpayment and annual ground rents, from the city of Philadelphia for Hog Island.

If the city had not purchased Hog Island and paid the ground rent continuously, or if the city had occupied the land pursuant to a lease or permit, it would probably have obtained this land without any payment at all as authorized by section 16 of the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 179, May 13, 1946). However,

in section 16 of the Federal Airport Act, Congress made no provision for transfer of interests such as the United States has retained in this instance, and the proposed legislation is necessary to authorize the release sought by the city of Philadelphia.

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

Mr. DUFF. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The General Accounting Office has entered an objection because it does not look favorably upon the surrender of property or rights of the United States without appropriate benefit accruing to the United States therefrom. Can the Senator give an explanation of what rights, and if there are rights, if they are sufficient, which will accrue to the United States Government?

Mr. DUFF. The answer to that question was given by Mr. Robert B. Murray, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce, for Transportation, who testified before our committee and said that they disagree with the General Accounting Office, not on principle, but on the facts. The facts are that an immense benefit would accrue to the Government by virtue of further improvements of an airport which is so necessary to the national defense as is the airport in Philadelphia. Already the city of Philadelphia has expended, in the development of the present airport, in excess of $30 million, and it is desirous of making further large improvements to the airport. It is not only one of the most important airports in the eastern part of the United States, but one of the largest.

In order to raise funds for various further improvements, including lengthening the runways, it is necessary that the city of Philadelphia raise further funds. Under the laws of Pennsylvania, there exists what is known as an authority act, whereby a municipal subdivision of the State, under certain conditions, and based on the value of the property borrowed upon, can increase its indebtedness for the purpose of making improvements. With the present outstanding claim of the Federal Government, it is impossible for the city to borrow the money in that manner in order to make the improvements.

It was also testified that if the bill were passed, the city, pursuant to the method I have explained would be prepared immediately to make further improvements to the extent of $10 million, in addition to the $30 million already expended, which improvements would accrue to the benefit of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3630) to permit the city of Philadelphia to further develop the Hog Island tract as an air, rail, and marine terminal by directing the Secretary of Commerce to release the city of Philadelphia from the fulfillment of certain conditions contained in the existing deed which restrict further development, which has been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "conditions", to strike out "of" and insert "for the benefit of the United States set forth in", and on page 2, line 9, after the word "trusts", to insert "for the benefit of the United States", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to release the city of Philadelphia from the fulfillment of any and all conditions for the benefit of the United States set forth in a deed of the United States, acting through the United States Shipping Board, dated the 23d day of July 1930, relating to a tract of land, known as Hog Island, situated partly in the township of Tinicum in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania and partly in the 40th ward of the city of Philadelphia, comprising 951 acres more or less; and to execute in proper form a full and complete release and discharge of the yearly ground rent reserved to the United States under and pursuant to said deed, and relieving the city of Philadelphia from the fulfillment of any and all covenants, conditions, and trusts for the benefit of the United States set forth in said deed.

SEC. 2. The execution of the aforesaid release shall be made without consideration therefor and upon condition that the aforesaid tract shall be held, used, and developed as and for an air, rail, and marine terminal for the promotion and furtherance of the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States, and for industrial purposes related thereto: *Provided*, That the premises shall not be disposed of by the city of Philadelphia by conveyance or sale, except in furtherance of the public purposes herein set forth. The release shall contain a further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency the United States shall have the right to enter upon the premises and use the same or any part thereof owned by the city of Philadelphia for a period not to exceed the duration of such state of war or national emergency plus 6 months, and upon cessation of such use said premises shall revert to the city of Philadelphia: *Provided however*, That the United States shall be responsible during the period of such use for the maintenance of all of the property so used, and shall pay a fair rental for the use of any structures or other improvements which have been added thereto, said rental to include all debt service charges or other obligations arising out of the financing of all structures or improvements on the aforesaid premises.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOANS BY THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 3339) to authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make loans of the type formerly made by the Land Bank Commissioner was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I request an explanation of the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as the record discloses, the senior Senator from Kansas is a cosponsor of this measure, together with the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The bill authorizes the Farm Credit Administration to make until June 30, 1959, loans of the type formerly made by the Land Bank Commissioner. The authority for such loans expired on July 1, 1947. In addition, the bill would make the maximum amount of the loans $15,000, instead of $7,500.

Second, the bill would liberalize the provision for deferring the principal installments.

Third, the bill would permit the interest rate on the extension of loans to be continued at the same rate applicable to the loans.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. As I have listened to the explanation being made by the able Senator from Kansas, I wonder why it is necessary to revive secondary mortgage availability to the farmers during this period. The program expired, as I believe the Senator from Kansas said, in 1947. Why is it necessary in 1954 to revive that program?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I may say, for the benefit of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has just arrived on the floor, that the Senator from Tennessee has requested a statement of the reason for the necessity of this proposed legislation, when, as a matter of fact, the authority to make loans of this type expired on July 1, 1947.

Mr. GORE. I may say that I was struck by the dates involved and by the fact that, heretofore, farmers have not been in particular need of secondary mortgages. However, now they seem to be found necessary. I was requesting an explanation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that at the time when trouble arose in connection with the livestock industry, a year or so ago, livestock prices dropped very drastically. Feed prices did not drop. As a result, many cattlemen and others were caught in difficulty.

It is anticipated that if the drought continues in southern Colorado, central Texas, all of eastern New Mexico, parts of the western section of Kansas, and the panhandle of Oklahoma, stockmen and farmers who have exhausted their present credit facilities will have a great deal of trouble arranging for loans. The authority provided by this measure will not necessarily have to be exercised; but many years ago the Land Bank Commissioner type of loan was found to be extremely useful.

At the present time there is no need for the enactment of this measure. It happens to be my opinion, however, that if the drought continues in the areas where there now has been drought for 4 years, the farmers and stockmen will be in need of additional types of financial aid and credit.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I understood we had special programs for drought relief. I shall not oppose the bill if the farmers are in such distressed condition, whether because of prices or the inadequacy of the farm program or because of the drought.

I am willing to extend a helping hand. However, I was struck by the necessity of providing now for this program.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that enactment of this measure is not now required. However, I anticipate it will be required this fall. It was because of my belief that enactment of the bill will be required that I originally suggested that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and I cooperate on this measure. He and I drove through five of the Western States—not viewing those areas from the air, but going by automobile directly to the places of extreme drought. There are areas of the United States where drought relief has terminated at the present time; as of July 15 the supplying of protein meal was stopped. It will be resumed in the States where the governors have decided to have a hay program.

However, this is the fifth straight season of drought. In the first year the farmers arranged for small loans from their banks. About the second year they went to the Farm Credit Administration. After a while they obtained some help from the Farm Home Administration. But after about 5 years the stockmen and farmers are in real trouble.

So my feeling is that with 10 million surplus cattle on the ranges, if the drought continues, there will be a rush to the market, and in that event there will be a collapse of prices, and at that time this provision will be needed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico on his record, not only in this case but as a great Secretary of Agriculture and an outstanding farmer before he became one of the outstanding Members of the United States Senate. I congratulate him upon foreseeing the needs of the farmers and trying to alleviate their difficulties under such circumstances.

I feel that the difficulties of the farmers may be more severe than is anticipated. Because of that, I shall withhold objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the bill is a sound one and is much needed. I merely wish to express doubt as to whether the Senator from New Mexico is completely correct when he says the bill is not needed now. It is my understanding that even a year ago a considerable amount of loans of this particular type, under the provision now proposed, could have been made and would have been made in the drought areas, for the reason that when the emergency program is ended stockmen may be supplied with hay and grain, and the assistance needed for immediate relief may be given, but that will not put the stockmen back on a profit-making and going-business basis, because the damage the drought does to the herds and facilities is so great that it is impossible even to begin to take care of that damage simply by supplying the stockmen with hay for starving cattle, or with grain to help fatten a few of the cattle the farmers or stockmen may wish to get on the way to market.

In this case we are dealing with the problem of supplying these particular stockmen and farmers with the loans they need in order to get back to a profitable basis of operation. In some instances they must buy new stock. The emergency relief is of no assistance to them, for example, in buying new breeding stock, if as a result of the drought they find it necessary really to get rid of stock that no longer is fit for breeding purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I could not agree more fully with the Senator from Oregon.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 339) to authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make loans of the type formerly made by the Land Bank Commissioner, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Farm Credit Administration is authorized to exercise the authority conferred upon the Land Bank Commissioner by part 3 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 (12 U. S. C. 1016–1019).

SEC. 2. Section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1016), is amended—

(a) By amending the first sentence thereof (12 U. S. C., 1946 edition, 1016 (a)), as partially repealed by section 206 (h) of the act of June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 208), to read as follows: "Loans to any farmer as hereinafter provided shall be secured by a first or second mortgage upon the whole or any part of the farm property, real or personal, including crops, of the farmer.";

(b) By substituting "$15,000" for "$7,500" in the second sentence thereof (12 U. S. C. 1016 (b), first sentence);

(c) By amending the proviso at the end of the fourth sentence thereof (12 U. S. C. 1016 (c), first sentence), to read as follows: "*Provided*, That any borrower under this section may be permitted to defer payment of the principal portions of installments on his loan for a period not exceeding 5 years under regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration"; and

(d) By amending the 11th sentence thereof (12 U. S. C. 1016 (g), first sentence), to read as follows: "The Farm Credit Administration shall make loans under this section on behalf of and in the name of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, but no such loans shall be made after June 30, 1959, except for the purpose of refinancing loans previously made under this section."

SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 4 (b) of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020d, second sentence), is amended by striking out "at a rate not exceeding 5 percent per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "at a rate not exceeding the rate of interest on the loan."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ALASKA TO THE ROTARY CLUB OF KETCHIKAN, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 6263) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Alaska to the Rotary Club of Ketchikan, Alaska, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this is a House bill. The information given to the Senate committee is to the effect that these 4 acres of land were developed by the Ketchikan, Alaska, Rotary Club sometime during the 1930's; and during the war they were turned over to the Forest Service, inasmuch as at that time the land was included within the area of the Tongass National Forest. These 4 acres were used as a recreational ground.

Since that time the boundaries of the forest have been drawn back several miles, leaving the 4-acre recreational tract where it is rather difficult for the Forest Service to handle it. The Rotary Club says it will take it back and operate it. The bill would turn the 4 acres, with the exception of 7 feet, which is desired for a right-of-way, back to the Rotary Club to be owned by them so long as the property is operated for the public benefit. That is all I know about it.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Vermont think I am correct in my understanding that this land was transferred to the Federal Government in the first instance for a specific use, to be held by the Federal Government so long as it was able to use it for that purpose, but that it no longer has any use for it for that purpose, and therefore the land should go back to the people who originally made it available to the Federal Government?

Mr. AIKEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding. However, for the record, in order that this case will never be cited as a precedent against me, that explanation makes it clear that the bill does not violate the Morse formula.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am quite sure that the purpose of the bill is such that it does not in any way violate the Morse formula.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6263) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF CLIFTON, N. J.

The bill (H. R. 4928) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the city of Clifton, N. J., was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation? The report indicates that this is a very valuable piece of land. I have no objection to its conveyance, but the RECORD ought to show the conditions under which it is con-

veyed, and whether or not the Government is receiving proper reimbursement.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think it should be said that this bill is exactly in accordance with the Morse formula, which has heretofore been cited.

Mr. MORSE. It is better than the Morse formula.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is better than the Morse formula.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am delighted to find a bill coming before the Senate that is better than the Morse formula. I congratulate the Senator from New Jersey. This bill provides for the payment of 75 percent of the appraised fair market value.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to observe that many good things come from New Jersey.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4928) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—RESOLUTION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The resolution (S. Res. 279) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Appropriations was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe, under our customary procedure, this resolution and the following one should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The resolution (S. Res. 276) providing additional funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that this resolution also be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, obviously this bill is not calendar business, and should be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not wish unduly to trespass upon the time of the Senate, but it strikes me as an amusing comparison that we have just passed a bill providing for secondary mortgage loans for farmers, whereas this bill is entitled "A bill to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture, and for other purposes."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee will note that the bill providing for emergency loans to farmers has an expiration date, about 4 years in advance. I believe that by the time of the expiration date of the emergency loan bill the other bill which has just been referred to, the bill to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture, and for other purposes, will no longer be necessary. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that, contrary to some of the arguments which I have heard from my good friends on the other side of the aisle, the United States Senate still cannot control drought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3744) to change the name of Gavins Point Reservoir back of Gavins Point Dam to Lewis and Clark Lake was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 280) to cite Albert Shadowitz for contempt of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested. The resolution was reported from the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. COOPER. I have just been informed that there is a request that the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 282) to cite Abraham Unger for contempt of the Senate was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I make the same request with respect to this resolution. I ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 281) to cite Corliss Lamont for contempt of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I make the same request with respect to this resolution. I ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago under the direction of the Secretary of the Army to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—this might be an important bill. I think it should be explained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. GORE. By request, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, here again we have proposed legislation which is clearly of such a nature that it should be brought up on motion. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NAVIGATION ON THE DELAWARE RIVER—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2317) authorizing the modification of the existing project for navigation on the Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have discussed the bill with the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. It seems to be an entirely meritorious bill, but it does involve an increase in cost of $18 million. We have followed, more or less, a rule of thumb, that no bill involving more than $1 million should pass on the call of the calendar. For that reason, rather than because of any objection to the principle, or the bill itself, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in view of the request that the bill be passed over, I hope the distinguished majority leader will bring the bill before the Senate for consideration by a motion at an early date.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say for the information of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and other Senators that, in conformity with the notice heretofore given, when the pending bill shall have been disposed of there will be a number of bills of first priority, and other bills which may be of lesser importance, to be considered. They are not necessarily stated in the order in which they will be taken up on completion of consideration of the unfinished business. The pending measure will be disposed of before any other bills are taken up. The list is as follows:

Calendar No. 1808, House bill 9709, a bill to extend and improve the unemployment-compensation program.

Calendar No. 1831, House bill 9678, a bill to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1825, Senate bill 3052, a bill to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1794, Senate bill 880, a bill to amend the license law of the District of Columbia.

Calendar No. 1774, House bill 7815, a bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Cougar Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork McKenzie River, Oreg., with participation for power by the city of Eugene, Oreg.

Calendar No. 1315, Senate bill 2910, a bill providing for the creation of certain United States judgeships, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 644, House bill 6287, a bill to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951.

Calendar No. 1720, Senate bill 3706, a bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

Calendar No. 1832, Senate bill 2317, a bill authorizing the modification of the existing project for navigation on the Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.

There will be additional announcements to the Senate later with respect to other bills which will be called up on motion.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There still remains at the foot of the calendar Calendar No. 1807, House bill 8983, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8983) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is simply to reconvey to the city of Muskogee, Okla., title to 5.4 acres of land for the purpose of providing a place for the historical display of the original Indian Agency of Oklahoma Territory.

This land was a part of a tract of more than 13 acres which was donated to the Federal Government without cost to the Federal Government, for the Veterans' Administration Hospital when it was constructed. The land is being reconveyed. The additional land which was obtained for the hospital did not cost the United States Government anything. The Veterans' Administration has found that this particular parcel of land, which is of historical significance in connection with the old Indian agency, is not needed or required by the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Muskogee, and therefore it has agreed and consented to this transfer to the city of Muskogee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my understanding of the bill is that we are dealing again with a situation in which land was conveyed to the Federal Government for a specific purpose, to be used only for that purpose, and with the understanding that if it was not used for that purpose it would revert. It is a piece of land which was deeded for the use of a veterans' hospital. More land was deeded than was necessary, and the Veterans' Administration wishes to relinquish these five and a fraction acres. The bill does not violate the Morse formula, and therefore I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8983) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXERCISE OF CERTAIN POWERS BY THE PRESIDENT RELATING TO PROPERTY CEDED TO THE UNITED STATES BY THE REPUBLIC OF HAWAII

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask that a message from the House of Representatives on House bill 2846 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect to certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senate, in considering this bill, had before it correspondence from the Interior Department indicating that certain technical amendments should be made in the bill because of an error on the part of the House in considering the legal effect of applicable law. The Senate committee adopted the recommendations, and the amendments were inserted by the Senate, and the bill then went back to the House. The House objected, and asked for a conference.

Since that time the Senate committee has been advised that the first information given the Senate committee was in error, and that the House language was the correct and necessary language.

At this time, in order to meet that peculiar situation, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments, so that the bill may be enacted as it passed the House.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I know of no objection, but I have had no notice from the minority leader that this matter would be considered. Can the Senator give us assurance that the minority leader has been notified?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to advise my colleague from Tennessee that the matter has been discussed both with the majority and minority leaders, and the second ranking member of the minority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who handled the bill, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY AT 10 A. M.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its labors this evening it stand in recess until Monday next, at 10 a. m.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION ON MONDAY

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet on Monday afternoon next, during the session of the Senate.

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Flanders	Knowland
Anderson	Gore	Long
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hendrickson	Payne
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Case	Holland	Robertson
Cooper	Ives	Russell
Cordon	Jenner	Schoeppel
Crippa	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Williams
Ervin	Kerr	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is not present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BURKE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of

New Jersey, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Montana in yielding.

Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief statement for the record regarding a statement made to the Senate on yesterday by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

I have discussed this matter with the able Senator from Connecticut, and he recognizes that I am not trying to get into a controversy with him about words. I merely wanted the two of us to be speaking the same language, so to speak.

At this time I wish to read from the third column on page 10677 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, July 16. At that point in yesterday's debate, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] made the following statement:

Mr. President, going back to my prepared remarks, special attention is directed to items 2 and 4. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] during his debate on the afternoon of July 14, 1954, made the statement that if construction costs—

Meaning the construction costs of the Dixon-Yates plant—

exceeded the estimate of $107,250,000, the Government would put up half of the additional capital costs to a ceiling of $117 million. In other words, on an increase of $9,750,000, he indicated the Government would put $4,375,000 of capital and the sponsors would put up a like amount. I refer my colleagues to page 10506 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That assertion by the Senator from New Mexico is not correct. I am sure he did not know it was incorrect, but it simply is not so.

In the first place, Mr. President, $9,750,000, divided into 2, does not amount to $4,375,000, but to $4,875,000.

However, the essential point is that I was trying my very best to stay within the facts.

Let me read from page 10506 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 14, 1954, where my statement is recorded in part as follows:

If the cost goes up from our $107 million to just under $117 million, the Government of the United States will put up $4½ million of the extra $9 million, and the operators, Dixon-Yates, will put up $4½ million.

I never used the term "capital," so far as I know.

Now let me read what the Bureau of the Budget said about this matter; I read now from page 955 of the hearings:

The Middle South-Southern proposal is predicated upon a base capital requirement of $107,250,000 for the production and transmission plant with provision that the new corporation and AEC share on a 50–50 basis any decrease or increase in this figure up to $117 million.

In addition, by referring to page 948 of the hearings, we find that the General Manager said:

In other words, if there is any increase over the $107 million estimate in construction, we—

Meaning the Government—

would pay half of that increase as reflected in the capacity charge, up to 9 percent, and the company, of course, would pay the other half or lose the other half.

Mr. President, I am merely trying to point out that I think both of us meant the same thing. I did not mean "to put up capital." I realize how it is done. It is done by paying $285,000 a year—that is, up to a maximum of that amount—instead of making an actual lump-sum payment.

I wished to state this matter for the record, because I do not think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and I are apart. I simply used the words "put up," whereas the Government uses the word "pay." I think they amount to the same thing.

I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to express some views on the pending bill.

Earlier today I listened with close attention to the able and distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who pointed to some of the dangerous consequences which may flow from this measure if we fail to discover the real effect of its technical provisions and fail to take proper steps in that connection, I agree completely with the views of the Senator from New York, as so eloquently expressed by him.

Mr. President, on numerous occasions during the consideration of the pending bill, it has been stated that this measure is one of the most important pieces of proposed legislation ever to come before the Senate of the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], in his able analysis of the bill on the day before yesterday, said:

Nothing during this session that will come before us will weigh heavier on what our destinies may be than the measure we are discussing today.

Continuing, the Senator said:

I daresay that we could take every piece of legislation we have discussed in the Senate since January and put it into one basket, and take this proposed legislation and put it into another basket, and by far this measure would outweigh anything we have considered or done in the Senate this year.

Of course, a small group of Senators serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have had the benefit of extensive hearings and study of the proposed amendments of the act. The majority of Senators, however, will be compelled during the period of this debate to make a complete study of the record and the report of the joint committee, in order to get a correct understanding of the effect this measure is going to have on the future of our country. During this debate we shall have the benefit of the views and recommendations of some of the Members who have served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Unfortunately, there is a conflict of opinion in the joint committee.

We are told that this measure will be of great and lasting influence on the growth and strength of our country. In fact, it will create a new era and will determine our whole future history. It must, therefore, be free from any provisions or conditions that might be construed to make it work to the detriment of the whole people. In other words, it must not be used as a vehicle to give advantage to any special interests or special groups, to the disadvantage of the country as a whole. This is the great fear which pervades the Senate in connection with this measure.

Thomas L. Stokes well expressed this fear in his article appearing in the Washington Star of July 16, 1954. In his article he reminded us of our failure in the past to guard the public interest. He said:

We start fresh now with atomic energy, with all that experience behind us. We will, indeed, be negligent—as well as fools—if again we let powerful and selfish private interests get a monopoly grip not only on atomic power but also in utilization in other fields that radiate from the atom—medical science, agriculture, processing of food, and so on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stokes' article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY—FEAR EXPRESSED THAT PRIVATE INTERESTS WILL GET AN UPPER HAND IN UTILIZING NUCLEAR RESOURCES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It may sound somewhat melodramatic to say that Congress is on the eve of one of the great legislative decisions of its long history.

But that hardly seems an exaggeration as to what it does about the bill to revise the Atomic Energy Act that is now before the Senate.

Unless the bill as it was presented to the Senate from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is amended to protect the public against the monopoly that some experts believe is inherent in its patent and other provisions, then future generations may be in for a lot of headaches.

There is a background of experience to warn us. That is the way we permitted our earlier source of energy—electricity developed from waterpower and steam power—to be exploited by private combines that got bigger and bigger and more and more powerful, took higher and higher tolls from the consuming public, and finally invaded and polluted our politics until the Government, moving under the impulse of public wrath, finally stepped in to straighten it all out. That wasn't so long ago—in fact, it is still clear in the memory of many of us.

Out of that we developed regulatory laws that offer a pattern to guide us in the development of atomic power.

We start fresh now with atomic energy, with all that experience behind us. We will indeed be negligent—as well as fools—if again we let powerful and selfish private interests get a monopoly grip not only on atomic power, but also in utilization in other fields that radiate from the atom—medical science, agriculture, processing of food, and so on.

We, the taxpayers, already have invested $11 billion in atomic development, mostly

for military purposes. We have, therefore, quite a stake. It belongs to us. The terms by which we permit private interests to develop atomic power for peacetime uses become consequently the overriding consideration before Congress—and with us.

There will likely be more noise and clamor about other issues in the atomic act revision bill.

One of these issues concerns how much we shall tell our allies about military use of atomic power. Another has to do with the recent order by President Eisenhower to the Atomic Energy Commission to purchase power from a plant to be built by a private syndicate, instead of having TVA, which has been the supplier of power for AEC, build a steam plant and add to its own capacity. Supporters of TVA in Congress see this arrangement as not only bad business for the Government and costly to it and the consumer, but also as an entering wedge to hamstring TVA's usefulness as a yardstick. They are seeking to stop execution of the contract by amending the atomic-energy bill.

These two matters are extremely important in themselves, and of considerable public import and interest. But the public should be cautioned not to let these controversies hide what is done about cutting in private interests on development of atomic power.

This last involves two changes in present law. One affects patent rights which heretofore have been controlled tightly by the AEC. Under the bill before the Senate patent rights are to be opened to private interests and under terms which are criticized as not properly protective against monopoly. Because of criticism, some alterations were made. One of these extends for 5 years the AEC's power to require the holders of private patents to make them available to others if such patents are important in production or utilization of nuclear fuels or atomic energy. But some familiar with the operation of patent law in such a field still believe that the public is not adequately protected.

Aside from patents, the bill also authorizes the AEC to issue licenses to private interests for construction, ownership, and operation of facilities to produce and utilize nuclear fuel and atomic energy. Ownership of nuclear fuel still would be retained in the Government.

It is here that production of power is involved. Yet the bill does not provide for preferences to public bodies or cooperatives in distribution of power, either from private plants that are licensed or from public atomic powerplants that might be constructed by the Government. Such preferences long have been in our laws dealing with hydroelectric power. It is true that the utilities are now engaged in a campaign to break these preferences down and, in fact, are on the point of success in various areas—at Niagara Falls, at Clarke's Hill along the Savannah River in Georgia and South Carolina, and in some projects being planned for the Pacific Northwest, among others.

If the utilities could prevent preferences for public bodies and co-ops in the atomic energy law, it would be quite a victory at the very outset. They may get away with it, of course. They have their highly paid lobbyists right here, at the ear of your representatives, and you, the public, are always a long ways off.

Mr. MURRAY. J. M. Roberts, Jr., Associated Press News analyst, has recognized the vital importance of this issue. In his column on May 23, 1954, he has written:

One of the great problems now will be to determine, as contracts are being drawn and precedents set, how the interest of the people can be protected. Industry has been insisting that, if it develops any new processes, it should be permitted normal patent rights. The great question is, where do new processes begin and the influence of original development work end? * * * Development of this type simply would not begin at this time without Government subsidization in one form or another. * * * The precedents set now will have an important effect on the whole relationship between the people, their Government, and private business management.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Montana was formerly chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee. In that position, as we know, he rendered great and lasting service, not only to small business, but to the entire economy and to all the people of the Nation. I wonder if he will not corroborate the statement that patents constitute one of the most important features of our economy, particularly if we are to preserve the free-enterprise system and keep the economy from getting too much under the control and domination of a few great concerns. In other words, small business must have the greatest possible concern in the subject of patents, because the question of whether or not small business is to survive may depend upon patent rights. Is not that true?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Alabama is exactly correct in his observation. There is no question that the preservation of small-business enterprise is vital to the continuation of our free-enterprise system. I am sure everyone realizes that.

Mr. President, the present administration has been in control of our Government for more than a year and a half. In order to determine the trend we are following, it might be well to consider what has befallen us during the past year and a half.

Early in the first year of the present administration we were confronted with a hard-money crusade, dictated by eastern bankers who had been placed in high positions of our Government by the administration. Dangerous consequences soon began to flow from that policy. We soon began to witness a slowdown in industry, an increase in small-business bankruptcies, and rising unemployment in many sections of the country. As a result, the administration was compelled to reverse that policy after it had caused considerable damage to our economy.

Now a deliberate attempt is on foot in the Congress to deflate the farmers of America and emasculate the laws and the policies that made it possible for the farmers and workers of the country to improve their status and increase their purchasing power, and thus become an asset to the Nation instead of a liability.

During the present administration we have also witnessed an effort to change the public-power policies and programs which have brought great wealth and prosperity to the Nation. The present administration has laid down a policy that there must be no new multiple-purpose dams started by the Government unless the electric power developed in connection with such dams is turned over to private-power utilities. This change of policy has already resulted in serious consequences to the Nation.

Mr. President, I should also call attention to the national tax program, through which the administration has sought to reward the wealthy, with the resulting danger of bringing on economic stagnation and depression.

Mr. President, we should not overlook the fact that the big utility companies and other special interests are spending enormous amounts of money lobbying the Congress, seeking special legislation and special favors.

These new administration policies to which I have referred are already having a serious effect upon our economy, and will result in serious consequences if not corrected.

In order to foretell the future we must understand what has happened in the past. Over a period of 50 years or more we have evolved a Federal power policy and built it into our economy so as to fit the needs of the Nation. We have tried regulation of the private utilities. We found that it was inadequate. We found that in the absence of some sort of real competition—if not within each community in the Nation, then by the example of a competitive type of development or yardstick in a few of the areas of the Nation—regulation alone was ineffective. Under regulation, utility management would settle down to sell a scarcity of power at a high profit and ignore the need for abundant low-cost power for the Nation's economic growth and development.

We have found that water power can be developed as the paying partner in great regional development projects and thereby stimulate, not only larger supplies of electricity, but in addition, soil conservation, new industries, expansion of employment and expansion of the whole economy.

Electric energy is not a commodity that we can take or leave alone without irreparable damage. The choice is not between an electric light and a kerosene lamp, or between a steam boiler and electric motors.

The expansion of the great electrochemical and light metal industries requires ever-increasing quantities of low-cost energy; and they are essential not only to a healthy economy, but to our national defense. As the President's Materials Policy Commission pointed out 3 years ago, abundant low-cost electricity is a national necessity.

One aspect of the present administration's shift from the highly satisfactory partnership between Federal generation and local distribution which is extremely disturbing to me is what becomes of irrigation. For a good many years we have permitted the use of the interest component—interest on Federal funds invested in the power facilities of a multiple-purpose project—to pay excess irrigation costs. There was a Columbia Basin account established to permit the use of the interest component to promote irrigation development in the Northwest. But if all the proposed giveaways of power sites in the Northwest proceed—if there is to be piecemeal development of the remainder of the hydroelectric sites in the Columbia Basin by

a variety of sponsors with no responsibility for irrigation—then irrigation development in the Columbia Basin appears to be finished.

The great Hells Canyon Dam, as planned by the Federal Government, was to provide interest component funds to permit irrigation of a considerable area in the Mountain Home project. Should the Federal Power Commission license construction at that site by the Idaho Power Co., at least $300 million of prospective interest component funds will be lost—as well as the possibility of a great new low-cost power source. The possibility of going ahead with irrigation development under the present financing formula will thereby be reduced.

I am quite fully aware that the use of the interest component is a form of financial aid to irrigation. In my judgment, it is a wise arrangement. Our country properly makes a great many investments which are not, of themselves, self-liquidating, but which stimulate tremendous returns indirectly. Irrigation can be such an investment. The farmers who take up the irrigated lands in some instances cannot afford to pay the full costs of the irrigation works. But the creation of the new farming units creates new businesses. It stimulates demand upon existing industry. It creates jobs. It develops new tax sources. And, in the end, the Federal Treasury as well as the whole economy are beneficiaries.

From the beginning of the Federal reclamation program more than 50 years ago, under President Theodore Roosevelt's leadership, subsidy for irrigation has been recognized as sound public policy for regional development purposes.

The planned extension of the irrigation subsidy principle in the case of Hells Canyon Dam would be to the Payette unit of the Mountain Home irrigation project. This consists of 192,000 acres on which 750 new farm units could be located. Investment in the farms would run $50 million. With the expansion of business and population that would result, studies indicate that Federal taxes, at present rates, of approximately $7,250,000 per annum could be anticipated.

It is argued that in view of our present tremendous agricultural production and supply, there is no justification for such irrigation projects. This is a very short-term viewpoint. By 1975 we will have 25 percent more mouths to feed than in 1950. We will need the production of an additional 100 million acres of land at present yields to feed our population, even if we give no consideration to improvement of the diet of people not now well nourished. The long-term answer is that this country should continue with the orderly development of irrigable lands, as well as scientific research in the improvement of yields from lands already under cultivation. Our steady population growth requires it. We do not have 100 million acres of new land to bring into cultivation. We are going to get our increasing food requirements through a few reclamation additions to acreage and improved yields.

Irrigation subsidy can be provided by other means. We can throw out the use of interest component and substitute direct, appropriated subsidies if that is the desire of the people of this country and the Congress. But before the interest component is discarded as the means of continuing reclamation, we should have some concept of the alternative plan which is to be used. We should face the problem and not discard present development procedures without a clear understanding of what the substitute is to be. We are demolishing a useful and needed policy structure without even a blueprint of a new policy.

Over a period of more than 50 years we have developed a Federal power policy. It is contained in a dozen legislative enactments.

In 1890, the importance of our great hydroelectric resources began to become apparent to the Congress and it enacted provisions in two measures to protect the public interest in them.

One bill forbade the construction of any dam or other structure in the navigable streams of the Nation without first getting the approval of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. The Rivers and Harbors Act which was passed that year—64 years ago—indicated congressional determination to limit the time of occupancy of any power site. A special bill, which authorized the Secretary of War to grant leases for power sites on the Green and Barren Rivers, specifically provided that the leases were not to run for more than 20 years.

That was the beginning of our Nation's awakening to the value of public energy resources; the first notice that it would be the policy of Congress to control those public energy resources in the general public interest.

Positive legislation to protect the public power sites was enacted on February 15, 1901. The act of 1901 gave authority to the Secretary of the Interior to license use of the public lands for "electrical plants, poles, and lines for the generation and distribution of electrical power" leaving the lease conditions to the Cabinet officer with the provision, however, that any such licenses or rights would be subject to revocation in the discretion of the Cabinet officer.

A report of the Committee of the House on Public Lands—House Report No. 16, 64th Congress, 1st session, 1916—later commented:

> Prior to the act of February 15, 1901, there was no legislation on the subject at all; waterpower sites were patented unmolested, either as parts of homesteads or by purchase, and were given no Federal attention whatever. Under this procedure, a large number of power sites on the public domain were frittered away and have passed into private ownership beyond regulation, beyond control.
>
> As we look back on this procedure it seems like criminal neglect. Many of the valuable waterpower sites of the country passed as fast as eager private concerns and persons could grab them under the several laws then in existence. These are now forever, in part, to be enjoyed by the few who at will may practice extortion and monopoly upon the consuming public subject only to inadequate State regulation when the business is intrastate and with little or no regulation when the concern is doing an interstate business.

The next legislative action in the development of Federal power policy came in the Reclamation Act of 1906, an act which was sponsored by Republican President Theodore Roosevelt and for which he has been acclaimed, until recently, by most Republicans as a great and far-seeing President.

The Reclamation Act of 1906 recognized that water stored for irrigation could also be used to produce power, and it therefore authorized the Secretary of the Interior to lease any surplus power or power privilege. The bill provided that the Secretary should give preference to municipal purposes, thus evidencing an intention that the power benefits should be widespread, rather than monopolized by a private corporation. The act provided a 10-year limit on such leases.

Such a time limitation would undoubtedly be considered extremely drastic at the present time. Federal Power Commission licenses are for 50 years. The new administration's concept of a partnership—so far as I can determine—contemplated long licenses, if not perpetual rights, to power facilities at a dam site. It is my understanding that it is planned to let the power companies build and own the electric generating facilities in connection with a multiple-purpose dam. There has been no suggestion of a termination or recapture provision in such arrangements, although no such arrangements have yet been made so we can inspect them.

It is therefore significant to observe that other Republicans, as early as 1906, opposed the granting of perpetual rights. Acts were passed in the 1906 period granting perpetual rights to private companies for hydroelectric developments on the Tennessee, Rainey, James, White, and Coosa Rivers. But those acts were vetoed by two illustrious Republican Presidents, Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft.

The President's Water Policy Commission, at page 221 of its report, issued in 1950, reviewed these vetoes and commented:

> Three veto messages by President Theodore Roosevelt and two by President Taft, dealing with bills to permit private construction of power dams on the Tennessee, Rainey, James, White, and Coosa Rivers, played an important part in the development of Federal water power policy. In general they noted, among other observations, that natural resources should not be granted and held in an undeveloped condition; that a definite time limit should be fixed in grants, permitting the public to retain control; that charges for the privilege should be imposed; and that, in approving plans, maximum development of navigation and power should be assured.

By 1910 the problem of use of the public hydroelectric sites was so pressing that Congress adopted the General Dam Act, designed to protect the people's rights in the public resources. Grants to develop power on rivers subject to Federal jurisdiction were limited to 50 years, but with the right reserved for the Government to revoke such grants at any time for public use upon payment of a reasonable value for the works, exclusive of any value for the Federal grants.

Next came the Federal Power Act of 1920—the basic legislation in our modern day power policy.

This bill has sometimes been described as a compromise between the private and the public power interests. The report of the Senate Committee on Commerce, submitting the act, said that there should be Government development, or private development, and that in order to encourage some sort of action this bill proceeds on the theory of private development with ultimate public ownership possible.

The bill then provided that the Government had first preference to any water-power sites, and that then the State and municipalities should be accorded a preference over any private applicant if their proposed projects could be made to equal the other.

There were other important aspects of that bill. It required that water-power development be undertaken as a part of comprehensive, multiple-purpose plans for development and use of waterways and watersheds. It contained a series of provisions to assure the public low rates, even under private development. It limited license periods to 50 years. It provided public recapture at the end of license periods.

The provision for recapture was an extremely significant provision and reflected the skepticism of the legislators of that early day over the adequacy of regulation alone to assure the American people abundant power at reasonable rates. The Congress, by inclusion of the recapture provision, in effect protected the right of the people through Federal, State, municipal or other nonprofit agencies, to take back the resources and provide themselves with electric power. It was a reservation against the possibility that regulated private utilities would not meet the public's requirements.

The intent of the Federal Power Act of 1920 was to stimulate development of power to supply—to give private utilities access to hydroelectric sites under regularized terms which would protect their investments but safeguard the public—to encourage them to develop a more abundant supply of power for America.

The effort to stimulate development did not work—and we should mark that fact in this period when private utilities are asking to be given the atom. By 1925, the Federal Power Commission had issued only 5 licenses for construction of dams. So Congress again took a hand and directed the Federal Power Commission and the Chief of Engineers to report to it on the cost of surveys to formulate plans for the improvement of the navigable waters of the United States. The Commission and the Chief of Engineers did report in a document known to all of us—House Document 308, 69th Congress, 1st session.

After this report was submitted, Congress, in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1927, authorized surveys in accordance with House Document 308. Since then, we have had about 200 of the 308 reports made to this Congress, all made at considerable expense and all in accordance with a policy of undertaking Federal development of our watersheds for their multiple values and purposes.

Congress has authorized many multiple-purpose projects, invariably including a clause giving preference in the sale of electric power from a public development to public and cooperative agencies.

The Hoover Dam Act of 1928 provided that contracts for the use of energy should be let in conformity with the policy expressed in the Federal act as to conflicting applications—which meant that State, city, county, irrigation district, drainage district or other division or agency of the State should have preference.

Inasmuch as the Hoover Dam Act has been cited recently as a model law, I think it is very important to note that it contained the preference clause. That fact is being overlooked by those who are using it as an example of how power resources should be farmed out to local interests today. The act providing for the construction of Hoover Dam definitely included the preference principle.

In the sale of power from Tennessee Valley Authority projects, the Congress prescribed a preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations of citizens or farmers not doing business for profit but organized primarily for the purpose of supplying power to their members. That act passed May 18, 1933.

The Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, provided that in making loans that agency should give preference to "States, Territories and subdivisions and agencies thereof, municipalities, peoples utility districts, and cooperatives, nonprofit, or limited dividend associations."

In 1937, the Bonneville Project Act provided a priority in sale of energy to public bodies and cooperatives. A similar provision was in the Fort Peck law passed May 18, 1938.

A preference was prescribed in the sale of power in the Water Conservation and Utilization Act of 1940.

In 1944, in the Flood Control Act of that year, Congress prescribed generally that, in the marketing of power generated at reservoir projects under control of the Secretary of the Army, preference shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

That act was passed December 22, 1944.

The policy of protecting public power resources for public and cooperative agencies—for the great mass of the people—has not only pervaded the laws of the last half century, but in that period the Congress has seen to it that the right of the people, who compose the Government, to the benefits of the power which the Government develops has been given real meaning; that the power is transported from the public projects to within reach of the public and cooperative, nonprofit distributors.

In the case of Hoover Dam, the large and wealthy city of Los Angeles, requiring both power and water, was able to go out nearly 300 miles and exercise its priorities there, transporting both its own power and its own water to the city. It became obvious that there are few cities, possibly none, which could finance such great transmission projects alone; and that the rural electric cooperatives could not, since they must devote their earnings to retirement of their Government loans. So the Congress for years has consistently followed the policy of authorizing, appropriating for, and having built public transmission lines which will get public power to the public and cooperative priority customers.

In the great Northwest area, Bonneville Power Administration has done it, and brought about a tremendous economic expansion in that area.

In the Tennessee Valley, the TVA has, at Congress' direction, built a great grid system reaching priority customers.

In the Southwest, in the Missouri Basin, in the Central Valley of California—wherever public power is available—it has been the policy to give meaning to the priority provision by getting the power within reach of the customer.

The Congress has provided the rural electrics with so-called G & T loan funds—generating and transmission loans—to permit them to build not only generating plants, but also necessary transmission lines. A transmission cooperative in South Dakota is entirely engaged in transmitting Bureau of Reclamation power to local REA's.

In some instances, arrangements have been made for private companies to "wheel" power over their lines for the Government to the public preference customers. I do not object to such arrangements where they are freely made by both parties—where the Government agency or the REA can go to a company and say: "We will contract with you to wheel power at a reasonable rate; but we will build our own transmission line if you are not reasonable."

But I certainly favor making it at all times possible for the public agency or REA to have the alternatives of building its own lines if the private companies are unreasonable.

I do not favor yielding to what I understand is now the private company demand that all power be sold to them at the bus bar—for them to resell to priority customers at their own rates.

Neither do I favor returning to the 19th century—ignoring all the developments of the last 50 years—and enacting atomic energy legislation which will give the private power companies exclusive, unregulated and unconditional right to use the public nuclear materials as fuel for generating plants without recapture provisions, without assent to regulation, without priority to public and cooperative power distributors—without any of the safeguards of the public interest to assure developments in abundance at the lowest possible costs which our predecessors in the national legislature—the Congress—have found necessary.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in spite of the opposition from power companies, when we passed the Flood Control Act of 1944 we wrote into it the preference clause applying to all Government-built projects, whether they were constructed for flood-control purposes, for navigation purposes, or for whatever purpose they were constructed, and this preference

for the purchase of the power was given, as the Senator has said, to municipalities, nonprofit public bodies, and REA cooperatives? If there was ever any question about the public-power policy it was made general and as broad as the encasing air, so to speak, so far as Government-constructed power projects are concerned. Is not that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely correct. It has become the established policy of our Nation. Everyone in the West who knows what has been accomplished there under that policy certainly approves it.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the policy had its genesis in the great fight for conservation which was made some 45 or more years ago, led by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, when they were waging the battle to preserve our forests, our lands, and our water and mineral resources as the heritage of the people of the United States, the gift of God Almighty to the people of the United States. This preference provision about which the Senator has been speaking is the child of that great struggle to save for the people the benefits of these great God-given natural resources.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. HILL. They should be used to benefit the people rather than for exploitation for profit by the power interests.

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely correct. I think it has become generally recognized in the United States, even in sections of the country far removed from where the policy has had such a beneficial effect.

Mr. HILL. There is a very excellent editorial on the subject published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY. I shall be glad to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Power on the Spot," published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, be printed in the RECORD following the very able address of the distinguished Senator from Montana.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the present state of world affairs, when for the foreseeable future we must remain strong, we must have a constantly expanding economy. We must have a constantly expanding supply of energy at low cost, if we are to be sure that we can meet any crisis, as well as to assure improvement of the standard of living of all of our people.

The President's Materials Policy Commission, in what is known commonly as the Paley report because the Commission was chaired by a businessman, William Paley, were cautioned in 1952 that we must have at least 260 percent expansion in electrical output to meet the foreseeable energy requirements of 1975. And we must keep down the cost of that development so the electrochemical and other electroprocess industries, including light metals essential to our aviation projects, will remain economically feasible. The Materials Policy Report told us:

> To assist the economy to expand normally and to assure the national security, the United States by 1975 must have a supply of fuels and electricity, roughly, twice as large as it used in 1950. The requirements of other free nations can be expected to increase on about the same scale.
>
> Four questions briefly point up the energy problem which policy must attempt to solve:
>
> Does the United States have the natural resources, the petroleum and gas, the coal and waterpower—to provide enough energy for the future?
>
> Will the real costs of energy be forced upward, and will any resultant rise retard economic growth?
>
> In the event of all-out war at any time in the next 25 years, will the United States and its allies have enough fuels and other forms of energy to support full economic mobilization and fighting strength?
>
> What opportunities are there for strengthening the long-term energy position of the United States and other free nations and what will it take to develop these opportunities?

The Commission did not at that time speculate on the possibility of atomic energy becoming available in the 1950–75 period, as is apparently developing. But the principles it enunciated about energy sources and supply, apply across the board. It said in effect that the Federal Government must assume responsibility for seeing that energy sources sufficient to meet our growing requirements are developed, that private participation and cooperation is needed, but that the Government must keep a hand on the throttle.

Two imperatives, the Commission reported, are keeping the real costs of power low, and being prepared to meet the demands of a possible war. It summarized:

> If these opportunities to strengthen the United States energy position are vigorously pursued, it should be possible with the resources at its command, supplemented by imports of petroleum and perhaps some natural gas, to keep supply in step with expanding demand from now to 1975, and to keep the average costs of energy from rising significantly if at all above today's level. Many large tasks, obstacles, and problems in the path of this accomplishment present a major challenge to industry and Government alike. The task of policy is made greater by the risks of war and by the energy problems of other free nations whose future is linked closely with the prosperity and security of the United States.

In its more detailed examination of the electricity problem, the Commission said:

> The central problem of electric energy is how to increase the Nation's supply 2½ times during the next 25 years without running into considerably higher costs per unit.
>
> The supply of electricity has had to double every 10 years since 1920 and will continue to expand at a very rapid rate in order to support a doubling, by 1975, of the Nation's total output of goods and services. The Commission's studies estimate that the demand for electricity will increase by 260 percent before 1975—from 389 billion kilowatt-hours in 1950 to something like 1,400,000,000,000 in 1975.
>
> Shortages of electricity and rising real cost could impede economic growth: They could throttle national effort in event of war.

In its conclusion, the Commission said:

> The national interest in greater production at lower costs will be promoted by mutual recognition, between the Federal power agencies and private systems, of the needs of each for expansion to meet market requirements, for close integration between public and private facilities within the established Federal power policy, and for strengthening joint public and private utility planning for future expansion.
>
> The Federal Government will have to continue work on economic hydro sites especially where multipurpose development of a river basin represents the best approach.
>
> The Commission recommends: That the Nation's hydroelectric potential be developed as fully and as rapidly as is economically feasible.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana is absolutely correct in what he says about the way in which the demand for electricity has grown. The Senator will well recall that when the TVA and some of the other great projects, like Bonneville, were under consideration, a great hue and cry arose from representatives of the power companies that the Government would be wasting money.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I have a vivid recollection of that situation.

Mr. HILL. It was said that the Government would be making a tremendous investment to generate power, when there would be no demand for the power. But the result has been what? For the past 20 years, ever since the Government began to build the great projects, there has been constantly a tight power supply. There simply is not sufficient electrical energy to meet the demands of America. Is not that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. I recall that when the Bonneville project was being planned, the experts in the field of electric power said, "Where will all this power be sold? To the jackrabbits in the plains of the West, we suppose."

Of course, when the dam was completed they were surprised at the rapidity with which the demand continued to grow, which has made it necessary to build other dams on the Columbia River.

Mr. HILL. They did not foresee at all that the Nation was then just entering the electrochemical age. As the Senator from Montana knows, there is nothing so vital to the growth and development of the electrochemical industry as is power.

With respect to all these wonderful things, whether they be in terms of new products made through the electrical process, or new machinery, or new materials—new things of all kinds—power has been absolutely essential for the marvelous development which we have witnessed. Is not that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. In that connection, I read not long ago some testimony, given by Dr. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, who, I am certain,

the Senator from Montana knows well. In his statement Dr. Waterman said that by next year the United States would be graduating 17,000 engineers, whereas Russia would be graduating 50,000 engineers. This shows how conscious Russia is, not only of the fact that the world is in the electrical age, but also of the tremendous possibilities of this age. She is conscious of it not only from the standpoint of the welfare, economic growth, and progress of the people of her nation, but also from the standpoint of the defense of her nation.

Once the United States falls behind in its onward march in the field of electrochemistry, we shall then have lost the titanic struggle in which we are engaged with the brutal, ruthless forces of Communist aggression. Is not that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is absolutely correct. I recall the terrific battle we had in our effort to bring about the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, which, since its completion, has been found to be of extremely great value.

Mr. HILL. But for the indefatigable, tireless, and valiant efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, that dam would not exist today.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Senator from Alabama will include the valiant efforts which he himself made to help in that struggle, I will agree with the Senator.

In view of the Nation's great power needs—needs that involve our national survival—I am disturbed by two developments.

One is the theory that no Federal developments should go ahead until some local interest agrees to take over the power phase, and the other is the dumping of atomic-electric generation over to private interests.

The hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy make it clear, and it has been made clear in other ways through other media, that Chairman Strauss and his collaborators at the Atomic Energy Commission do not want to become a power agency, they do not want to develop atomic generators. They want to dump the whole problem.

One wonders at the concept of public service of such atomic energy commissioners.

It would be nice if Members of the United States Senate could pick and choose among the policies they want to pass upon; if we could reject onerous committee responsibilities. It would be nice if we could say that we do not want to fiddle with appropriations, or with foreign policy, or with some other type of legislation. But when a legislative job has to be done, Congress has to do it.

When there are agricultural problems, the Secretary of Agriculture has to face up to them, and usually the Congress also.

The production of atomic energy needs an abundance of low-cost electric power. The Atomic Energy Commission has a fuel—a basic resource—which can supply such power. And neither the Commission nor the Federal Government totally can escape the responsibility for bringing that resource to a state of technical development, and of practical development, by simply shrugging it away to someone else.

In the case of atomic power, the Commission is proposing that we turn atomic materials over, uncontrolled, to the private utilities which, in the past, have repeatedly failed to meet America's energy needs.

They did not develop an abundance of hydroelectric power when it was made available to them under the Federal Power Act of 1920. As a matter of fact, the private power companies have repeatedly used applications to the Federal Power Commission—pre-empting hydroelectric sites—as a means of delaying development of power supply. The East Tennessee Development Co. rushed in and made application for a string of dams along the length of the Tennessee River when sentiment for public development of that river started to grow. But they did not press those applications; they did not follow up; and development by private utilities was just as remote when TVA was created as it was on the day the private utilities filed their applications to blockade development rather than to achieve it.

In the case of Hells Canyon Dam, the same tactic is in use.

The first application conflicting with the high Hells Canyon project was for a little, low dam that would throw away most of the potential at the site. One application after another has proved so ridiculous that there has been a series of modifications of applications, 1 for 5 dams, and now 1 for 3 dams, which have revealed the real game.

As I have previously indicated, it was the failure of the private utilities to take advantage of the Federal Power Act of 1920 which led to congressional determination to go ahead with river development, to get an estimate of the cost of such development, to obtain the 308 report of the Power Commission and Chief of Engineers, and to proceed with the developments which are the backbone of our present public power resources.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator well recalls the investigation which was carried on by one of his great predecessors, the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana. That investigation showed to the country in a clear, yet reprehensible light, the abuses and excesses of the private power companies.

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely correct. I remember that the late Senator Walsh took a very active part in the TVA.

Mr. HILL. Not only in the TVA, but in bringing to light the abuses or excesses on the part of private power companies. He demonstrated that the private power companies had sought to place, and in some cases had been successful in placing their propaganda, even in textbooks in the American school system.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Alabama. The people of Montana—and, indeed, of the Nation—owe a debt of gratitude to the late Senator Walsh, of Montana, for his work on these problems.

Today it is the policy of the new administration to ignore the lessons of the past, to forget the power scarcities, to forget the failure of the private-utility industry to service rural America, to forget its consistent record of maintaining a scarcity of electricity but a superabundance of propaganda, and turn the entire initiative for the development of electric energy back to advocates of scarcity.

In the case of hydroelectric power, it is to be done by a ban on all future single-purpose electric projects by the Federal Government, and by a ban on starting any multiple-purpose projects until a local interest has been found which will take on the construction of the power phase.

These are the first items in the Federal power policy enunciated by Herbert Hoover at Case Institute on April 11, 1953, preceding his appointment by the President as head of the Hoover Commission.

In his address at Case, outlining steps to get the Federal Government "out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible," Mr. Hoover's first and second points were these:

1. The Congress should cease to make appropriations for any steam plants or hydroelectric plants solely for power.

2. The Congress should follow the precedent of the Colorado project and make no more appropriations for new multiple-purpose projects unless the electric power is first leased on terms, the standards of which I shall describe in a moment.

Mr. Hoover later explained that a Commission—the very Commission that he heads today—should be established to work out the precise standards.

This policy of completely surrendering, even in these critical times, the initiative on energy supply to private interests with a scarcity record was carried into the report of the House Interior Appropriations subcommittee last year. In the report on the Interior appropriation bill, the committee said:

With respect to construction activities, essential and completely justified projects in the construction stage should be carried to completion to avoid waste of Federal funds, but wherever possible, private enterprise shall be taken into partnership to build, own, and operate that part of each project that can be handled by private ownership under conditions that protect the interests of all the people. In all future projects or new starts which include transmission lines, private enterprise shall be urged to take the initiative in constructing, owning, and operating such works before money is made available for Federal construction.

This committee recognizes that this policy cannot be fully put into operation in the fiscal year 1954, but all interested parties are urged to keep this policy in mind and to plan accordingly.

In the case of atomic power, we have been submitted a bill which includes none of the safeguards found essential, through years of experience with the private utilities, in the Federal Water Power Act of 1920. Licensing is provided only if the applicant agrees to handle nuclear materials to protect the public health and safety, and agrees to certain defense conditions. There are no recapture pro-

visions, no requirement of use as against inadequate use or nonuse, no submission to Federal regulation, or a half dozen other essential things.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The requirements to which the Senator has been referring are all written into the Federal Water Power Act with reference to private development on navigable streams, are they not?

Mr. MURRAY. They are written into that act in unequivocal language and their legality has been upheld in many court decisions.

Mr. HILL. But none of those safeguards have been written into the pending bill, have they?

Mr. MURRAY. None of them appear in the provisions of the present atomic-energy bill.

Chairman Strauss and his fellow Commissioners do not want to be bothered with electric-power development. They want to be the most independent agency ever created—able to toss off all responsibility of guarding against monopoly, or to assure the Nation abundant energy to meet any emergency, or to pursue other than military development of the atom—at their pleasure.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will no doubt recall that the bill as originally drafted gave to the Chairman of the Commission powers, authority, and jurisdiction not given to the other members of the Commission. Is that not correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is true. That fact has been mentioned several times during the course of the debate.

Someone has said that the administration wants to substitute the golf stick for the yardstick. That puts it only partially appropriately. It is an apt expression as far as it goes. But unfortunately, more than just destroying Government power-rate yardsticks is involved.

The adequacy of power for economic growth, for national defense, and for national security is involved directly in the development of electric energy supply, and consequently even our national existence as a free and democratic Nation.

It is difficult to believe that the men who are today saying that the initiation of power projects must depend on so-called local interests entirely if the projects are wholly for power, or upon their willingness to go along with the power phase in the case of any multiple-purpose project, are familiar with the history of the power industry.

They have not taken a look at the probability that the private power industry will not provide an abundance—even the necessities—in power generation. They have not carefully studied the record.

Electroprocess aluminum production in quantity was not made possible by private electric power. The Aluminum Company of America had to go down to Tennessee and develop its own power supply to make it economically feasible. The aluminum industry is confronted with the necessity of finding power supply of its own again in these critical days as a result of the administration power policy—sometimes called the "Eisenhoover" power policy.

Rural America was not electrified by the private power industry. It was provided electricity by a Federal program after the power industry failed to meet rural need.

I have heard easterners talk about Tennessee hill-billies as a sort of backward people. The fact is the homes in the State of Tennessee today make seven times as much use of electricity as do home in New York city. The archaic people of today are not the Tennessee hill-billies but the New York City cavemen, who have never escaped the shackling scarcity of private power rates and escaped into the modern era of abundant electricity.

Since the Federal Power Act of 1920, and the development of an aggressive Federal power policy, America's use of electricity has grown 820 percent, and is still skyrocketing.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true—and we are glad it is true—that the private power companies have made large profits?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. In an area where a Government project has been located, we have found the rates of the private power companies to be lower than they are in areas where there is no Government project. Yet such private power companies, even with lower rates in effect, have prospered more, and have made greater profits, on the whole, than power companies which did not have the competition, so to speak, of Government projects within the area they were serving. Is that not correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Does not this demonstrate what Henry Ford proved by his inauguration of mass production methods, that when there is mass consumption, there are lower rates, but so much more power is sold that in the end the profits are much greater? Is that not true?

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely true. Rural America was not furnished electrical power by private companies. That is now a well-recognized fact. Rural America was furnished electric power as a result of a long, hard struggle in Congress to provide Americans who lived in rural areas with a rural electrification program. That made it possible to electrify farms. Today in Montana 95 percent of the farms are electrified. That program had had a profound effect in increasing production and the prosperity of the farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks a table which shows United States electrical output by years since 1920, with unofficial estimates from the Federal Power Commission of requirements in 1955 and 1960.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, back in 1920 our electrical output was 55.6 billion kilowatt-hours. In 1952, the last year for which I have been supplied figures, electrical output reached 463 billion kilowatt-hours. The 1950 estimate is for a growth to 600 billion kilowatt-hours, and in 1960 a growth to 790 billion kilowatt-hours.

This growth in power use never would have occurred had not our predecessors—Republicans and Democrats alike—seen the necessity of the Federal Government breaking the private utility bottleneck. The great growth in industry in the United States, the great growth in our productive capacity, could not have occurred if the initiative in power matters had been shirked by the Federal Government and left entirely in the hands of men more concerned with brainwashing the American people with private power slogans than in providing them with electric energy at low cost.

Part of the reluctance of private power companies to stay ahead with power development is generally regarded as good business—the practice of keeping supply somewhat behind demand. They want customers on the line before they build generating capacity. And they have always been skeptical about America's expansion and growth.

It was recounted on the floor of the Senate last year, by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], that when the Tennessee Valley Authority was proposed, the private companies said that it would be a century before the power of the Tennessee River could all be used—that it was folly to be talking about speedy development of the river. One of our great research foundations made a study which backed up this contention. A tremendous point was made of it.

Now—20 years later—we know that not only was all of the power of the river needed, but that it would prove insufficient to meet the needs in that area when economic expansion got underway. The point of attack today—the effort to stifle growth—is against steam plants to supplement TVA power. Now the minions of scarcity want to prevent the TVA from developing needed power over and above all that can be generated from the river.

The Senator from Oregon also recalled, when he spoke, that out in the Bonneville area the propaganda was that there will be only jackrabbits for customers for the power from the great Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams.

But the dams were built. Other dams have been built. And the problem today, as in the Tennessee Valley area, is getting enough power to meet future requirements. The jackrabbits are still without electricity.

The private utilities have, year in and year out, denied the need for rural-electrification funds.

In 1935 Mr. Grover C. Neff, spokesman for the private utilities on rural-power matters, wrote to REA Administrator Morris Llewellyn Cooke that—

> There are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm operations that are not now served.

The census that year showed that 10.9 percent of the farms were electrified.

Mr. Neff continued to see no need for further REA work down through the thirties and the forties, as REA gradually pushed out to 50, 60, 70, 80, and 85 percent of the farms. I have a series of Mr. Neff's statements that become very interesting today, in view of the effort to turn all initiative back to the private companies. All of them are by Grover C. Neff, president of the Wisconsin Power & Light Co., and president, 1946–47, of the Edison Electric Institute.

July 24, 1935: "There are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm operations that are not now served." (Letter to Morris L. Cooke, REA Administrator, written by committee of utility executives, including Mr. Neff.)

August 11, 1945: "There seems to be no necessity for additional allotments (to REA) at this time." (Memorandum presented to committee on electric service for farmers.)

October 17, 1945: "The job of extending lines to farms and nonfarms will be practically over in 1948." (Before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

December 20, 1945: "The end of the big task of taking electric service to the great bulk of farms is now in sight." (Article, Public Utilities Fortnightly.)

June 5, 1946: "The big job of extending electric lines to the farms of this country will be about completed on December 31, 1948. REA has plenty of money to carry on the above outlined construction program for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, even if the Senate does not grant them the $250 million included in the 1947 appropriation bill." (Inaugural address.)

April 24, 1947: "It is our opinion that REA does not need any additional loan authorizations by Congress to complete its job." (Before subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.)

The percentage of the United States farms with central station electric service grew steadily as Mr. Neff talked on. The record shows the following growth:

1935	10.9
1940	30.4
1945	44.7
1946	52.9
1947	57.4

The job is not yet completed. There are more farms to be reached with lines; distribution lines must be made heavier to meet growing farm demand; and generating and transmission facilities must be built to provide power to meet that demand.

The extent of growth in the use of the new "electrical hired hand" on farms is indicated by a sample survey conducted by the Rural Electrification Administration.

In 1938 the average use per farm was 32 kilowatt-hours per month. In 1951 the average use per farm was 129 kilowatt-hours per month. In the 13-year period use had increased four times over. In the period 1945 to 1951 it doubled.

Studies by State colleges indicate that average farm use is headed toward 300 to 400 kilowatt-hours per month, on the basis of present available appliances, and that it may go even higher as other applications of the "electrical hired hand" become available.

Totally, Mr. President, the demand for electrical energy by REA borrowers has climbed from 153 million kilowatt-hours, in 1939, to 11.2 billion kilowatt-hours, in 1952. It is expected to be 19 billion kilowatt-hours in 1955.

I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a table of power requirements of REA borrowers by year, 1936 to 1963, the latter years being estimates by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Other years are based on REA annual reports.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have gone back into the record of the attitude of the private utilities toward speeding up power developments, to illustrate the record of the past, which convinced our predecessors in 1920, 1925, and subsequent years, that the Federal Government could not look to the private groups for needed, speedy development.

The effort today to restore the initiative entirely to private interests—with possibly a few local public agencies carried along—is being undertaken without any evidence or even a contention that there has been a reform in attitude.

The reason for encouragement of the bills to permit development of 1 or 2 hydroelectric projects in the Northwest by public utility districts is quite apparent to all of us. It is a strategy to open the door to such developments for private interests. It is very doubtful if the public districts can get the amounts of money necessary to go ahead. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] pointed out that one of the public agencies has assurances of financing from a company which fell down on financing an Iowa project, after it had made similar commitment.

The strategy is to get the door open. Let us get the policy established. The public agencies can be controlled by pressure on the purse strings in New York and the few other centers where the large sums necessary for big hydroelectric developments are available.

The little public agencies will never get beyond the anteroom; but the main door will be open for the private utilities to move in and take over.

The unregulated licensing of the use of public nuclear materials to private concerns for commercial energy use is not just a result of Chairman Strauss' antipathy to getting involved in power production. I have no doubt that he wants to avoid having the AEC become a power-producing agency. I accept his word for that. But I suspect that it puts Chairman Strauss in the position of unfairly avoiding the rendering of a public service; or appearing to want to avoid a responsibility for other than the real, basic policy reasons.

The proposed new Atomic Energy Act not only permits licensing of the limited few who have the know-how to handle atoms to produce electricity; it gives them an opportunity to patent processes by which the publicly owned nuclear material can be used as fuel in generators.

Because of secrecy, none of us can speak with authority about what processes are held by the Atomic Energy Commission. But we are told that practical use of nuclear material for commercial power is a few years off. We are told not to worry about regulations now—that can be done after the processes are developed.

Obviously, there are steps, procedures, and techniques still to be developed. There are points remaining which will be patentable. By the time regulation of the use of Uncle Sam's nuclear materials are brought before the Congress, the slate may not be a clean one, but one crisscrossed with private claims supported by patents.

This parallels what is being done in the other area of power development—the hydroelectric field.

There is a growing unanimity about integrated regional development.

I am aware that there is opposition to valley authorities. I have become aware of it after 9 years of advocacy of a Missouri Valley Authority, not futilely, by any means, but not successfully. I continue to advocate this type of administration of regional programs. In my mind, nothing which will be more effective, or assure the results of such an agency, has yet been offered as an alternative.

But our real disagreement in the case of the MVA, as in the case of the old Hoover Commission proposal of a Public Works Division at the Department of Interior, has not been over integrated regional development. It has been over method.

If we step back and take a historical view, it is clearly evident how the theory of starting at the heads of streams to control water, to stop erosion by soil conservation practices, by small dams and reforestation, has been accepted; how we have all come to look upon these problems—flood control, irrigation, domestic water supply, electrical production, economic stimulation, and a dozen other problems—as common problems in regional development programs.

The governmental agencies which once battled the overall regional approach have to a considerable degree ceased their blind insistence on single-purpose developments; the original "shotgun wedding" of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri Basin, which occurred under the threat of an MVA, has been repeated in other basins more or less voluntarily. The security of wedded bliss and of dwelling together with common, more comprehensive aims, appears to have appealed to the participants.

Even the Chicago Tribune has ceased to cartoon advocates of regional development as impractical young scholars with cap, gown, diploma, and huge horn-rimmed spectacles.

The integrated regional development concept is now widely accepted, like social security and the basic idea of some

sort of farm price supports. Historians will report this period—or I hope that they will report it—as a period of debate over methods, rather than over the concept.

And they will record, if I am correct, that one of the most serious threats to the regional development concept was the current proposal to pass out the great key dam sites, the hydroelectric projects, on an unintegrated, piecemeal basis, robbing many regional developments of the immediately lucrative asset which makes possible economic justification of the whole development.

I hope this will be recorded as the last futile effort to throw a road block in the way of regional developments, whether thoughtless or deliberate.

I have a great deal of sympathy for those public power agencies caught between growing demand and their desire for full regional development, who have been driven to make applications for dam sites and be a party to the dismemberment of regional development opportunities, or even, in one case, to the turning over of key sites on a stream to private development.

This is a policy matter which seriously involves the future of the Nation and the question of whether we shall have abundant power for an expanding economy or whether we shall have scarcity and hard times. I shall cast my vote on the individual bills against piecemeal development, as I shall vote against the biggest giveaway of them all: the atomic-energy giveaway.

I am confident that after the November elections this year, we are not going to be confronted with such choices; that we can then again move ahead with power development and with making up for the 2 years we are now losing while the predatory power interests—momentarily befriended by a shortsighted administration—try to liquidate the power program and power policy which dates back to William Howard Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, and even earlier.

Mr. President, the power of the atom has been harnessed through the expenditure of between $10 billion and $12 billion of American taxpayers' money. It is as much a part of the public domain as waterpower sites. It is an asset belonging to the people.

The Atomic Energy Commission has authorized today five nuclear reactors to produce heat to run electric generators. They are experimental plants, designed to develop the art of producing electricity in plants fueled with Federal nuclear material. It is hoped that out of these experimental plants will come the answer, and that with experience gained from them we can eventually produce electricity at costs which will be competitive with hydropower and fuels.

On the very eve of revealing the practical use of nuclear materials to generate electricity, on the very eve of a great peacetime benefit flowing from the taxpayers' tremendous investment, it is proposed to pass a measure which will let companies with know-how move into the energy field, take out patents, and reap a potentially enormous profit from the taxpayers' investment.

I am not opposed to the private electric companies being licensed to build nuclear-fueled electric plants. I hope that areas without hydroelectric power or a nearby coal supply, and which now have high rates, will be able to get abundant power at low rates from atomic materials through their private companies. Let those companies have it, under regulations that will assure reasonable rates.

But I am not in favor of the Government permitting the companies to patent some final step in the process of generating electric power with nuclear energy, and thereby gain control of the whole process. I am not in favor of them having a tollgate between the people's raw material and the end product, whether it be a patent or an exclusive license.

We should provide that the Government continue the development of processes for using nuclear materials to make electricity, and further provide that, when such processes are feasible, an appropriate Government agency will build generators and supply Government customers—the rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, the industries located on public lines, and others—with the power they need.

The Federal Government should produce power from this great new energy resource just as it produces power from the Columbia River, the Tennessee, the Missouri, and other great streams.

I shall support amendments to provide for regulation of the private use of nuclear materials for producing electricity in the same way we regulate the use of waterpower sites. I will support an amendment to provide for the production of electricity from nuclear materials by the Government when such production is feasible. Doubtless there will be many amendments offered, and I will support those which safeguard this resource for the people who own it—all the people of the United States.

I very strongly feel, however, that this measure should be recommitted for at least another full year of study.

The McMahon Act—the original Atomic Energy Act of 1946—provided at section 7–B that when commercial use of the atom appeared feasible, then the Atomic Energy Commission should submit to the President and Congress a report on what the social, political, and economic consequences of the development would be. That would give the President and the Congress some understanding of the problem of regulating the new development, and seeing that there were proper safeguards and controls.

No such report has ever been made. Most of the Members of Congress are in the dark about what effect atomic power is going to have on our economy and our social conditions 5 years from now; 10 years from now; or 20 or 25 years ahead. The Members of this body are supposed to have better than average information about such things—at least enough information on which to base our judgments.

If we lack adequate information, then what of the people of the Nation generally? How can they petition their Government in relation to atomic legislation if they are uninformed?

There needs to be at least another year of broad general education about this subject before we begin to legislate. And then any bill ought to have the most careful study.

The debate on the atomic energy bill now occurring is valuable. It is bringing out conflicting viewpoints. It will help to guide the joint committee as it reconsiders the measure. It will aid the Atomic Energy Commission in preparing a report on social, economic, and political effects of commercial development. It is time well spent. But when we are through, this whole measure should be set aside for further study and refinement. We want to be sure that there are no mistakes. We want to be sure that there is not "criminal neglect" of the people's interests. We want to be sure that unrestricted licensing does not place beyond recapture property which belongs to all the people. We want to be sure that this program is not used to exploit and plunder electricity users, but will contribute to a growing economy, a stronger and healthier Nation, and a more abundant life.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Washington Post and Times Herald of July 17, 1954]

POWER ON THE SPOT

Senator COOPER's significant differences with the administration position on electric power in the Tennessee Valley ought to give some pause to promoters of the private contract. Mr. COOPER has made what is probably the clearest and simplest explanation of the issues. He has pegged his opposition to the administration plan on the most fundamental discrepancy: An abuse of the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission. Actually, under the administration plan the AEC would be used to contract for private power, not directly for its own needs, but for Tennessee Valley Authority customers in the Memphis area. Furthermore, there has been no competitive bidding on the contract which the President has directed the AEC to enter into with the private Dixon-Yates group.

Both Senators COOPER and PASTORE noted that this contract would have the effect of rewriting by Executive action the basic functions of TVA as determined by Congress. Mr. COOPER's proposal for an alternative means of financing TVA's needs for additional powerplants through the sale of bonds seems to us to have much merit. But any change in the scope of TVA operations ought to be made openly by Congress. There is special reason to hold up any precipitate action, as Senator COOPER suggested, in order to give the new TVA Administrator, when he is oppointed, a chance to survey the situation.

An amendment by Senator ANDERSON would block the Dixon-Yates contract unless it were rewritten to eliminate reimbursement for Federal income taxes and to provide that power be furnished directly to the Atomic Energy Commission. The administration will be very foolish, indeed, if it permits this amendment to come to a vote. For either the administration will lose, or it will hand the Democrats a potent campaign issue, not only in the Tennessee Valley, but elsewhere in the country where public power is in question. From the standpoint of the administration's prestige it would be far better for the President to compromise by accepting Senator COOPER's suggestion that the whole matter be shelved pending study by the new head of TVA.

EXHIBIT 2

Total United States electrical output by years, 1920–60

[Billions of kilowatt-hours]

1920	55.6
1921	53.1
1922	61.2
1923	71.4
1924	75.9
1925	84.7
1926	94.2
1927	101.4
1928	108.1
1929	116.7
1930	114.6
1931	109.4
1932	99.4
1933	102.7
1934	110.4
1935	118.9
1936	136.0
1937	146.5
1938	142.0
1939	161.3
1940	179.9
1941	208.3
1942	233.1
1943	267.5
1944	279.5
1945	271.3
1946	269.6
1947	307.4
1948	336.8
1949	345.1
1950	388.7
1951	433.3
1952	[1] 462.9
1953	-----
1954	-----
1955	[2] 600.0
1956	-----
1957	-----
1958	-----
1959	-----
1960	[2] 790.0

[1] 1952: Federal Power Commission estimate based on 11-month reports.

[2] 1955–60 Federal Power Commission unofficial estimates based on power marketing reports for class 1 utilities.

Source: Federal Power Commission. Includes industrial and utility output.

EXHIBIT 3

Power requirements of REA borrowers by years, 1936–63

	Demand in kilowatt-hours (billions)	Percentage increase over preceding year
1936	-----	-----
1937	-----	-----
1938	-----	-----
1939	0.153	-----
1940	.406	165
1941	.735	81
1942	1.086	48
1943	1.680	55
1944	1.988	18
1945	2.237	13
1946	2.368	6
1947	3.082	30
1948	4.151	35
1949	5.536	33
1950	7.138	29
1951	8.975	28
1952	11.162	[1] 24
1953	14.5	30
1954	17.0	17
1955	19.0	12
1956	-----	10.5
1957	-----	9.5
1958	-----	6.5
1959	-----	6.1
1960	-----	3.8
1961	-----	3.7
1962	-----	3.6
1963	30.0	[2] 3.4

[1] Percentage increase of 1952 over 1943 was 564 percent. Percentage increase of 1952 over 1948 was 269 percent.

[2] Percentages from 1954 through 1963 are estimated on assumption of a 76-percent increase in 9-year period.

Source: 1939–51, REA annual reports, Energy Purchased by REA Borrowers; 1952–55 REA estimates; 1963, NRECA estimates.

Data for chart VII.

NEED FOR DEVELOPMENT OF UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, there have been many hours of debate in this Chamber recently on the TVA-AEC power contract controversy.

While this matter has not yet been settled, I believe that the strenuous argument has adequately demonstrated that there has been extensive industrial and economic development in the great Tennessee Valley in the last 2 decades. I, for one, certainly will countenance nothing in the way of legislation which, in my opinion, would circumscribe or limit the growth and development of that river valley region. I may disagree with the methods used, but cerainly I favor a far-reaching development of that area.

However, I think it germane for me to spend a few minutes on the problems of another great river valley region which, unlike the Tennessee Valley, is today largely undeveloped. Not a single power or water storage dam has been built on the main stem of the river in this area, even though the basin extends over a geographic area the size of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania combined. This area is one of the most arid sections of the country and desperately needs water for its agriculture, industry, and growing communities, and yet the river is currently carrying into the sea more than two-thirds of the water to which the four States in this area are entitled.

I am referring, of course, to the upper basin of the Colorado River, which lies within the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

People who have watched the impressive development of power and reclamation facilities, under Federal-State-local sponsorship, on the Columbia, the Missouri, and other great rivers of the country undoubtedly appreciate the importance of these large, multiple-purpose projects, both to the area served and to the Nation as a whole. And I am sure that few reasonable people would deny to our semiarid area the opportunity to develop its limited water resources, in the manner which we are now proposing through a long-range, self-liquidating reclamation project outlined in the Colorado River storage project bill, now before the Congress. I should like to stress, too, that this plan for developing the water makes possible the concurrent development of strategic minerals and a large number of other resources where they are more extensive than in any other river basin in America.

In spite of these obvious advantages of the Colorado River storage project, the facts are that a vicious, concentrated campaign has been and is being carried on to defeat, in its infancy, this highly meritorious project which is so vital to the people of these States and undoubtedly to the entire West and the Nation.

We do not have the power, we do not have the fresh-water recreation areas, we do not have a controlled river, and we do not have adequate water for current municipal, agricultural, and industrial needs and future growth. We do not have these assets of the Tennessee Valley and other river basins, and yet this "have not" river-basin area is the object of a deliberate campaign of propaganda, pressure tactics, and legal obstructions to delay or stifle a project to develop the water so desperately needed for the growth and expansion of a strategically situated defense area, rich in natural resources, in the heart land of the West.

New broadsides were hurled against this incipient project this week, indicating that the opponents are getting desperate now that they see possibilities for congressional approval of the Colorado River storage project this session.

The stepup in the campaign to defeat this project is reflected in the artificially inspired flow of letters into the offices of Members of the Congress, most of it bearing the easily recognizable stamp of the propaganda line adopted by pressure groups, well-paid propagandists and writers opposing the project. That same stereotyped line was injected into a recent column of the widow of the late United States President, who signed legislation authorizing the long-range, detailed Government investigations which formed the technical basis for the proposed Colorado River project.

In California, also, according to an editorial in a Salt Lake newspaper, the Colorado River Association, with headquarters in Los Angeles, mailed letters to editors, suggesting editorials deliberately designed to stir up and scare the residents of that great State through misstatements of the objectives of the pending legislation.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a nationally syndicated column written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and published July 13 in the Washington Daily News and other newspapers.

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

SIERRA CLUB IS WORRIED ABOUT OUR NATIONAL PARKS

(By Mrs. Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK.—I have a letter from the president of the Sierra Club in San Francisco, Richard M. Leonard, about our national parks.

I quote from it here because our national parks and our natural resources belong to the people of this country as a whole, no matter in what part of the country they may be found.

The whole national park system and State park system, our nationally owned and State-owned forests, and all of our natural resources, mean the future of our country. If they are wasted or wrongly used, our children and grandchildren may inherit bare mountains and a land no longer able to support them. Therefore, anything that happens in any of these areas is of interest to all of us.

Part of Mr. Leonard's letter reads:

"From time to time our National Park System has been threatened with schemes for dams and other inappropriate developments within the boundaries of areas dedicated for the enjoyment of all Americans. Today the Bureau of Reclamation has plans, big plans, to drown Dinosaur National Monument with two dams that would inundate its mighty canyons for a hundred miles.

"This plan is the most serious and determined effort we have ever seen by a Government agency to appropriate unnecessarily a unit of the National Park System to make it a part of a huge irrigation, power and flood control project.

"We think that you will be interested to know of this threat to Dinosaur, for these treasured acres are yours and you will want to help preserve them for another generation to explore and admire. Under an avalanche of letters and prodding from conservationists, some Congressmen have looked into the facts more closely and not liked what they found—inadequate engineering data, incorrect arithmetic on evaporation, huge tax subsidies, and a needless sacrifice of Dinosaur National Monument.

"Does your Congressman know that these dams could be built at other locations outside the monument without sacrificing their effectiveness? You should tell him that his vote can save an outstanding unit of our national park system from destruction."

Those of you who care about preserving our national park system will look into this, I feel sure, and write your Congressmen. I have written to mine because the Sierra Club sent me two pamphlets. One put the question—"A geat national park or two wasteful dams?" I decided I would prefer the national park. The other pamphlet is headed, "Don't dam the national park system," and that is important, for it tells you the wrong ideas which have been circulated among the people of Utah, where this park exists.

I urge you to get these pamphlets from the Sierra Club, 1050 Mills Tower, San Francisco 4, Calif. On these facts you may decide to write your Congressman as I have done.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am surprised that a person of Mrs. Roosevelt's intelligence and integrity should be taken in by propaganda arguments which have been baked up and warmed over, and discredited time after time in the past 4 years. She did this in reprinting the letter from a San Francisco club man whose writing bears all the earmarks of the propaganda machine that has been grinding out anti-Colorado River project material since the project was proposed in 1950.

It is not my intention to dignify this propaganda effort by repeating the denials that have been made, time after time, to the ridiculous charges made in the Leonard letters. That letter, I presume, was mailed from the propaganda center to every newspaper columnist in the country, few of whom, I am glad to report, have been similarly taken in by the obvious propaganda appeal, presumably containing more expensive printed brochures, obviously beyond the means of an outdoor club to produce without generous outside financial assistance.

Reporters and editors can check that biased outpouring against the objective record built up in 10 days of hearings last January before the House Irrigation Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. Included in the 909-page hearing report is a 28-page memorandum prepared by the committee counsel which clearly demonstrates that the proposed storage dam construction at Echo Park is, in no way, an invasion of, nor does it constitute a precendent for invasion of a national park or monument. This record which I am briefing in an accompanying statement, shows that this conclusion was recognized by President Roosevelt in his proclamation of July 14, 1938, enlarging the boundaries of the 80-acre Dinosaur Monument to include 203,885 acres of river canyons which, for years, have been recognized as potential power and reclamation sites.

That Roosevelt proclamation specifically provided that the enlargement reservation "shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920," which applied to long-standing powersite withdrawals in the Echo Park area. Furthermore, the proclamation exempted from monument administration a reclamation withdrawal on the Green River, within the monument boundary.

In spite of this indisputable recognition of area plans to develop the water and power resources of the river in the expanded monument area—a position supported by two Secretaries of the Interior—the opponents to a vital regional water-development program have expanded this feature into a great propaganda "crusade" that has taken in many honest conservationists.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to reproduce in the RECORD as a part of my remarks another newspaper article that has come to my attention this week. This is an editorial which appeared in the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of July 13.

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

WATER STEALERS—WHO, US?

A copy of a release sent out to California newspapers has just been sent to this newspaper from a former Utahan living in Los Angeles. Its contents strip away any pretense that may be left about California's motives on the upper Colorado storage project.

The release, sent out by Don J. Kinsey, general manager of the Colorado River Association with headquarters in Los Angeles, is a suggested editorial and carries the heading "Protect Our Life's Source." It starts out:

"There are bills pending in Congress for reclamation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, that threaten southern California's rightful share of Colorado River water."

Mr. Kinsey's propaganda broadcast makes it clear, as have a few other recent statements, that the reclamation projects he is attacking are actually the upper Colorado storage project. But just how the project could threaten southern California's rightful share of Colorado River water is difficult to see—unless southern California is scheming to take more water than she is entitled to under the Colorado River compact of 1922.

The 1922 compact divided the water between upper and lower basin States. The upper basin States are required to let pass to the lower basin 75 million acre-feet of water each 10 years, and then may themselves use up to 7,500,000 acre-feet a year. The upper Colorado storage project is not itself a reclamation project, but a storage project to provide a means of delivering the required amount of water to the lower basin—mainly southern California.

The project, far from being a threat to southern California's rightful share of water under the 1922 compact, actually represents a guaranty of delivery to southern California.

The conclusion that southern California does plan to grab more than her legal share of water seems rather obvious. And this is interesting in light of some past protestations. For example:

"California is not reaching for any more water than provided under the 1922 Colorado River compact and will fight the attempt of any other State to do so." (Arvin B. Shaw, assistant attorney general of California, before the Colorado River Water Users Association at Las Vegas, Nev., January 1949.)

And—

"California recognizes and will conform to the Colorado River compact and the California Limitations Act * * * and seeks no water which would interfere with full use in the upper basin of water apportioned to the upper basin." (Joseph Jensen, chairman of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, in a talk before the Salt Lake Junior Chamber of Commerce, March 23, 1951.)

And especially—

"California does not seek to scuttle the Colorado River compact of 1922 nor to change its terms." (Don B. Kinsey, general manager of the Colorado River Association, in a statement prepared for the Daily Sentinel of Grand Junction, Colo., and published January 29, 1954.)

Mr. Kinsey would do well to reread his own statement of only 6 months ago. And the Nation at large should become acquainted with his more recent one.

As for Utah—we still have the same stand we have always taken:

We want no water to which we are not legally entitled. But we do want the water which is rightfully ours—and which we must have for future life and growth.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the editorial adequately answers Mr. Kinsey and his associates who have been publicly exposed in their efforts to insert propaganda of questionable veracity into the newspapers of California. I only hope that the editors of California newspapers will look into the facts before they, too, give editorial dignity to such propaganda.

I also wish to call to the attention of the Members of this body the fact that the California defendants in the case of Arizona against California, now before the Supreme Court, have moved to join as necessary and indispensable parties the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. This is a suit brought against California interests by Arizona, in 1952, and concerns the use of Colorado River water in the lower basin.

I wish to assure the residents of the upper basin States and the Members of this body that this Court action should have no effect whatsoever upon the authorization of the Colorado River storage project.

This was pointed out by the Honorable Jean S. Breitenstein, distinguished lawyer-judge of Colorado, in his testimony before the recent Senate hearings on this project. He stated:

All parties to that case assert and rely upon the 1922 compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Mexican Water Treaty, and the other laws and instruments which constitute the recognized and admitted law of the river. Similarly the authorization of the Colorado River storage project is predicated upon the validity and integrity of the law of the river.

While it is true that in the lower basin there has been a prolonged controversy over the application and construction of certain specific terms and provision, these controversies do not affect the upper States or the availability of water for the Colorado River storage project. Any insinuation that the authorization of the Colorado River storage project should be delayed until the *Arizona* v. *California* case is decided is an attempt to defeat upper-basin development. Litigation, both threatened and actual, has been

long utilized to delay Colorado River development. There is no legitimate reason for any delay in this project because of the lower-basin controversy.

I may say that the filing of the motion with the Supreme Court on July 15 of this year is an indication on the part of the State of California, which is the principal defendant in that case, that it will do all it can to defeat the project to put to beneficial consumptive use of the waters of the upper Colorado River. If it had been planned deliberately, it could not have come at a more timely occasion to help defeat the project authorization by the present Congress. If the State of California is not opposed to the project and is not seeking to defeat it, it could have waited at least until Congress adjourned before filing its motion with the Supreme Court to include these particular upper-basin States. I can well understand the theory on which the motion was filed, namely, for the purpose of indicating to Congress that title to the waters of the Colorado, which would be the basis of this project, are in dispute, and need to be litigated; and for that reason the project, it will be argued, should not be built now.

I am sorry that that is the objective. I do not believe that that represents the views of literally millions of people of California, who want to be fair. California already has numerous reclamation projects to develop the lower basin of the Colorado River, which have been supported by the people of Utah and by the people of all the other upper Colorado River Basin States. The filing of the motion comes rather as a blow to us, and it is somewhat unfair to attempt to defeat us by bringing us into litigation.

I agree wholeheartedly with Judge Breitenstein's statement regarding the case into which the recent motion attempts to inject the four upper-basin States. It is purely a controversy of long standing as to the rights of the lower-basin States to the use of Colorado River water. The States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming are not involved in the matter in dispute, and it is my belief that this litigation should in no way impede the authorization or construction of the Colorado River storage project which, after all, was designed with a view to guaranteeing delivery of the water allocated by compact to the lower basin.

Mr. President, I invite attention to another matter connected with the building of the Echo Park part unit of the upper Colorado storage project. The question of whether the President of the United States actually increase the area of the monument to take in Echo Park is, of course, in dispute, that is, whether or not he authorized it without making it subject to power projects and also the reclamation project in the upper part of it. The record is clear that the people of Utah were told at the time when it was proposed to enlarge this monument, which consisted of 80 acres, that the enlargement would be subject to the right of the people to build this reclamation project and to develop power sites in Echo Park Monument.

A brief has been prepared by a distinguished young lawyer who represents the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in which he covers all the various materials, documents, and what not connected with the question of whether President Roosevelt, in issuing his proclamation, actually made the enlargement subject to all these other developments.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a summary of the brief prepared by Mr. Abbott, of the House committee, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON THE DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT

Much has been said recently relative to the development of the upper Colorado River Basin through the construction of the Colorado River storage project and its participating projects. Everyone recognizes the need for water and power in the arid West. The development of water and power in the wild unruly Colorado River requires large dams, one of which is proposed in what is now the Dinosaur National Monument. The heat of the discussion relative to the contract of the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument has put in the public press much confusing, misleading and often deliberate untruths relative to this matter. An invasion of the National Monument system has been charged.

In order to bring some light out of the darkness and confusion, I submit a brief of a memorandum, submitted by George W. Abbott, Committee Counsel to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, and printed as a part of the hearings on H. R. 4449, 83d Congress 2d session, on pages 719–747.

Before submitting this brief, however, I wish to point out that the father of the national park and monument system, Stephen Mather, laid down three simple criteria to guide the selection of national monuments, as follows:

1. The area must be in the nature of a shrine.

2. The area must be unique, nothing like it anywhere else.

3. The area must not contain material resources likely to be needed later in the development of the Nation's national economy and its supply of food and fiber.

The expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument from 80 to 204,000 acres violated all 3 of these criteria. The expanded area is not in the nature of a shrine; it is not unique (there are many other areas like it); and it contains tremendous water and power resources, the development of which are absolutely essential to the development of the upper Colorado River Basin.

A summary of the statutory provisions, executive actions, and correspondence relating to the establishment and expansion of Dinosaur Monument follows:

1. June 8, 1906: Congress passed an act giving the President authority to establish national monuments.

2. October 4, 1915: A proclamation was issued establishing the Dinosaur National Monument:

"SEC. 2. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected."

NOTE.—The original area of the Dinosaur National Monument was 80 acres; it was expanded to 204,000 acres in 1938.

3. August 25, 1916: Act was passed creating the National Parks Service to regulate and promote the use of national monuments, parks, and reservations.

4. June 10, 1920: The Federal Power Act was passed, giving the FPC (sec. 4) authority to issue a license for the erection of a dam within a national monument.

5. March 3, 1921: Federal Water Power Act was amended as follows:

"That hereafter no permit, license, lease or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines or other works for storage or carriage of water or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power within the limits, as now constituted, of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without the specific authority of Congress."

NOTE.—The phrase "as now constituted" was an amendment to the bill to prevent a possible tying up of the country's water and power resources by creating national parks and monuments.

6. August 9, 1945: Letter from National Park Service to Federal Power Commission re power withdrawals in the Echo Park-Blue Canyon areas.

The Utah Power & Light Co. on January 30, 1932, made application to FPC for a preliminary permit to develop power in the Echo Park-Blue Canyon areas.

It was pointed out by A. E. Demoray, Acting Director, National Park Service, that such dams would be in a proposed national monument in northwestern Colorado and if a national monument were established it would be subject to said power withdrawals, quoting:

"Such an area would be established by Presidential proclamation which would exempt all existing rights, and a power withdrawal is, of course, an existing right."

This same letter suggests that the FPC release these power withdrawals so that a monument could be established without interference.

7. December 13, 1934: Letter from Federal Power Commission to the National Park Service.

Refers to letter of August 9, 1934, relating to the proposed establishment of a national monument along the Green and Yampa Rivers in northwestern Colorado which would cover lands withdrawn for the Echo Park and Blue Mountain power developments.

Quote: "Assurance was given in the letter that the Presidential proclamation establishing such a monument would exempt all existing rights, including power withdrawals, but a statement was added that if it were possible to release the power withdrawals the monument would be placed in much better position from the standpoint of administration."

After giving careful consideration to the request for a vacation of the power withdrawals, the Federal Power Commission says further:

"It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. * * *

"The sites we are considering are important links in any general plan of development of those streams." * * *

"The Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted."

Reference is made in the letter to extensive reports, plans and profiles relating to the

potential water and power resources of the river.

8. August 26, 1935: Federal Power Act amended further. It appears that this amendment did not change the conditions set forth in the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, which is referred to in the President's proclamation of 1938 and which expressly reserves the right to develop the water and power in the expanded Dinosaur National Monument.

9. November 6, 1945: Letter from Secretary of the Interior to the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. Harold L. Ickes specifically asks the FPC to release the power withdrawals that exist in the Green and Yampa River areas so that a monument could be created.

10. January 9, 1936: Reply of Federal Power Commission to the Secretary of the Interior.

In this letter the Federal Power Commission reiterates its position set forth in its letter to the National Park Service on December 13, 1934, as follows:

"Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the project some time may elapse before this power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted."

11. Utah Colorado Park Service meetings: Public meetings were held in Vernal, Utah, June 11, 1936 and in Craig, Colo., June 13, 1936.

The following is an affidavit signed March 27, 1950, made by David H. Madsen, Superintendent of the Dinosaur National Monument, representative of the National Park Service at their meetings.

"Among other things discussed was the question of grazing and the question of power and of irrigation development which migh be deemed essential to the proper development of the area at some future date. I was authorized to state, and did state as a representative of the National Park Service, that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power or irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Colorado and Utah, that the establishment of the Monument would not interfere with such developments."

12. Enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument by Presidential proclamation: On July 14, 1938, Dinosaur National Monument, by a proclamation of the President, was enlarged to include an additional 203,885 acres. (The original area was 80 acres.)

The proclamation provides that the reservation of such lands "shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended"; further, that administration of the monument would be subject to the Brown's Park Reservoir reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, in connection with the Green River project.

This proclamation, including the specific reservations, is a pledge to the people of Utah and Colorado that the expansion of the monument would not interfere with the development of their water and power resources. The construction of the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument, therefore, cannot be an invasion of the National Monument principle.

Subsequent to the proclamation enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument, investigations were continued by the Bureau of Reclamation, directed toward the development of the water and power resources of the Green and Yampa Rivers. These investigations were made with the full knowledge and consent of the National Park Service which had jurisdiction over the area and with the full understanding of all concerned that water and power development would take place within the monument under the reservations set forth in the President's proclamation. Such knowledge and consent is clearly set forth in the following documents:

13. May 14, 1943: Ad interim report, survey of recreational resources of the Colorado River Basin.

14. December 1, 1943: Memorandum from Park Service to Bureau of Reclamation.

15. June 27, 1944: Report of position of the National Park Service on Dinosaur development.

16. May 2, 1946: Letter of Park Service Director to Dr. J. E. Broaddus, signed by Newton B. Drury, Director. Quote: "Dinosaur is one of the few areas in the system established subject to a reclamation withdrawal and this may have some bearing on the proposed Echo Park project."

17. June 1946: A survey of the recreational resources of the Colorado River Basin, report by the National Park Service.

18. December 20, 1949: Memorandum from the Bureau of Reclamation to the Department of the Interior signed by Michael Strauss.

19. December 30, 1949: Memorandum of National Park Director sent to the Secretary of the Interior.

20. February 28, 1950: Memorandum from National Park Service to the Secretary of the Interior.

21. March 3, 1950: Memorandum from the National Park Service Director to the Secretary of the Interior.

22. June 27, 1950: Memorandum from the Secretary of the Interior to the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service, signed by Secretary Oscar L. Chapman.

Quote: "I am impressed with the fact that the waters of the Colorado constitute a resource of paramount importance to the region and that in view of the arid nature of the area, my approved plan for the development of the upper basin must make every practicable provision for the conservation and multiple use of these waters in the interest of the people of the West and the whole Nation.

"Weighing all the evidence in thoughtful consideration, I am impelled in the interest of the greatest public good to approve the the completion of the upper Colorado River basin report, including the dams in question because: (1) I am convinced that the plan is most economical of water in a desert river basin and therefore in the highest public interest; and (2) the order establishing the extension of the monument in the canyons in which the dams would be placed contemplated use of the monment for a water project, and my action, therefore, would not provide a precedent dangerous to other reserved areas."

23. December 10, 1953, Report of the Secretary of Interior on the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects, signed by Secretary Douglas McKay.

The report again approved the project including the construction of the Echo Park Dam.

All of this evidence clearly demonstrates that after more than 40 years of investigation, numerous reports, much correspondence, and a Presidential proclamation, that the intent to develop the water and power resources of the Green and Yampa Rivers originated long before the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded and that the construction of the Echo Park Dam in the Monument will not create a precedent for nor constitute an invasion of a National Monument. On the contrary, the provision for the proposed water storage dam at Echo Park represents the fulfillment of a pledge of the President and the Federal Government to the people of Utah and Colorado, and will prove to be a recognized benefit to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, for the information of the Members of Congress, and particularly the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum prepared at the request of the House committee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

1. AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL MONUMENTS

The authority of the President to establish national monuments by proclamation is contained in the act of June 8, 1906, sometimes referred to as the "Antiquities Act." [Emphasis supplied.]

"Act of June 8, 1906, 59th Congress, 1st session (34 Stat. 225)

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person who shall appropriate, excavate, injure, or destroy any historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or any object of antiquity, situated on lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, without the permission of the Secretary of the Department of the Government having jurisdiction over the lands on which said antiquities are situated, shall upon conviction, be fined in a sum of not more than five hundred dollars or be imprisoned for a period of not more than ninety days, or shall suffer both fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 2. That the *President* of the United States is hereby *authorized,* in his discretion, *to declare by* public *proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned* or controlled *by the* Government of the *United States to be national monuments, and may reserve* as a part thereof *parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected: Provided,* That when such objects are situated upon a tract covered by a bona fide unperfected claim or held in private ownership, the tract, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the proper care and management of the object, may be relinquished to the Government, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept the relinquishment of such tracts in behalf of the Government of the United States.

"SEC. 3. That permits for the examination of ruins, the excavation of archaeological sites, and the gathering of objects of antiquity upon the lands under their respective jurisdictions may be granted by the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War to institutions which they may deem properly qualified to conduct such examination, excavation, or gathering, subject to such rules and regulations as they may prescribe: *Provided,* That the examinations, excavations, and gatherings are undertaken for the benefit of reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions, with a view to increasing the knowledge of such objects, and that the gatherings shall be made for permanent preservation in public museums.

"SEC. 4. That the Secretaries of the Departments aforesaid shall make and publish from time to time uniform rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act."

2. ESTABLISHMENT OF DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT

Dinosaur National Monument was established by Presidential proclamation, pursuant to the 1906 act, in 1915, and as originally established covered an area of 80 acres. [Emphasis supplied.]

"Proclamation of October 4, 1915 (39 Stat. 1752)

"By the President of the United States of America

"A proclamation

"Whereas, in section twenty-six, township four south, range twenty-three east of the Salt Lake meridian, Utah, *there is located an extraordinary deposit of Dinosaurian and other gigantic reptilian remains* of the Juratrias period, *which are of great scientific interest and value, and it appears that the public interest would be promoted by reserving these deposits as a National Monument, together with as much land as may be needed for the protection thereof.*

"Now, therefore, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power in me vested by Section two of the act of Congress entitled, "An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities", approved June 8, 1906, do hereby set aside as the Dinosaur National Monument, the unsurveyed northwest quarter of the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section twenty-six, township four south, range twenty-three east, Salt Lake meridian, Utah, as shown upon the diagram hereto attached and made a part of this proclamation.

"While it appears that the lands embraced within this proposed reserve have heretofore been withdrawn as coal and phosphate lands, the creation of this monument will prevent the use of the lands for the purposes for which said withdrawals were made. Warning is hereby expressly given to all unauthorized persons not to appropriate, excavate, injure or destroy any of the fossil remains contained within the deposits hereby reserved and declared to be a National Monument or to locate or settle upon any of the lands reserved and made a part of this monument by this proclamation.

"In WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington, this fourth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifteen and the Independence of the United States the one hundred and fortieth.

"[SEAL]

"WOODROW WILSON.

"By the President:

"ROBERT LANSING,

"Secretary of State."

3. ACT CREATING THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535) 64th Congress 1st session

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created in the Department of the Interior a service to be called the National Park Service, * * * The service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. * * *

"SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the use and management of the parks, monuments, and reservations under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service * * *."

4. THE FEDERAL WATER POWER ACT OF 1920

The act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), known as the Federal Water Power Act, provided for creation of the Federal Power Commission, to make possible orderly development of water power. (Emphasis supplied.)

Section 3, contained these definitions:

"'*Public lands*' means such lands and interest in lands owned by the United States as are subject to private appropriation and disposal under public-land laws. It shall *not include 'reservations'* as hereinafter defined.

"'*Reservations*' means *national monuments* * * * and other lands and interests in lands owned by the United States * * *"

Section 4 authorized the Federal Power Commission

"* * * (d) *To issue licenses* * * * *for* the purpose of constructing * * * *dams* * * * and for the development, transmission and utilization of power across, along, from or in any of the navigable waters of the United States, or *upon any part of the public lands and reservations of the United States* (including the Territories), or for the purpose of utilizing the surplus water or water power from any Government dam, except as herein provided: *Provided,* That *licenses shall be issued within any reservation only after a finding by the commission that the license will not interfere or be inconsistent with the purpose for which such reservation was created or acquired,* and shall be subject to and contain such conditions as the Secretary of the Department under whose supervision such reservation falls shall deem necessary for the adequate protection and utilization of such reservation. * * *"

Therefore, under the 1920 act, it is apparent that the FPC had authority to issue a license for the erection of a dam within a national monument.

5. 1921 AMENDMENTS TO THE 1920 FEDERAL POWER ACT

(A) Provisions of the 1921 act

The act of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1353) amended the act of June 10, 1920, by providing (emphasis supplied):

"That *hereafter no* permit, license, lease, or *authorization for dams,* conduits, reservoirs, power houses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, *within the limits* [*as now constituted*] *of any national park or national monument shall be granted* or made *without specific authority of Congress,* and so much of the Act of Congress approved June 10, 1920 * * * as authorizes licensing such uses of [*existing*] national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed."

It will be noted that the words "as now constituted" and "existing" were amendments to the original bill. Two excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 66th Congress, 3d session, help background these amendments.

(B) Action in the Senate

On January 25, 1921, in the Senate (60 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2001 et seq.), the following comments were recorded:

"Waterpower Projects Within National Parks

"The bill (S. 4554) to amend an act entitled 'An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of waterpower; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the River and Harbor Appropriation Act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes,' approved June 10, 1920, was announced as next in order.

"Mr. KING. Let that bill go over.

"Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I wish to inquire if objection was made to the present consideration of Senate bill 4554?

"Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] if this is the measure to which he referred?

"Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

"Mr. KING. Then I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, Mr. President.

"The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

"The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

"'*Be it enacted, etc.,* That hereafter no permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines, or other work for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, within the limits of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress, and so much of the act of Congress approved June 10, 1920, entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, as authorized licensing such uses of national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed.'

"Mr. BORAH. That bill cannot be disposed of this morning.

"The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senator from Idaho may object to its consideration.

"Mr. BORAH. I object to its consideration.

"Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in connection with the bill which has just been read. I was not able distinctly to hear the reading of the bill, but I understand that it was introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] for the purpose of eliminating national parks from the jurisdiction of the waterpower commission.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. That is correct.

"Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think, perhaps, it would be appropriate to say in this connection that the Senator from Washington, as well as myself, is under obligation to bring this matter to the consideration of the Senate with all speed, and unless there is some special reason I hope the measure will have consideration.

"When the waterpower bill was transmitted to the Senate for consideration an objection was made——

"Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to object to the remarks of the Senator from Montana, but I understand the bill is not under consideration. There was objection to the bill.

"Mr. WALSH of Montana. I so understand, but I will take occasion at this time to say what I desire to say, with the permission of the Senate.

"An objection was made to the bill by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Payne, upon the ground that it granted the waterpower commission created by that act the authority to authorize the construction of dams for power purposes within the national parks, and it seemed not unlikely that the bill would be vetoed by the President in consequence of the objection to it thus pointed out by the Secretary of the Interior. In that connection the Senator from Washington and myself, both being very deeply interested in the speedy enactment of the measure, called upon the Secretary of the Interior and stated to him that if he would withdraw his objection to the bill we would at the ensuing session of Congress charge ourselves with the duty of introducing a bill to relieve the waterpower measure of the objection and urge its passage upon the Senate. Accordingly, I feel obligated to do what I can to remove any objection that might be made against the bill. I feel that both of us stand

pledged to do everything we can to expedite the passage of the bill.

"In this connection I also desire to say, Mr. President, that in all of the long discussion of and consideration given to the waterpower bill I do not recall that anybody ever called attention to the feature of that bill to which reference is now made. It was embodied in the bill as it was originally prepared by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture. It was not the subject of discussion upon the floor. Apparently it passed without any attention whatever being given to it. No one was particularly interested in it, so far as I can understand; yet, notwithstanding this condition of affairs, and the pledge given by the Senator from Washington as well as myself, a very active, energetic campaign is being waged, and the country is being deluged with appeals from civic associations of all kinds charging something in the nature of intrigue or indirection in getting this provision into the waterpower bill and calling on all the friends of the national parks throughout the country to assist in sweeping away all possible objection to the legislation now proposed and speedily accomplishing its enactment, reminding one of some of the adventures of Don Quixote and his celebrated mount. I do not believe that there is any serious objection to the enactment of this measure. I hope that we shall have it speedily considered. I say this in explanation of my own attitude with respect to it.

"Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not going to stand in the way of the consideration of the bill if it comes up on a proper occasion when we can consider it for a reasonable length of time, but I do object to it at the present time. It is a matter of some importance, and we could not possibly dispose of it under the rules with the time which we have this morning.

"Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will simply say that this is the first time I ever heard of any objection to the bill. It has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Commerce, I believe, and I never knew heretofore there were any objections to it.

"Mr. BORAH. There are some objections to it, Mr. President, which have been presented to me. What my final attitude upon the bill will be I do not know, but it is a matter of a great deal of importance to some people. I therefore do not desire that the Senate shall undertake to dispose of it this morning.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have been seeking to get this bill up for some time. I knew that the Senator from Idaho was interested in it, and possibly might have some objection to it. I have delayed asking for its consideration in order that the Senator from Idaho might procure some information concerning the bill which he desired to obtain. As I have said before, at the very first opportunity I expect to call the bill up. As the Senator from Montana [Mr. Walsh] has stated, I feel under obligation to do whatever may be possible to secure action upon the measure by the Senate, and I expect to secure such action.

"The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

"* * * * *"

The Senate passed the bill, with amendments, on February 24, 1921 (60 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3789, et seq.), with the following debate:

"Amendment of Federal Power Commission Act

"Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to make another attempt to make good my promise to the Secretary of the Interior. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Spencer] a moment ago told me that this was not the bill he had in mind. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 4554, intending to offer two amendments if that consent is given. It is the bill that takes from the jurisdiction of the Water Power Commission the granting of permits in national parks and leaves it with Congress.

"The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

"There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4554) to amend an act entiled 'An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of waterpower; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes,' approved June 10, 1920, which was read, as follows:

"'*Be it enacted, etc.,* That hereafter no permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, within the limits of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress, and so much of the act of Congress approved June 10, 1920, entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, as authorizes licensing such uses of national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed.'

"Mr. JONES of Washington. After the word 'limits,' on page 1, line 7, I move to amend by inserting the words 'as now constituted.'

"The amendment was agreed to.

"Mr. JONES of Washington. Then, on page 2, line 6, after the words 'uses of,' I move to insert the word 'existing.'

"The amendment was agreed to.

"Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I did not feel that I was in a position to object to the consideration of this bill, as the Senator from Washington has been for a long time trying to get it before the Senate for consideration, and he was under an obligation, by reason of a promise which he made to the President and the Secretary of the Interior, to bring it up for consideration if possible. I did not desire to interfere with his bringing it before the Senate, neither have I time at this hour to discuss the bill; but I desire to record my objection to it, and I want an opportunity to vote against it. That is all I shall ever get out of it anyhow, I presume, so we might just as well consider it this afternoon.

"I have understood that the bill is very generally favored by the Senate, but it seems to me to be an unwise measure, even from the standpoint of those who are advocating it, taking into consideration the reasons for it which they assign. But I cannot undertake at this late hour, Mr. President, to discuss it. However, I ask for an opportunity to vote upon it.

"Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I only want to say that I happen to know something about the situation. The waterpower bill, which many Members of Congress were interested in securing the passage of, was in very grave danger of a Presidential veto in the closing hours of the last Congress, and finally the Secretary of the Interior expressed as his main objection the fact that the power in that bill extended over the national parks, and he did not want any bill to develop power in the national parks and destroy their beauty. Finally, the Secretary agreed that he would recommend to the President to sign the bill and let it go through, if the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jones), who was acting chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, would bring before the Congress a bill to amend the waterpower act so as to leave out the national parks. I think in good faith we ought to pass the bill.

"Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not think that good faith requires us to pass it. I think that good faith does require that an opportunity shall be given for the Senate to vote upon it. Therefore I have not opposed a veto.

"As I understand the bill, it all resolves itself into a simple proposition whether the parks would be better protected by the Congress of the United States or by the Commission which was created by the Power Act.

"I had some experience here in trying to protect the parks through the Congress of the United States, when we had up the famous Hetch-Hetchy proposition, and I observed that the Congress did all it could do, in that instance, to destroy that park. I think those who are advocating this bill will find in a very short time that they are not securing the protection which they think they are securing. I am just as much in favor of protecting the parks, I think, as those who are advocating this bill, but I wholly disagree with them as to how they can be best protected. Therefore I am opposed to the bill.

"The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

"The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed."

* * * * *

(C) Action in the House

House action on the Senate version of the bill is set out in proceedings of March 1, 1921 (60 Congressional Record, 4204, et seq.):

"Amending Federal Power Commission Act

"Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 4554, a bill to eliminate from the Water Power Act national parks and monuments.

"The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"'S. 4554. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the River and Harbor Appropriation Act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920.

"'*Be it enacted, etc.,* That hereafter no permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, within the limits as now constituted of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress, and so much of the act of Congress approved June 10, 1920, entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the Public Harbor Appropriation Act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, as authorizes licensing such uses of existing national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed.'

"Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the object of the bill is to modify the Federal Water Power Act so as to eliminate from its provisions national parks and monuments. When the act was originally passed we supposed we had sufficiently safeguarded national parks and monuments so that there would not be constructed therein any water power or reclamation projects. However, the President was in doubt as to whether he would sign the bill which was presented to him on the 4th day of June, the day before we adjourned. He referred the bill to the Secretaries of the Interior, War, and Agriculture. The Secretary of the Interior had great doubt as to the policy of giving to a commission control over

national parks and monuments in the matter of water-power development. Senator Jones, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and Senator Walsh of Montana called upon the Secretary and conferred with him regarding the signing of the bill. The Secretary conferred with Senator Underwood and the majority leader [Mr. Mondell], and an understanding was reached whereby the bill was to be introduced at this session eliminating the parks and monuments from the operation of the Federal Power Act, and this bill carries out that understanding.

"Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. ESCH. Yes.

"Mr. BARKLEY. What is the difference between the bill as it passed the Senate and as it was reported from the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House?

"Mr. ESCH. They are identical.

"Mr. BARKLEY. Would you gentlemen consider an amendment to the bill as it passed, striking out the word 'existing'?

"Mr. ESCH. That is in the bill.

"Mr. BARKLEY. The word 'existing,' which limits it to national parks and monuments now in existence, is in the bill as it passed the Senate?

"Mr. ESCH. Yes; and as reported by the Select Committee on Water Power.

"Mr. BARKLEY. I would like to ask whether the gentleman would be willing to consider an amendment to the bill striking out the word 'existing'?

"Mr. ESCH. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that with such an amendment the bill would fail in this Congress.

"The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

"The bill was ordered to be read a third time; was read the third time.

"Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question? This does not create any commission?

"Mr. ESCH. Not at all.

"Mr. BLANTON. It is only an amendment perfecting the act, and it does not increase any salaries, or anything of that kind?

"Mr. ESCH. No.

"Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to offer an amendment to the bill?

"The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is.

"Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I did not yield the floor for that purpose.

"Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. ESCH. Yes.

"Mr. MANN of Illinois. I hope that the gentleman from Kentucky will not do that. I am in full sympathy with what the gentleman wants.

"Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield to me for a moment?

"Mr. ESCH. I do.

"Mr. BARKLEY. When the bill was under consideration the question arose whether a limitation should be made applying to national parks now in existence or also to future parks that might be created.

"As the bill passed the Senate and as it was reported to the House, it limited its effect to existing national parks only, so that hereafter, if more national parks shall be created, or those already in existence shall be enlarged, we must fight out on every individual bill creating a new national park or enlarging one already in existence the question whether the water power in the national park shall be used. It was my thought that we ought to make this provision apply to all parks that exist now as well as those that may be created in the future; but if the House feels that such an amendment would endanger the passage of this bill and thinks it is better to get what we can under this bill than to try to get more, I have no disposition to offer an amendment. I do desire, however, to register my objection to the provision that limits it to existing national parks instead of including all that may hereafter be created.

"Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the thought as presented to the committee by Secretary Meredith and Secretary Payne was that this would safeguard existing parks and monuments, and hereafter, if any project was presented to Congress for the creation of a new park or monument or the extension of existing parks or monuments, it would be within the power of Congress to determine whether or not the water power act should apply to them.

"The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

"The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

"On motion of Mr. Esch, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

"On motion of Mr. Esch, the bill, H. R. 14469, an identical House bill, was ordered to lie on the table.

"* * * * *."

It is here pointed out that Dinosaur National Monument as it "existed" or was then "constituted"—in 1921—was comprised of a total of 80 acres of land.

6. AUGUST 9, 1934: LETTER OF PARK SERVICE TO FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

In August 1934 the Acting Director of the National Park Service addressed a letter to the Federal Power Commission on the subject of power withdrawals in the Echo Park-Blue Canyon areas. [Emphasis supplied.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 9, 1934.*

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We are studying the possibility of setting aside certain lands in northwestern Colorado as a national monument. The area considered is within the watershed shown on the map marked "Exhibit H (a)," which accompanied an application of January 30, 1932, of the Utah Power & Light Co. for a preliminary permit, and which is on file in the Denver office of the Reclamation Bureau. The proposed monument would be affected by the Echo Park Dam site and the Blue Canyon Dam site, as indicated on the enclosed map of the proposed monument.

Such an area would be established by Presidential proclamation which would exempt all existing rights, and a power withdrawal is, of course, an existing right.

However, we feel that we should call this to your attention. If it is possible to release the power withdrawals that you now have in the area, our monument will be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of administration.

If you have any data or reports on this area, we would appreciate very much receiving copies.

Very truly yours,

A. E. DEMARAY,
Acting Director.

7. DECEMBER 13, 1934: REPLY OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO LETTER OF PARK SERVICE

The response of the FPC to the Park Service letter of August 9, 1934, was as follows (emphasis supplied):

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, December 13, 1934.

EP-279-Utah,

Re Utah Power & Light Co.

DEAR DIRECTOR CAEMMERER: Reference is made to Acting Director Demaray's letter of August 9, 1934, in which the Commission was advised that you were studying the possibility of establishing a national monument along the Green and Yampa Rivers, in northwestern Colorado, which would embrace lands withdrawn for the proposed Echo Park and Blue Mountain power developments included in the application for preliminary permit of the Utah Power & Light Co., designated as project No. 279.

Assurance was given in the letter that the Presidential proclamation establishing such a monument would exempt all existing rights, including power withdrawals, but a statement was added that if it were possible to release the power withdrawals the "monument would be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of administration." This implied request for a vacation of the power withdrawal has called for careful consideration because of the magnitude of the power resources involved and the fact that the permit application is still in suspended status pending conclusion of the comprehensive investigation of irrigation and power possibilities on the upper Colorado River and its tributaries by the Bureau of Reclamation, and a more definite determination of water allocations between the States of the upper basin. The power resources in this area are also covered by Power Site Reserves Nos. 121 and 721 and Power Site Classifications Nos. 87 and 93 of the Interior Department.

In the application of the Utah Power & Light Co. the primary power capacity of the Echo Park site is estimated at 130,000 horsepower. This is based on the development of a head of 310 feet at the dam and a regulated flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second obtained by storage in the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir on Green River and Juniper Mountain Reservoir on Yampa River. At Blue Mountain the primary capacity is estimated at 19,000 horsepower based on the development of 210 feet of head and a regulated flow of 1,100 cubic feet per second.

Ralf R. Woolley in his report on Green River and its Utilization (Water Supply Paper No. 618, United States Geological Survey), proposes the development of 114,800 horsepower, primary capacity, at the Echo Park site, based on an average head of 290 feet and a streamflow of 4,950 cubic feet per second. At Johnson's Draw, which is his designation for the Blue Mountain site, Mr. Woolley proposes a primary capacity of 43,200 horsepower based on a regulated flow of 1,800 cubic feet per second and a head of 300 feet. Either of these estimates would justify installations of something like 300,000 horsepower at Echo Park and at least 50,000 horsepower at Blue Mountain.

It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power possibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1,500,000 to 2 million horsepower installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the great part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. *The sites we are considering are import links in any general plan of development of these streams.*

Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time may elapse before this power is needed, *the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.*

I enclose a copy of the portion of the application of the Utah Power & Light Co. which describes the proposed development, and blue prints of exhibits H (a), H (b), and H (c) showing the location of the various units of the plan, river profiles, and cross sections of the dam sites. The Commission has no special reports on the area under consideration, but if you are not already familiar with them, it is suggested that you

obtain the following publications of the Geological Survey:

Water Supply Paper No. 618 (previously referred to).

Plan and Profile of Yampa River, Colo., from Green River to Morgan Gulch (5 sheets showing river profile and topography and 1 sheet of special dam site surveys).

Plan and Profile of Green River, Green River, Utah, to Green River, Wyo. (16 sheets, 10 plans, and 6 profiles).

Yours very cordially,

FRANK R. MCNINCH,
Chairman.

8. 1935 AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL WATER POWER ACT

The 74th Congress, 1st session, in the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 838), again amended the Federal Water Power Act—in two respects germane to the legislative history herein set out.

First: Section 3 of the act, which had included "national parks and monuments" in the definition of "reservations," was amended so as to exclude national parks and national monuments; offered as a committee amendment, and agreed to without discussion (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10569), the amendment—and thus, the present language of the act—reads:

"'*Reservations*' means national forests, tribal lands embraced within Indian reservations, military reservations, and other lands and interests in lands owned by the United States, and withdrawn, reserved, or withheld from private appropriation and disposal under the public land laws; also lands and interests in lands acquired and held for any public purposes; *but shall not include national monuments or national parks.*" [Emphasis supplied.]

It will be noted that the conference report, submitted on August 24, 1935 (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 14621), on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the overall 1935 act, contains this explanation:

"The Senate bill included national monuments and national parks in the definition of 'reservations' * * * amending section 3 of the Federal Water Power Act, *but the House amendment excluded national monuments and national parks in conformity with the act of 1921* * * *." [Emphasis supplied.]

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in Report No. 1318 (74th Cong., 1st sess.), accompanying the bill S. 2796, at p. 22 states:

"The definition of the former term ('reservations') has been amended to exclude national parks and national monuments. *Under an amendment to the act passed in 1921, the Commission has no authority to issue licenses in national parks or national monuments.* The purpose of this change in the definition of 'reservations' is to remove from the act all suggestion of authority for the granting of such licenses." [Emphasis supplied.]

Second: Section 212 of title II of the 1935 act (49 Stat. 803, 847)—still dealing with the Federal Water Power Act—provides:

"SEC. 212. Sections 1 to 29, inclusive, of the Federal Water Power Act, as amended, shall constitute part I of that act, and sections 25 and 30 of such act, as amended, are repealed: *Provided,* That *nothing* in that act, as amended, *shall be construed to repeal or amend the provisions of the amendment to the Federal Water Power Act approved March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1353)*, or the provisions of any other act relating to national parks and national monuments." [Emphasis supplied.]

The record (79 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10575) for July 1, 1935, discloses the coming into being of the foregoing amendment:

"* * * * *

"Mr. CROSSER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 253, line 10, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

"The Clerk read as follows:

"'Amendment offered by Mr. Crosser of Ohio: Page 253, line 10, after the word "repealed" change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided,* That nothing in that act, as amended, shall be construed to repeal or amend the provisions of the amendment in the Federal Water Power Act approved March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1353), or the provisions of any other act relating to national parks and national monuments".'

"Mr. WOLFENDEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

"Mr. CROSSER of Ohio. Will not the gentleman withhold his objections?

"Mr. WOLFENDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my objection to permit the gentleman to make an explanation.

"Mr. CROSSER of Ohio. The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the language of the bill; and *this is the law now. The national parks organization wants to make sure that the bill does not infringe upon their preserve,* so to speak. We are offering this at their request. *This is not anything at all technical.* The national parks organization thinks it would be helpful to have a provision in the bill distinguishing between the national parks and the Federal Power Commissions. [Emphasis supplied.]

"Mr. WOLFENDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

"The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

"The amendment was agreed to.

* * * * *"

In view of these two amendments—which appear on first examination to be somewhat inconsistent—what construction should be placed on the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, as amended in 1921 and 1935, with respect to national parks and monuments?

The conclusion indicated is that the 1935 act did not amend or repeal the act of March 3, 1921, requiring specific authorization by Congress before construction of any dam or related works within any national park or monument "constituted" or "existing" on that date. Summarized, successive legislative and executive action provided:

(*a*) Authorization for President to establish national monuments in the act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225).

(*b*) Establishment of Dinosaur National Monument, comprising 80 acres, on October 4, 1915 (proclamation, 39 Stat. 1752).

(*c*) Authorization for Federal Power Commission to issue licenses for construction of dams upon any part of the public lands and reservations (defined to include "national monuments") in the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063).

(*d*) Modification of authority of Federal Power Commission to require specific authority of Congress before issuance of license for construction of dams within any existing national monument, or national monument as constituted on March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1353).

(*e*) Redefinition, in the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 803, 838) of "reservations" to exclude national parks and monuments; but with qualification in same act that such redefinition did not amend or repeal (49 Stat. 803, 847) the provisions of the 1921 act—the latter act limiting authority of FPC in monuments as "constituted" in 1921.

No attempt will be made here to summarize or set out the conclusions reached in memorandum briefs on related questions by the Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, or briefs submitted for committee consideration during the hearings on H. R. 4449, and companion bills.

The several pertinent portions of legislative history detailed above:

1921 act floor amendment inserting "existing" and "as now constituted";

Conference report on the 1935 amendment referred to as "in conformity with the act of 1921";

Committee Report No. 1318 on the 1935 act reference to "an amendment in the act passed in 1921";

Floor statements of Mr. CROSSER, i. e., "* * * and this is the law now" and "* * * This is not anything technical"; and

Section 212 of the 1935 act's clear statement that "nothing * * * shall be construed to repeal or amend (the March 3, 1921 act)"; all

suggest a conclusion that the 1935 redefinition of "reservations" can be construed only as a restatement of the 1920 Federal Water Power Act, as amended in 1921; therefore, that the 1935 act did nothing to either enlarge or reduce the inside and outside limits of authority of the Federal Power Commission spelled out in the earlier legislation.

If so interpreted, it follows that the enlarged Dinosaur National Monument (that portion not "existing" in 1921) has at no time been within the restrictions of the 1921 act, as redefined in 1935. Such a conclusion becomes significant upon examination of that portion of the 1938 proclamation (set out post, as Document 12) which declares that the enlarged reservation therein created "* * * shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 * * * as amended."

9. NOVEMBER 6, 1935: LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 6, 1935.

Hon. FRANK R. MCNINCH,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCNINCH: For some time the National Park Service of this Department has been studying the possibility of setting aside, as a national monument, certain lands in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah along the Yampa and Green Rivers. Enclosed is a map of the area.

The Utah Power & Light Co. filed an application in January 1932 for a preliminary permit for a power site reservation in the Yampa and Green Rivers section. This application was on file in the Denver office of the Reclamation Bureau. Recently, however, the Utah Power & Light Co. voluntarily withdrew their application. This suggests that the power resources of the section may not be as important as originally believed.

I shall appreciate receiving your opinion as to the possibility of releasing the power withdrawals that exist in the area. By such action the proposed monument would be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of administration.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosure 686264.

10. JANUARY 9, 1936: REPLY OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, January 9, 1936.

EP-279-Colorado, Utah
Utah Power & Light Co.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to your letter of November 6, 1935, in which you inquire as to the possibility of releasing the power withdrawals existing in the area along Yampa and Green Rivers, in Colorado and Utah, in which the National Park Service desires to establish a national monument.

The Utah Power & Light Co. did, as you state, withdraw its application for preliminary permit covering the power sites in this area in March 1935, but this withdrawal was not based on any reduced appraisal of the

power resources. The action was taken because the Commission was unwilling to carry the application any longer in suspended status, and the growth of the company's power market did not justify the construction of any of the plants within the comparatively brief period which could have been allowed under the Power Act after the issuance of a permit. Nothing has occurred to change the status of the Power Commission withdrawal, or power site reserves Nos. 121 and 721, and power site classifications Nos. 87 and 93, which are also involved.

In reply to a similar request made by the National Park Service, a letter was sent to the Director on December 13, 1934, in which the power value of Green and Yampa Rivers was discussed in some detail and the position of the Commission was summed up as follows:

"Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time may elapse before this power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted."

Since receipt of your letter this whole subject has been given further study but no information has been developed to change the views of the Commission as expressed in the above quotation. For your further understanding of the Commission's position I enclose copies of my letter of December 13, 1934.

Yours very cordially,

FRANK R. MCNINCH,
Chairman.

11. JUNE 11–13, 1936: UTAH-COLORADO PARK SERVICE MEETINGS

On March 27, 1950, David H. Madsen, former manager of Dinosaur National Monument, signed a sworn affidavit setting out certain statements with respect to meetings held at Vernal, Utah, June 11, 1936, and Craig, Colo., June 13, 1936.

"Affidavit

"STATE OF UTAH,
"County of Utah, ss:

"David H. Madsen, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says: That he is over the age of 21 and a citizen of the United States, and a resident of Utah County, Utah. That at the time the area of the Dinosaur National Monument was enlarged to include the canyon unit I was employed by the National Park Service under the title of supervisor of wildlife resources for the national parks. Among my other duties I was acting superintendent of the Dinosaur National Monument and in that capacity *was ordered by the National Park Service* to arrange for hearings at Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., for the purpose of securing the approval of the citizens of that area for the expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument to include the canyon unit. Meetings were accordingly held at Vernal, Utah, June 11, 1936, and Craig, Colo., June 13, 1936. A large representation of the citizens of the area were present at these meetings.

"Among other things discussed was the question of grazing and the question of power and of irrigation development which might be deemed essential to the proper development of the area at some future date. *I was authorized to state,* and *did state as a representative of the National Park Service,* that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power or irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Colorado and Utah, that the establishment of the Monument *would not interfere with such development.*

"The first part of this agreement with reference to grazing has been carried out and the residents of the area involved are entitled to the same consideration with reference to the development of power or irrigation at the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam sites, and any other development that may not duly interfere for the purpose of the establishment of the monument and which is necessary for the development of the area.

"DAVID H. MADSEN.

"Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March A. D. 1950.

"KARL H. BENNETT.

"Residing at American Fork, Utah.

"My commission expires: December 25, 1950."

This affidavit was made part of the record of the 1950 hearings, as were supporting affidavits of J. A. Cheney, Vernal; Joseph Haslem, Jensen, Utah; Leo Calder, Vernal; H. E. Seeley, Vernal; and B. H. Stringham, Vernal.

Each deposed substantially as follows:

"That during the course of this meeting the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of the future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes."

12. ENLARGEMENT OF DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT BY PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION

On July 14, 1938, Dinosaur National Monument, by proclamation of the President, was enlarged to include additional lands aggregating 203,885 acres. As indicated by the emphasis supplied, basis for the extension of the monument's exterior boundaries was to include lands containing "various objects of *historic* and *scientific* interest"; the proclamation provides that the reservation of such lands "* * * shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended * * *"; further, that administration of the monument would be subject to the Brown's Park Reservoir reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904.

"Proclamation—July 14, 1938 (53 Stat. 2454)

"Enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument, Colorado and Utah

"By the President of the United States of America

"A proclamation

"Whereas certain public lands contiguous to the Dinosaur National Monument, established by proclamation of October 4, 1915, *have situated thereon various objects of historic and scientific interest;* and

"Whereas it appears that it would be in the public interest to reserve such lands as an addition to the said Dinosaur National Monument:

"Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 2 of the act of June 8, 1906, chapter 3060, 34 Stat. 225 (U. S. C., title 16, sec. 431), do proclaim that, subject to all valid existing rights, the following-described lands in Colorado and Utah are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument:

* * * * *

aggregating 203,885 acres.

"Warning is hereby expressly given to any unauthorized persons not to appropriate, injure, destroy, or remove any feature of this monument and not to locate or settle upon any of the lands thereof.

"The reservation made by this proclamation supersedes as to any of the above-described lands affected thereby, the temporary withdrawal for classification and for other purposes made by Executive Order No. 5684 of August 12, 1931, and the Executive order of April 17, 1926, and the Executive order of September 8, 1933, creating Water Reserves No. 107 and No. 152.

"The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of this monument as provided in the act of Congress entitled 'An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes,' approved August 25, 1916, 39 Stat. 535 (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 1 and 2), and acts supplementary thereto or amendatory thereof, *except that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the Reclamation Withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir Site in connection with the Green River project.*

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington this 14th day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and thirty-eight, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-third.

[SEAL] "FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

"By the President:

"CORDELL HULL,
"The Secretary of State."

13. MAY 14, 1943: AD INTERIM REPORT, SURVEY OF RECREATIONAL RESOURCES OF THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

The Bureau of Reclamation, in November 1940, under authority of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940 (sec. 2 (d) provides authority for financing conservation investigations and studies in connection with the work of the Bureau within the Colorado River Basin), requested the National Park Service to identify the scenic, scientific, and recreational resources of the Colorado Basin, as a part of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of the water resources of the region.

On January 27, 1941, the Secretary of the Interior approved the inclusion of a basin-wide recreational survey as a part of the studies and investigations to be continued and extended under his direction for the formulation of a comprehensive plan of utilization of the waters of the entire Colorado River system. The Secretary also appointed Frederick Law Olmsted, distinguished landscape architect, with wide experience in regional and site planning, as consultant for the survey.

By letter of transmittal of May 14, 1943, Mr. Olmsted submitted the following:

"Survey of recreation resources of Colorado River Basin

"Dinosaur National Monument Region.—Report of Progress, May 13, 1943

"(By Frederick Law Olmsted)

"To the DIRECTOR: This ad interim report is to record certain problems and certain tentative conclusions in regard to the Dinosaur National Monument area, as developed to date by unfinished investigations by Mr. George F. Ingalls and myself and others, in relation to plans now in process of development by the Bureau of Reclamation for water-control projects in and near the monument."

* * * * *

"Apart from its effect on road planning for the area, reservoir construction as contemplated by the Bureau would submerge a number of sites, geologic formations, and wildlife habitats, and would alter the character of the landscape by substitution of still water for flowing streams, and by re-

ducing the visible height of canyon walls. The latter effect would be most disastrous scenically at and near Pats Hole, where the extraordinary feature of Steamboat Rock would be submerged up to more than half its height, and in the inner canyon of the Yampa for some miles upstream well beyond Harding Hole.

"Nevertheless, the canyon unit would still have scenic and recreational values of notable importance and of nationwide interest. I venture to cite a very few examples.

"The canyon of Lodore, in general roughly V-shaped in section, is so deep that raising of the water in its bottom by 100 to 500 feet or thereabouts would hardly diminish its great impressiveness to a perceptible degree. Its rapids and low waterfalls now visibly continuing the process of erosion which cut all these canyons in the uplifting mountain mass as it rose athwart the rivers that once meandered across an ancient peneplain, would be changed to a fiordlike lake. Such an artificial change would not be justified in a national monument administered to preserve notable features of nature for enjoyment of mankind as nearly as possible in their natural condition; but it cannot be denied that if the area is deliberately made a multiple-use area, for power developments plus any recreational values compatible therewith, a great many more people can and will derive pleasure and inspiration of a high order from traversing the canyon of Lodore in boats on a fiordlike lake than would even be able to see it all in a more perfectly natural state by shooting its dangerous rapids in boats or by following the 25 miles or more of narrow trail that might with difficulty be contrived to traverse it without much scarring of natural conditions. The upstream portions of the meandering narrow inner canyon of the Yampa, incised into the "bench" in many places to a depth of about a thousand feet with almost vertical walls, would appear much as at present seen from above. One of the most impressive and geologically illuminating features of the entire area would remain, at the eastern end of the monument, wholly unaffected by the damming. It is where the high, bare, sandstone escarpment of the upfolded strata has so obviously been sawn through, on the axis of an anticline, by the river; which there quietly flows from a broad flood plain into the dark deep canyon it has cut in the slowly rising rock. The notable outlooks from many places on the rim of the upper plateau south of the rivers, especially on and near Harpers Corner—some very beautiful, all interesting geologically or otherwise—would in most cases remain substantially unchanged in appearance (unless transmission lines, as yet not definitely planned, should be so located as to impair one or more of them seriously).

"To sum up my chief considered impressions and opinions to date in regard to the scenic and recreational values of the canyon unit:

"1. It is without doubt sufficiently notable and distinctive and good of its kind, from a national standpoint, to justify in the absence of very strong special reasons to the contrary, retaining it as a national monument, administering it as such, and in due course of time expending a considerable amount of Federal taxpayers' money to make certain parts of it conveniently accessible by road and to provide simple conveniences for visitors and for its operation.

"2. It is not so unique and precious for such purposes (in the sense that Zion National Park is, for example), and the scenic, recreational, and related values which it would have if so administered would not be so largely sacrificed by the introduction of the waterpower developments contemplated by the Bureau of Reclamation as to give very strong grounds for opposing those economic developments if and when it becomes clearly evident that the installation of some or all of those waterpower developments would produce economic values of social importance largely and certainly in excess of the economic cost of producing them. Under those conditions it would be reasonable for the Park Service to approve changing the legal status of the unit from that of a national monument to that of a multiple-use area devoted to the storage and regulations of water and production of waterpower and also (to the full extent compatible with the reasonably efficient performance of that function) to conserving and utilizing the potentially great scenic, recreational, and related values of the area.

"When the several road-locations studies now in progress in the field shall have been carried far enough to determine with confidence which of them are most practicable and advantageous, the next step will be to prepare a comprehensive general plan and report for guiding the development and administration of the area—including some desirable readjustments of the present boundaries, which were fixed in the absence of accurate topographic information now available from the special USGS survey. That general plan must embody a program that can be adapted to meeting either of the two major contingencies: (a) Use of the canyon unit for hydroelectric developments and also for recreational and related values consistent therewith; or (b) indefinite postponement of final decision about building the power dams without also indefinitely postponing progressive development and use of the area in a manner appropriate to a national monument, and in such a way as to reduce to a minimum the risk of avoidable waste of natural resources or of investments in construction that may have to be made before final decision is reached about the dams."

DECEMBER 1, 1943: MEMORANDUM FROM PARK SERVICE TO BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

After the Reclamation withdrawal of June 17, 1943, the Director of the National Park Service addressed the following memorandum to the Commissioner of Reclamation:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Chicago, Ill., December 1, 1943.

Memorandum for the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation

On pages 13070–13071 of the July 24 issue of the Federal Register there is published the notice of the reclamation withdrawal of June 17, approved July 13, for the Colorado River storage project. This withdrawal covers most of the area of the Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado.

Since this notice in the Federal Register constituted the first information that we had received concerning the withdrawal, and since there might be some question as to the necessity for the withdrawal, as well as to the legality thereof, the lands already having been withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws, it occurred to us that your office might not have realized that the withdrawal covered national monument lands.

You will recall that the proclamation of July 14, 1938, enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument, including the lands now under discussion, contained a provision at the request of the Federal Power Commission, "that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended," and a further provision inserted in the proclamation at the request of your Bureau, that "the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." While there is no question as to the validity of the provision protecting the Brown's Park reclamation withdrawal, it has been our opinion that the provision relating to the operation of the Federal Water Power Act was ineffectual, since Congress specifically excluded national parks and monuments from the purview of that act. The reclamation withdrawal of June 17, of course, does not come under either one of the above-quoted provisions in the proclamation of July 14, 1938.

As you know, our two Bureaus are collaborating in the study of the Echo Park project and other reservoir projects affecting the Dinosaur National Monument, in an attempt to work out the best possible plan of development and use of the area in the event that any one or several of the proposed water-storage projects should prove feasible and should be authorized for construction. It has been the understanding between our two Bureaus, in which the Secretary has concurred, that, in event of reservoir construction within the monument, some suitable change in the designation of the area would be sought. It is our understanding, from discussions held with representatives of your Denver office that you have not made final determinations yet as to the feasibility of the projects in Dinosaur National Monument and that, in any event, it may be many years before any of them are approved for construction.

I have cited the foregoing facts to make it clear that, insofar as I am aware, there is no misunderstanding between us as to the possible future of Dinosaur National Monument.

We are concerned, however, about the promulgation of a reclamation withdrawal within an existing national monument, which has not been done heretofore, and the possible detrimental effect of such action upon the future interpretation of the laws under which the national monuments are established and administered. Because of these considerations, it is suggested that we might profitably discuss this matter further when next I am in Washington. Perhaps it would be possible to amend the June 17 withdrawal so as to exclude from it any lands within Dinosaur National Monument.

NEWTON B. DRURY,
Director.

15. JUNE 27, 1944: REPORT OF POSITION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ON DINOSAUR DEDEVELOPMENT

On June 27, 1944, the position of the National Park Service was stated in a report:

* * * * *

"4. If and when it is shown that it would certainly be in the greater national interest to develop the water resources of the canyon unit than to retain the unit for national monument purposes and it then becomes evident that authorization for such development will be given the status of the unit should be changed to that of a multiple-purpose area in which water control for the generation of power would be the principal use, and recreation the secondary but also important use."

* * * * *

16. MAY 2, 1946: LETTER OF PARK SERVICE DIRECTOR TO DR. J. E. BROADDUS

Because of its apparent bearing on intradepartmental understanding as to the effect of previous power withdrawals, the following letter is included herein (emphasis supplied):

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE
INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Chicago, Ill., May 2, 1946.

Dr. J. E. BROADDUS,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR DR. BROADDUS: I appreciate your courtesy in writing me as you did about your continued interest in preserving the park and monument areas in Utah, and giving me an evaluation of the scenic qualities of the canyon country within Dinosaur National Monument. Through my long association with conservation organizations, including this Service, I am well acquainted

with your work and with the contribution you have made toward bringing the outstanding scenic areas of Utah to the public attention which led to their protection and preservation.

I am intensely interested in your statement about the possible beneficial effect of the proposed Echo Park Reservoir in Dinosaur National Monument as a means of access for visitors to see the Green and Yampa Canyons.

The extensive river basin surveys now being conducted by the several agencies of Government are of concern to us, as some proposals may adversely affect areas of the National Park System. *Dinosaur is one of the few areas in the System established subject to a reclamation withdrawal and this may have some bearing on the proposed Echo Park project.* While we would regret to see this nonconforming use in the national monument, we are pleased to have your expression as to the possible beneficial effects.

As I have never had an opportunity to visit Dinosaur, I have not formulated any personal opinion of its scenic qualities. I know that it is regarded highly by Regional Director Merriam, of region 2, and others in the Service. It is hoped that there will be an opportunity for me to visit the area sometime this summer and to get in touch with you in Salt Lake City at the same time.

Sincerely yours,

NEWTON B. DRURY,
Director.

17. JUNE 1946: A SURVEY OF THE RECREATIONAL RESOURCES OF THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

During June 1946, there was compiled the report of the National Park Service on its survey of the recreational resources of the Colorado River Basin; this report was printed in 1950.

At page 199, there is set out the following:

"Conclusions

"The policy of the National Park Service, as the administrative agency now primarily responsible for the national monument, has been, and is, to make the protection of the natural and archeological values of the area the controlling factors in administering it. The question of whether this policy is to be changed to permit water uses will require for its solution a review of all probable advantages and disadvantages arising from such use.

"Dinosaur National Monument is eminently qualified, in the absence of very strong special reasons to the contrary, to justify its retention as a unit of the National Park System. Certain parts of it should be made reasonably accessible by road and accommodations provided for visitors just as soon as funds become available. Before authorization is given to develop its water resources and to recognize water use as the principal consideration in the administration of the canyon unit, it should be clearly shown (1) that economic and social values deriving from such development and use would largely and certainly exceed the economic costs of producing them; (2) that it would be more economical to develop the water resources of the monument rather than other resources available for the same purpose within practicable reach; and (3) that it would be of greater benefit to the whole Nation to develop the area for water storage and power than to retain it in a natural state for its geological, wilderness, and associated values for public enjoyment. * * *"

18. DECEMBER 20, 1949: MEMORANDUM FROM RECLAMATION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

It appears that on December 20, 1949, by memorandum addressed to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation first urged formal concurrence by the Secretary in the Bureau's plans providing for construction of Echo Park. The memorandum follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1949.

Memorandum.

To: Secretary of the Interior.

From: Commissioner.

Subject: Development of the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs in the upper Colorado River Basin, and their relationship to the Dinosaur National Monument.

Reference is made to memorandum of November 4 to you for approval from Director Newton B. Drury of the National Park Service on the subject, Clearance of Bureau of Reclamation Colorado River Basin Project Investigations. In concurring in Director Drury's memorandum, I informed you that the Bureau of Reclamation was studying alternative proposals to the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs, which would be located within the Dinosaur National Monument, and that we would present our findings to you as soon as current studies were completed. This memorandum summarizes the situation in the upper Colorado River Basin and the results of our studies of alternative reservoir sites.

Many years of effort in the development of coordinated plans for the best possible use of the waters of the upper Colorado River have recently culminated in the ratification and approval of the upper Colorado River Basin compact and in a recommendation by representatives of the States of the upper basin for immediate construction of certain regulating reservoirs necessary to aid in meeting requirements of the 1922 compact and for water-use projects on the streams of the upper basin.

By January 1, 1950, the regional director, Bureau of Reclamation, region 4, will complete a report entitled "Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects" to the point where it is ready for informal submittal to the States and interested Federal agencies for preliminary comments. Following this, it is hoped that the report soon can be submitted to this office for formal approval and adoption as your proposed report, and that formal release of the report can be made to the States and Federal agencies for review and comments in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and in accordance with the interagency agreements for review and coordination of reports. Members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee were pressing the Bureau last spring for immediate submission of a report on this project.

In accordance with the 1922 compact, the States of the upper division are required not to deplete the flow at Lee Ferry below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years. This necessitates provision of holdover storage reservoirs in the upper basin with a total capacity in excess of 48 million acre-feet. Many reservoirs have been studied by the Bureau of Reclamation in order to find the best plan for development of the necessary storage. Over a period of several years, it has become increasingly evident that any plan that would meet the upper basin's obligation in an efficient manner must include the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir on the Green River. In addition to providing efficient storage, at a location which will control the Green and Yampa Rivers with a minimum of loss or evaporation, the Echo Park project is probably the best power site in the upper Colorado River Basin and would provide a much-needed block of hydroelectric power, the returns from which are essential to the payout plan for the upper Colorado storage project. Any deferment of the Echo Park project would be only temporary, as it is a key unit in a plan requiring development of all proposed sites in the ultimate stage of the Colorado River Basin.

The Echo Park Reservoir and its afterbay, the Split Mountain Reservoir, are both in the area of the Dinosaur National Monument. Fortunately, those reservoirs will not affect the original monument area containing the Dinosaur remains, and will afford an opportunity for providing access to the undeveloped canyon areas of the Green and Yampa Rivers.

In view of the imminent release of the Colorado River storage project report, it is considered desirable that there be concurrence by the Secretary at this time in that portion of the Bureau's plan which provide for construction of the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir and the Split Mountain Dam and Reservoir on the Green and Yampa Rivers in the area previously set aside under the Secretary's jurisdiction and that of the National Park Service as the Dinosaur National Monument.

The Dinosaur National Monument as originally established by Proclamation No. 1313 of October 4, 1915, was an area not affected by the waters of the Green and Yampa Rivers and set aside as a national monument to preserve certain gigantic reptilian remains. A large additional area, known as the canyon unit, which contains very interesting geologic formations and magnificent scenery, and which was far greater in extent than the original monument, was declared as a part of the monument by Proclamation No. 2290 of July 14, 1938.

At the time of the creation of the canyon unit of the Dinosaur National Monument in July 1938, it was fully recognized within the Department and by other Federal agencies that the streams of the upper Colorado River Basin afforded vital possibilities for the development of power and consumptive water-use projects. The Federal Power Commission as early as 1935 and 1936, relative to the proposed creation of the canyon unit of the Dinosaur National Monument, had advised the Secretary of the Interior: "The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provision of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted."

The position of the Bureau of Reclamation was also well known to the Secretary and the National Park Service when the proclamation was issued in July 1938, and recognition was given to the acknowledged alternate water use potentialities of the Green and Yampa Rivers in this area by the inclusion of an exception in the proclamation providing that "establishment of this monument shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended."

The position of the agencies of the Department in regard to the potential developments of the Green and Yampa Rivers was further expressed in the continued joint planning efforts of the National Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation for the best possible development of the water resources lying within the Dinosaur National Monument. In a report of June 27, 1944, the position of the National Park Service was stated:

"4. If and when it is shown that it would certainly be in the greater national interest to develop the water resources of the canyon unit than to retain the unit for national monument purposes and it then becomes evident that authorization for such development will be given, the status of the unit should be changed to that of a multiple-purpose area in which water-control for the generation of power would be the principal use, and recreation the secondary but also important use."

Engineering studies now completed by the regional director, region 4, and thoroughly reviewed by the Chief Engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, establish without a doubt the superior advantages of the pro-

posed Echo Park Dam and Reservoir with the Split Mountain afterbay dam and powerplant to any other potential developments in the upper basin. As a keystone in the plan for the upper basin, it will be required for the fullest development of this area. In view of the needs for many additional storage sites in the upper Colorado River storage project, and because of evaporation rates and reduction in storage capacities which will be caused by sedimentation over the life of the upper Colorado River storage project, there are no acceptable alternative possibilities for development which will adequately meet the needs of the basin over the life of the project. Deferring construction of the Echo Park project at this time would result in economic loss of great magnitude, and, in all probability, would serve only to delay the eventual construction of these reservoirs. The benefits to be obtained from the Echo Park projects are compared with the best alternative possibilities in the attached report by the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, entitled "Brief Report on the Importance of the Echo Park and Split Mountain Units, Colorado River Storage Project and Their Relation to the Existing Dinosaur National Monument, Colorado and Utah," dated December 1949. This report shows that the development of the best alternative reservoirs, namely Lodore and New Moab, would result in a loss of about 100,000 acre-feet of water annually more than from the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs, and would result in a loss of 800 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually under initial conditions and 431 million kilowatt-hours under ultimate conditions of stream depletion. This is equivalent to an annual loss to the Nation of about $8 million annually under present conditions, decreasing to about $5 million under ultimate conditions.

In the joint studies made by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation, it has been fully recognized that proper planning of the Echo Park development with regard to the construction of access roads and public facilities will make available to the public of the United States the beauties of the canyon unit of the Dinosaur National Monument. Access to the entire Lodore Canyon of the Green River by boat on the surface of the reservoir will open to many people the beauties of this region which can otherwise only be approached by a few on extremely difficult and hazardous trails through the existing canyon.

In view of the outstanding superiority of the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir, its required place in any event in the ultimate development of the upper Colorado River, the benefits to be gained by the public from the appropriate development of a recreational area contiguous to the Echo Park project, and the strong desire expressed by the States and local interests for prompt development of this project, inclusion of the Echo Park project and the afterbay Split Mountain Dam in the regional director's report on the Colorado River storage project should be contemplated, said report to provide for the construction of the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects and joint planning of roads and other facilities in the area now encompassed by the canyon unit of the Dinosaur National Monument. Thus, it will be possible to accommodate the fullest and most sound water resource developments, preserve the historic area of the original Dinosaur National Monument area, and enhance the recreational possibilities of the canyon area of the present monument. No formal change in the designation of any part of the Dinosaur National Monument would be required until such time as the report has been issued as a part of the Secretary's proposed report and until the States and interested agencies have commented thereon, the report submitted to Congress, and the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir authorized by the Congress and approved by the President. Before the regional director's report recommending construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs is released at field level, I would like to bring this matter to your attention and secure your permission at this time for the Bureau of Reclamation to recommend the construction of the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument.

I recommend that you approve this memorandum which will permit the Bureau of Reclamation to move forward with the Colorado River storage project report and to recommend authorization of the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs.

MICHAEL W. STRAUS.

Approved:

———— ————,

Secretary of the Interior.

19. DECEMBER 30, 1949: MEMORANDUM OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE DIRECTOR TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

On December 30, 1949, the National Park Service Director expressed his views of the December 20, 1949, reclamation memorandum:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, December 30, 1949.

Memorandum.

To: Secretary of the Interior.

From: Director, National Park Service.

Subject: Effect of Reclamation's Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoir proposals on Dinosaur National Monument.

Commissioner Straus' attached memorandum of December 20, which has been routed to this Service for review, requests your permission and approval for his Bureau to recommend construction of these two reservoirs in Dinosaur National Monument and to submit by January 1, or shortly thereafter, to the States concerned and otherwise the regional director's report Colorado River storage project and participating projects in accordance with established review and approval procedures.

For the following reasons, I recommend that his memorandum be not approved:

The review and clearance procedures which Reclamation now wants rushed through will comply only with the letter of the law. The spirit has already been violated through the irregular, advance submission by the Bureau to the upper Colorado River Basin States concerned of its preliminary draft report of the same title, dated March 1949. It is a little difficult to reconcile the admonition stamped in red on its cover Preliminary Draft of Proposed Report, for Review Only, Not for Public Release, with the series of public hearings, engendered by the report proposals, held in the West this autumn by the State agencies with full participation of Bureau officials. It is regrettable that the Department should now be embarrassed by the resulting local "demand" for the Echo Park and Split Mountain proposals in advance of secretarial determination of the Department's position.

During our so far unsuccessful efforts to reach with Reclamation a compromise solution of our conflicting responsibilities to be submitted for your possible approval, the National Park Service has refrained from informing the conservation organizations and others having an interest in this specific problem. I believe that you will want to have their views before reaching a conclusion on this controversial issue. However, I do not propose to seek those views without first having your approval to do so. I recommend that such approval be given.

The National Park Service has constantly been at a disadvantage in connection with dam-building projects in that almost always the knowledge of these projects is given out locally prior to any nationwide information being given to those who are interested in conservation of all natural resources.

In November representatives of this Service went to Salt Lake City in an effort to work out possible alternate reservoir proposals that might at least save the heart of Dinosaur National Monument by eliminating Echo Park Dam. Although Reclamation promised, in order to speed our analysis of the situation, to provide directly to this Service comparative data on alternates to Echo Park, the promise has not yet been kept. The first we have heard of this is the mimeographed Brief Report on the Importance of the Echo Park and Split Mountain Units, Colorado River Storage Project, and Their Relation to the Existing Dinosaur National Monument, December 1949, attached to the original and the National Park Service copies of Commissioner Straus' memorandum. This report appears to be far from an exhaustive study of alternate possibilities. Even so, certain deductions from Reclamation's conclusions based on the report are possible.

Commissioner Straus concludes that annual losses ranging from $8 million under present conditions to about $5 million under ultimate conditions would result from the substitution of Lodore and New Moab Reservoirs for Echo Park-Split Mountain. Incidentally, while he admits that the alternate proposal would provide ultimate storage capacity equal to Echo Park and Split Mountain, at smaller capital costs, he fails to point out that the saving in construction cost amounts to $33,700,000.

Moreover, as to the $5 million to $8 million annual loss that Reclamation claims would result from substituting Lodore-New Moab, we are convinced that the "loss" would not be a real one. First, it is evident that the estimates for power generation are based on the maximum potential of the reservoirs, whereas unknowable future conditions of precipitation and runoff (and, for that matter, the demand for power itself which nearby river basins appear to be able and anxious to produce) may well be such that they will not permit or justify practical operation at the projected scale; second, it is our considered judgment that the tangible economic benefits to the surrounding States from an unimpaired and fully developed Dinosaur National Monument would amount to from $10 million to $12 million a year; and this places no dollar sign whatever on the many recognized but intangible values of recreation and wilderness conservation, let alone the saving of Dinosaur National Monument itself for future generations. Furthermore, the economic values of the area as a national monument will increase in future years, whereas Reclamation's anticipated values necessarily decline with the years.

With respect to our estimate of annual economic value of Dinosaur National Monument, attention is directed to an impartial survey and analysis of the expenditures in Montana by out-of-State visitors to Glacier National Park (to which Dinosaur, when developed, may logically be compared), made by the bureau of business and economic research, Montana State University, during the current year. The Montana survey, final results of which are to be published in February 1950, disclosed an expenditure in Montana by out-of-State visitors to Glacier National Park of approximately $10 million per annum. Indications are that final tabulations by the university will result in a higher figure. In any event, it is our opinion that the potential economic value of Dinosaur National Monument compares favorably as an offset to the estimated "loss" that Commissioner Straus speaks of.

Our experience does not permit us to agree with Reclamation's view that greater economic benefits from recreation will accrue if the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams are built. We believe that the opposite would be true.

Commissioner Straus appears to be misinformed as to the effect of the proviso in the proclamation of July 14, 1938, that "establishment of this monument shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended," which he cites. The Federal Power Commission is by statute expressly prohibited from granting licenses for power works in national parks and monuments (sec. 3 of the Federal Water Power Act as amended by sec. 201 of the Federal Power Act). Accordingly, it would appear that the exception in the proclamation is ineffective to accomplish Reclamation's purposes, since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an Executive proclamation of this character. (See Solicitor's Opinion M. 30471 of December 5, 1930.)

Commissioner Straus quotes the following statement of National Park Service's position from a 1944 report we made:

"(d) If and when it is shown that it would certainly be in the greater national interest to develop the water resources of the canyon unit than to retain the unit for national monument purposes and it then becomes evident that authorization for such development will be given, the status of the unit should be changed to that of a multiple-purpose area in which water control for the generation of power would be the principal use, and recreation the secondary but also important use."

This statement was made as a part of the series of investigations and reports made by this Service in connection with the recreational resources survey of the Colorado River Basin. It was not intended to be and is not a commitment that the monument should be sacrificed to facilitate Reclamation's dam proposals. It is our contention that there has been no showing "that it would certainly be in the greater national interest to develop the water resources of the canyon unit than to retain the unit for national monument purposes." Boiled down to its essentials, that is the question that Commissioner Straus and I now find it necessary to place before you for decision.

In any case, I believe you will agree that there are considerations involved which cannot be resolved by January 1, 1950.

In summary, I recommend:

1. That Commissioner Straus' memorandum of December 20 be not approved.

2. That the Bureau of Reclamation be specifically directed, by your approval of this memorandum or otherwise, not to release the regional director's report on January 1 or until you have indicated what your position is to be.

3. That you authorize me to ascertain in your behalf the views of the conservation agencies.

NEWTON B. DRURY,
Director.

20. FEBRUARY 28, 1950: MEMORANDUM FROM NATIONAL PARK SERVICE TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

From the correspondence files of the Department of the Interior, it appears that a meeting was held in the Secretary's office on February 23, 1950; one of the results was this memorandum:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1950.

Memorandum.

To: Secretary of the Interior.

From: Director, National Park Service.

Subject: Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

In accordance with the request made of me at the meeting in your office on February 23, I have had prepared a statement of facts and events leading up to the opinion of the Department's Solicitor (M. 30471), dated December 5, 1939.

The proclamation which increased the Dinosaur National Monument to its present size was issued on July 14, 1938 (53 Stat. 2454). It provided that "this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of July 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended," and that "the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project."

When the Federal Water Power Act (now called the Federal Power Act) was amended in 1935 (16 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 796), national monuments and national parks in specific language were excluded from the term "reservations" as defined and used in the act, thus removing these areas from the authority of the Federal Power Commission with respect to the issuance of power licenses. The legislative history of this particular amendment indicates that it was the intention of Congress, by excluding national monuments and national parks from the term "reservations," to remove all suggestion of authority for the granting of such licenses in these areas and that the purpose of the amendment was to implement the policy established in a previous amendment (act of March 3, 1921, 41 Stat. 1352), which prohibited the granting of such licenses within the limits as then constituted of any national park or national monument without specific authority of Congress. (See Solicitor's opinion of Aug. 19, 1938 (53 I. D. 372).)

At the time the proclamation enlarging Dinosaur National Monument was signed (July 14, 1938), there had been no opinion of the Solicitor construing the effect of the 1935 amendment of the Federal Power Act upon the administration of the national parks and national monuments. A little more than a month later, on August 14, 1938, the Solicitor rendered the above-mentioned opinion, holding that the Federal Power Commission does not have authority to grant licenses for power works within national parks or national monuments, whether or not there are navigable waters within such reservations, and that, therefore, it is unnecessary to include in proposed legislation for establishing or extending national parks or national monuments a provision designed to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

This opinion did not, however, discuss the question whether or not the authority of the Commission could be preserved by an appropriate provision in a proclamation reserving lands for national monument purposes. This question was not raised until 1939 when, on December 5 of that year, the Solicitor rendered an opinion (M. 30471) on the questions (1) whether a national monument (proposed Sawtooth National Monument) could be created subject to reclamation withdrawals and power site classifications; and (2) if so, whether the Federal Power Commission would thereafter be authorized to grant licenses affecting the classified lands. In this opinion, it was held that while, in the light of long and persistent practice, there can be no reasonable doubt as to the legal propriety of establishing a national monument subject to prior reservations for other purposes, it is clear that the Federal Power Commission is, by the 1935 amendment to the Federal Power Act, expressly prohibited from granting licenses for power works within national monuments. On the question whether this authority could be preserved in the monument proclamation, the opinion stated: "Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Commission by specific provision in the national monument proclamation would be ineffective since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an Executive proclamation of this character."

NEWTON B. DREWRY,
Director.

21. MARCH 3, 1950: MEMORANDUM FROM NATIONAL PARK SERVICE DIRECTOR TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1950.

Memorandum.

To: Secretary of the Interior.

From: Director, National Park Service.

Subject: A brief on the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams versus Dinosaur National Monument.

I have submitted, in a separate memorandum dated February 28, an answer to your specific question regarding the right of the Federal Power Commission to reserve sites in Dinosaur National Monument.

In this present memorandum I should like to summarize the main issues relating particularly to Echo Park Dam and Split Mountain Dam in order to clarify what we believe to be the position that the Department finds itself in. These issues are presented in an effort to be of assistance to you in reaching a final decision on our recommendation that Echo Park Dam and Split Mountain Dam be not built.

The problem breaks itself down into four main items, and I shall treat each item separately. They are as follows:

(1) Dinosaur National Monument and its value to the Nation;

(2) Power reservations;

(3) Past agreements and studies made for and with the Bureau of Reclamation;

(4) Secretary Warne's committee recommendations and the effect.

1. Dinosaur National Monument and its value to the Nation: Collectively, the present geologic, wilderness, and scenic qualities of the canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers and their adjacent benches and plateaus within Dinosaur National Monument are of national significance. Their combination in natural state, together with associated geological features constitute an inspirational and recreational resource of utmost value to the people of the Nation. The topography of Dinosaur National Monument portrays a living geological story which challenges the imagination. The recent geologic history records the work of the rivers and tributary streams in abrading their channels even deeper as tremendous internal forces elevated the land. The monument formations also present in an outstanding manner the dynamic story of mountain uplift and subsidence, accompanied by faulting and folding, erosion, deposition, and stream piracy.

There have been two main charges against the Service's stand that Dinosaur National Monument should not be sacrificed for dams. One is that the proposed Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams will not touch the dinosaur remains and, second, that nobody is using the area at the present time. Both of these statements are correct. As to the dinosaur remains, the misunderstandings arise from the misnomer, Dinosaur National Monument. It probably seemed logical, at the time the original 90-acre monument was enlarged to 209,744 acres in order to include the Green and Yampa Canyons, that the original name be used. Few will now disagree that a more appropriate name should have been chosen to reflect the main purpose of the enlargement, which is to protect the scenic grandeur and the scientific values of the Green and Yampa River Canyons, originally proposed for establishment as a national park. This area fully measures up to the standards for a national monument.

Relative to the second charge, that the area is not developed and people cannot enjoy it; that is also true, but it is only a temporary condition. It is impossible to develop fully an area for public use within a few years after it has been established. Particularly has this been true in view of inadequate

appropriations for the past several years. In any event, I believe that you subscribe to our position that it is a sound policy to develop gradually and protect our natural resources for the use and enjoyment of generations to come.

2. Power reservations: While the facts pertaining to the reservation of power in the monument are covered by a separate memorandum, I do want to recall in this general résumé some of the thinking that went on at the time that the proclamation was in the process of being drawn up. On August 9, 1934, Acting Director Demaray wrote the Federal Power Commission informing them of the Department's interest in the establishment of a national monument in the Green River and Yampa Canyon area, and informed them that, while national monuments are established subject to valid existing rights, it would be preferable from an administrative standpoint if the existing power withdrawals could be released. On December 13, 1934, the Power Commission replied that they would have no objection to the extension of the monument provided that there would be no interference with any issuance of power permits within the monument boundaries. Following this correspondence, in 1935 (16 U. S. C. 1946 ed., sec. 796), the Federal Water Power Act, now called the Federal Power Act, was amended so as to preclude any power development in any park or monument then established or to be established in the future. On November 6, 1935, Secretary Ickes, who was much concerned about the preservation of this area, wrote the Federal Power Commission referring to the National Park Service letter of 1934, stating that he had heard that the Utah Power & Light Co.'s preliminary permit within the monument had been voluntarily withdrawn by them, and asking whether the Federal Power Commission would be willing to go along with the proclamation. On January 9, 1936, the Federal Power Commission replied that the permit had been relinquished, but advised that their stand was similar to that taken in their letter to the Service on December 13, 1934. The files indicate quite clearly that there was a general understanding by the affected bureaus and the Federal Power Commission of the Department's desire and effort to free the proposed monument from power withdrawls and a realization that failing this, the monument was being established subject to a desire by power interests for developments at Echo Park and Split Mountain, and subject to the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation eventually to construct a dam at the Brown's Park site (the monument proclamation was made subject only to this withdrawal) in the northernmost part of the monument as enlarged. When it was concluded that Dinosaur National Monument nevertheless should be enlarged, as it was in 1938, there was the further realization that future requirements might require that the power issue be more squarely met. That time has now come. However, the record is clear as to whether, regardless of their opinions in the matter, the Federal Power Commission has any right to issue power permits or grant applications for developments within the monument. The answer is definitely "No." The only way that such action can be accomplished is by a specific act of Congress. The Solicitor's opinion (M. 30471) of December 5, 1939, subsequent to monument enlargement, contains this sentence: "Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Commission by a specific provision in the national monument proclamation would be ineffective, since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provision of an executive proclamation of this character."

Another occurrence, which has in no way served to clarify matters, was Reclamation's success, in 1943, in having the Department issue without our knowledge or consent, reclamation withdrawals covering the Echo Park and Split Mountain areas in the monument. This action we have always considered as of questionable propriety if indeed there is any authority for having taken the action. We have never received from Reclamation any answer to our requests for an explanation, but have made no issue of it because of possible embarrassment to the Department and with the realization that before any dam could be built it would require approval of the Secretary.

3. Past agreements and studies made for and with the Bureau of Reclamation: It is true that the National Park Service has cooperated with the Bureau of Reclamation in making a recreational study of the Colorado River. It is also true that during the process of these studies we considered what the possible effect would be upon Dinosaur National Monument if the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs were built. Personally, I feel that no reservoir studies should be undertaken in national park or monument areas. I think your decision to this effect in connection with the Kings Canyon National Park was the proper one to make; however, I realize that in the case of the Dinosaur National Monument the questions of future power and reclamation developments were definitely in mind in some quarters at the time of its establishment, and a final solution to the problem of the area's best public use was left open for future consideration. The results of subsequent studies have convinced us that the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams should not be built unless there is an absolute national necessity as distinguished from purely local power benefits and reclamation subsidies to be derived from the sale of that power. The overall national interest in this matter appears to us to be clear.

Unavoidably, in frank discussions of Reclamation's proposals with their officials and perhaps otherwise, some of our people may have expressed thoughts, ideas, or personal opinions as to extent, caliber, worth, and kind of recreational developments that might be appropriate in the area if the dams are built. Some preliminary studies, but no final ones, have ever been made in this respect, nor do we believe that they should be unless it is concluded that the monument is to be abandoned.

The Park Service has always agreed with the Bureau of Reclamation that the entire matter should be carefully studied and analyzed, and nothing that I have ever signed or agreed to with the Bureau has had an objective other than to get all of the facts in the open so that a decision could be made by the Department as to whether congressional authorization should be sought to build power dams, or any kind of a reservoir or reservoirs, within the area that is now Dinosaur National Monument. I do not feel it fair for anyone to consider these agreements and studies except as an effort to cooperate. They should not be used against us in reaching a final decision.

Our efforts have involved many studies over the years, including a study of the entire Colorado River Basin. Our agreement and understanding with Reclamation is that they would undertake a complete study of the alternate reservoir possibilities, and certainly our understanding was that Echo Park Dam would be considered only the last resort; and only after review of the issue by the Secretary. While a token effort has been made by Reclamation in this respect, all that we have had is one copy of a mimeographed pamphlet (which we had to detach from copies of correspondence to you in order to see it at all) which lists a few alternate possibilities for project combinations in lieu of Echo Park-Split Mountain. It appears to be slanted to show why the alternates, notably New Moab-Lodore, are less desirable. In any case, the conclusion is inescapable that the search for acceptable alternates outside the monument has not been pursued with the enthusiasm, vigor, and thoroughness that have governed Reclamation's Echo Park-Split Mountain investigations within the monument.

Even if the Echo Park project is the best in the United States, we are not convinced that there are no alternates or combination of alternates capable of supplying most if not all of what is claimed for it. Certainly the national monument and its values, economic and otherwise, should count for something in totaling the score and concluding what is really in the national interest.

Surely it is not convincing to cite tentative agreements with the affected States favoring these dams within the monument. We believe that no such agreements should have been attempted before the Secretary had passed upon the desirability of building Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

4. Secretary Warne's committee recommendation and its effect: The recommendation of Assistant Secretary Warne's committee does not, in my opinion, disapprove or approve the Echo Park Dam. It merely authorizes the construction of certain dams already on the Bureau of Reclamation's program and approved by the State committees and the five States in the upper Colorado River Basin before any work is done on Echo Park Dam. It also provides that further studies be made as to possible alternates to the Echo Park between now and the beginning of the second phase of the upper Colorado River program, which would be January 1, 1955. In the discussions of the committee in Secretary Warne's office, at no time was it recalled by Service representatives that the Bureau of Reclamation came out and stated definitely that there was no alternate whatsoever for the Echo Park project in the upper Colorado Basin overall program.

These are the facts in the case as we know them. I know in addition that you must take into consideration other matters of national importance, such as the expediency of the situation. There is one thing that this episode brings forward emphatically. It is the need for improved technique in the Department's public relations with the people in the immediate vicinity of this type of undertaking and with the Nation as a whole. The principle here involved extends far beyond this specific case. I most sincerely hope that some arrangement can be made for future handling of projects such as this one, or any reservoir project, whether or not it affects national park lands, whereby all interested parties, Federal, State, and individual, including the many conservation societies, can be simultaneously advised and brought in for a general discussion at one time, especially before approval of any one particular interested group is obtained. I urge that the proper procedure to accomplish this be discussed with your Advisory Committee on Conservation.

Even in view of the fact that the four States have already gotten together according to the compact and approved a definite program, I still believe that this matter can be aired in a general meeting with a representative of each State and other groups interested in the Nation's welfare, and a decision reached along the line of the Warne committee program. I most sincerely hope that this can be done.

I agree most heartily with the statement made by Assistant Secretary Warne, that in whatever way you decide the issue it will require the full support of both bureaus in order to carry out your decision and to obtain the maximum benefit from the decision reached. I am sure that you can depend on both the Bureau of Reclamation and the

National Park Service to support your decision wholeheartedly, whether in their opinion they "win, lose, or draw."

NEWTON B. DRURY,
Director.

22. JUNE 27, 1950: MEMORANDUM FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION AND NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

On April 3, 1950, the Secretary of the Interior held a hearing on the proposed construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams as a part of the overall development of the upper Colorado River Basin.

The conclusions reached by the Secretary in this memorandum were in turn incorporated by the Park Service in that agency's comments on the proposed report of the Secretary on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. The memorandum follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 27, 1950.

Memorandum.

To: Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.
Director, National Park Service.

From: The Secretary.

Subject: Construction of dams in the Dinosaur National Monument.

The preparation of a comprehensive report for the development of the upper Colorado River Basin has posed the question of whether Echo Park (immediately) and Split Mountain (eventually) Dams should be built in the canyon sections of Dinosaur National Monument. I will not have the final say, but I must determine whether, as Secretary of the Interior, I shall approve and recommend to the Congress a plan that includes these dams.

The history of the issue is well known to you and is well documented in the transcript of proceedings of the hearings I held on April 3, 1950. I shall not review it here.

I am impressed with the fact that the waters of the Colorado River constitute a resource of paramount importance to the region and that in view of the arid nature of the area, my approved plan for the development of the upper basin must make every practicable provision for the conservation and multiple use of these waters in the interest of the people of the West and of the whole Nation.

I am not unmindful of the public interest in the inviolability of our national parks, and in the status, only a little less austere, of the national monuments. By no precedent of mine would I wish to endanger these places.

Weighing all the evidence in thoughtful consideration, I am impelled in the interest of the greatest public good to approve the completion of the upper Colorado River Basin report, including the construction of the dams in question, because:

(a) I am convinced that the plan is the most economical of water in a desert river basin and therefore is in the highest public interest; and

(b) The order establishing the extension of the monument in the canyons in which the dams would be placed contemplated use of the monument for a water project, and my action, therefore, will not provide a precedent dangerous to other reserved areas.

I note that the fossils are not in the areas of the monument proposed to be flooded and that the creation of the lakes will aid the public in gaining access to scenic sections of the Green and Yampa River Canyons. Much superb wilderness within the monument will not be affected, excepting through increased accessibility.

The importance to the growth and development of the West of a sound upper Colorado River Basin program can scarcely be overemphasized. I hope that this decision on my part will promote quick solution of all other problems connected with this matter so that we may proceed with such a program.

I ask the National Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation to cooperate fully in making plans that will insure the most appropriate recreational use of the Dinosaur National Monument, under the circumstances.

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished majority leader desires to address the Senate. He does not seem to be present at this time. I think the proper thing to do is to suggest the absence of a quorum. If he enters the Chamber in the meantime, I will request that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, within a short time the Senate will face a decision on one of the Nation's most pressing domestic problems. This problem was laid before us early in January by the President of the United States. At that time he warned immediate action was necessary to assure the stability of our agricultural economy and to avoid the danger of a complete breakdown of our farm program brought on by large surplus stocks.

Now—more than 6 months later—the problem of these surpluses is much more serious than it was in January. It is so serious that not only is the welfare of our farmers at stake but also the welfare of our entire Nation.

At the present time the Government has about $6½ billion committed to price supports. Early this session the administration was forced to request an increase in the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation amounting to $1¾ billion. In the past couple of weeks the administration has been forced to request another billion and a half making a staggering total of $10 billion.

Our responsibility is to meet this problem fairly and objectively. We must look at the facts and from these facts form an agricultural program that will be fair to farmers, consumers, and taxpayers. These proposals, developed by the best agricultural minds in the country, charted the course to a sound and permanent agricultural policy.

The basic feature of the proposals was a shift from an emergency wartime program of high and rigid price supports encouraging all-out production to a peacetime program of flexible supports adjusting production to our needs.

This, then, is the decision we must make.

I would be less than frank if I did not state that it is unfortunate that the decision must be made at a time of declining agricultural income, of huge price-depressing surpluses, and of reduced foreign markets. But further delay in facing the facts will not solve the problem. These conditions are all part of the penalty we pay for pursuing an emergency program after the emergency has ended. They are to a great extent the direct result of that program. They will get heavier rather than lighter the longer the day of decision is postponed. This is why we must act now.

There is a weakness on the part of some individuals that the decision should now be put off for another year. The very nature of this proposal indicates a conviction by its supporters that a continuation of the program is not sound policy. They know the program will not work. But they want just one more year of it.

Mr. President, the "one more" theory applied to something inherently wrong is very dangerous. Two, three, or four evils do not solve a problem. They only create more evil. In like manner, a farm program that helped create a serious problem will not help solve it if it is continued.

We face the task of enacting agricultural policy. We should judge each provision of the legislation on the basis of whether it is a sound and workable policy. We should not make a decision which favors one farmer over another or which favors one part of the country over another. But, most important of all, under a guise of helping our farmers, we must not do anything which our very conscience dictates will do irreparable damage to agriculture.

I do not intend to make a detailed examination of farm policy, but let us consider a few of the major points involved and see whether they constitute sound policy.

One of the most certain results of high and rigid price supports is the creation of surpluses.

Our present farm program on basic commodities was designed to assure farmers a profit and spur production under emergency conditions. We got that production and are still getting it after the need has ended.

We now have a year's supply of wheat on hand, with a new crop coming up. This fall we will have enough wheat to last us 2 years. In the face of this, is it sound policy to use taxpayers' money to encourage the production of more wheat only to be stored rather than used?

We have enough cotton to meet our domestic demands for about a year. Is it sound policy to encourage the production of cotton through incentive prices under such a condition?

We have millions of pounds of dairy products in storage—products that have been sold to the Government rather than to consumers. Government purchases are still large—but through the courageous action of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, in reducing supports last April, the dairy industry is already moving toward a healthier condition. Production is beginning to taper off. Consumption is picking up. Would it be

sound policy now to deliberately increase the support prices so that Government purchases would increase and consumption of these products again slip backward?

Mr. President, the inevitable result of excessive surpluses is waste. Our soil is needlessly depleted and we face the ever present danger of spoilage.

Artificially high prices also lead to loss of markets. Foreign countries no longer offer us the seemingly unquenchable markets of a few years ago. Competition has returned. If we are to share in world markets we must do so at competitive prices.

Domestically, many of our markets are largely a matter of price. We have seen the butter market cut in half—not because our citizens do not like butter, but because of price. We have lost some of our cotton markets because of price. We have seen our feed market for wheat dwindle away because of price. To a considerable extent these commodities have been priced right out of the world market.

Every lost market, domestic or foreign, simply aggravates the surplus problem. Our job is to develop an agricultural program which will expand markets, not reduce them.

Another inevitable result of high and rigid supports is production control. The higher the support level, the stronger must be the controls. The Nation's farmers want less, not more controls, and they do not believe that an ever-tightening system of production control is sound policy.

Rigid Government controls are resented by most Americans. The greatest thing this country has to offer the world is freedom, and we should do everything we can to see that every American enjoys a full measure of it.

The sad truth of controls is that they take away from farmers, through reduced volume, about as much as they give through higher prices. They also work a hardship on many farmers—particularly small farmers who have just enough acres to make a living.

These three great disadvantages—surpluses, loss of markets, and production controls—go hand in hand with high and rigid price supports. Every year we pursue such a program, we get further away from our goal of a free and balanced agriculture.

This, then, is the decision which will soon face the Senate of the United States. The welfare of the Nation demands that we direct our agricultural program toward a prosperous future for our farmers. We can do this with the flexible support program. We can adjust production by lowering supports in time of surpluses and raising them in time of shortage. We can build new markets through more competitive prices. We can move toward a relaxation of Government controls once we begin to restore balanced production.

Mr. President, we will undoubtedly hear attempts to justify continuation of high rigid supports on the ground that they are necessary to prevent a further decline in farm income. Let me give assurance that there is no Member of the Senate more interested in seeing farm income raised than I am. California is one of our leading agricultural States. Neither is there any one more concerned with the present decline than President Eisenhower.

Farm income has declined in 5 of the past 6 years. It is still declining. This alone should be convincing evidence that high price supports will not and cannot maintain agricultural income. This decline has taken place during a period when we have invested more money in price supports than at any other time in our history.

In this connection, I commend for the reading of my colleagues a recently issued pamphlet entitled "Farm Price Supports—Rigid or Flexible?" It was written by Dr. Karl Brandt, of Stanford University. Dr. Brandt declares:

> Rigid 90-percent price supports were not what lifted farm income during the decade from 1940 through 1949 to a level of high prosperity. Only the exceptional, almost unlimited, demand during the war and the reconstruction period, and our farmers' full utilization of this opportunity boosted the average annual net farm income from $3.9 billion in 1930–39 to $11.5 billion in 1940–49, with an all-time record of $16.8 billion in 1947. That price supports had nothing to do with it is evident in the fact that in 1940–49 farm prices stood at an average of 111 percent of parity, or high above the floors. Many of them for years pressed hard against price ceilings.
>
> The net income of farmers depends more on the volume that can be sold at a price and the costs involved in producing it than it does on the support the Government puts under prices.

In our discussion of farm income, we forget at times that price alone does not produce income. Income is price multiplied by volume. Our farmers can never be prosperous on price alone. They must have volume—large volume. When we maintain artificially high prices that shut off normal markets and invite the development of substitutes, we are damaging farm income just as surely as through a decline in price.

Let us beware of sacrificing our farmers on the altar of parity. That is a gage of price, not of income. That parity is insufficient as a sole objective of our farm program is shown by the fact that while in the past 40 years farm prices have fallen 8 percent in relation to nonfarm prices, per capita net farm income has increased 11 percent relative to per capita income of nonfarmers. Thus, since the 1910–14 period, farmers have improved their net income position relative to nonfarmers. They did this by turning out greater volume and by increasing their efficiency.

Mr. President, all the discussion which has taken place during the past year and a half cannot erase the fact that farm income is dropping under rigid supports. In addition, all the economics we know tell us that income is bound to be higher under a program that avoids a build-up of surpluses, that builds both domestic and foreign markets, that places a premium on sound management rather than one that does exactly the opposite.

There is another vitally important factor. The administration's program is designed to hold price changes to a minimum. With the setaside of large amounts of our surpluses, price supports under the new program will be considerably higher than under provisions of the present law that will become effective unless we reach agreement on an acceptable program. There is also a limitation of 5 percent a year on changes resulting from a shift from old to modernized parity.

Contrast this with what will happen if we continue the present program until it collapses under its own weight. It is this catastrophe, Mr. President, that Congress seeks to avoid; that the administration seeks to avoid.

We know there is a limit to the amount of taxpayers' money we can channel into a farm program. We do not want our entire farm program to go down the drain, as our potato program did a few years ago, because of excessive costs.

The losses on the investment we have already put into the Commodity Credit Corporation will be substantial. Just how much, no one can say. Actual losses last year, however, were more than a quarter of a billion dollars, and the Commodity Credit Corporation's reserve for losses is now near the billion-dollar mark.

Since cost figures will be a major consideration in our determination of the new program, I believe it should be pointed out that from 1932 to 1953 our price- and income-support programs on basic commodities cost more than $4½ billion. This may seem large, but it could actually be small compared with losses that will be incurred if we continue under our present program.

There are those who assert that our price supports have cost only about $1 million a year. Mr. President, that is just not the truth. We spend nearly three-quarters of that amount each day just to store our surpluses—to say nothing of the cost of acquiring them.

I firmly believe, and this administration believes, that the Government must help farmers over economic rough spots. But I believe that funds so spent should actually help our farmers—not drive them and the country deeper into an economic morass.

These basic reasons, then, demand a change in our agricultural program now—not a year from now or 2 years from now.

This is not a partisan issue. Flexible price supports were overwhelmingly supported by both parties when enacted in 1948 and 1949. I appeal to my Democratic and Republican colleagues not to make the farm program a political issue now, at the expense of a sound agricultural economic policy. The flexible program was developed on a bipartisan basis. I hope it can be voted on in the same manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a table showing the total cost of the price- and income-support program on basic commodities from 1932 to 1953.

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

Total cost of price and income support program, 1932–53 on basic commodities

	Millions
(a) Price support (loans), 1933–53	$20.7
(b) International Wheat Agreement (export subsidy), 1950–53	546.5
(c) Surplus removal, 1933–53	552.0
(d) Acreage allotment payments under the ACP, 1936–43	1,666.3
(e) Acreage allotment and marketing quota programs administration, 1933–53	40.2
(f) Parity payments, 1938–43	967.1
(g) Retirement of cotton pool trust certificates, 1939–40	1.3
(h) Acreage contract payments, AAA of 1933, 1933–36	505.6
(i) Agricultural Marketing Act revaluing fund, and payments to stabilization corporation for losses incurred, 1932–34	288.3
Total	4,588.0

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE NEW GIVEAWAY: ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this will be the first of a series of speeches I contemplate giving on this subject matter, because in my judgment this bill is of such vital importance to the economic welfare of the American people for a century to come, that I propose to discuss the subject matter at this time, under the amendment now pending, and then, within my parliamentary rights, at a later time in connection with a discussion of other features of the bill.

Mr. President, since the explosion of the first atomic bomb at Hiroshima, on August 6, 1945, mankind has been aware of the existence of a great new energy source which can reshape human society. In the few years since that date, atomic technology in the United States has reached a stage where the use of atomic energy for industrial purposes can reasonably be foreseen. Of the various uses of atomic energy which in time will be made, one of the closest to practical realization is the utilization of atomic energy in the generation of electric power.

Until now the sources of economical power have been coal, oil, gas, and falling water. Power prices in our country have been lowest where these natural resources have abounded. The development of atomic energy as a new source of power means that within a period of about 10 years, high-cost power areas may have made available to them at reasonable prices power produced from fissionable materials. Within 20 years, power from atomic energy may be as economical in any area as power now produced from conventional fuels.

PEOPLE HAVE INVESTED BILLIONS IN ATOMIC PROGRAM

The people of the United States, through their Government, have to date invested about $12 billion in the development of atomic energy. Many millions more will be spent by the Government before a return from this investment in the form of peacetime benefits will be realized. Atomic energy, while not technically a natural resource, is a great national resource which must be considered to be a part of the public domain and public wealth.

Atomic-energy development in the United States has proceeded under a program which up to now has considered the production, distribution, and use of fissionable material to be too important to the national security to be left in private hands. This program has been governed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, known as the McMahon Act.

BILL REWRITES M'MAHON ACT

On February 17, 1954, the President submitted to the Congress a special message on atomic energy. He asked the Congress to approve "a number of amendments to the Atomic Energy Act." Accompanying his message were drafts of two separate bills prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission. One of the bills proposed to amend the McMahon Act so as to allow for widened cooperation with our allies in certain atomic-energy matters and to improve procedures for the control and dissemination of atomic-energy information. The other bill proposed to amend the act so as to encourage broader industrial participation in the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy in the United States.

On June 30, there appeared in the calendar of the Senate a bill—S. 3690—prepared by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, purporting to make certain amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Actually, the bill is a complete rewrite of the McMahon Act, carrying over some provisions of the existing law intact, modifying others, and adding a number of entirely new sections. The bill is exceedingly complicated; and the inclusion of many new definitions, together with cross-referencing and interrelation of sections, make it virtually impossible for the Congress to separate matters so as to take action at this time on only the more urgent sections.

Within a few days it was announced that S. 3690 would be taken up for consideration on the floor of the Senate. At the time of the announcement, a committee report on the bill had not yet been authorized, and committee hearings had not been printed. Transcripts of the hearings, 1157 pages in length, were made available to Senators on July 9. The report of the joint committee became available on the afternoon of July 13, the same day that the bill was made the business of the Senate.

BILL NOT SUBMITTED IN CONFORMITY WITH M'MAHON ACT

The framers of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 knew that at some future date, atomic energy would be made available for industrial use. They wisely anticipated that a future Congress deliberating on such an important change in the law would need a comprehensive report from the Atomic Energy Commission on the advisability and significance of the proposed change to guide them in their deliberations. Section 7 (b) of the McMahon Act reads, in part, as follows:

> Report to Congress: Whenever in its opinion any industrial, commercial, or other nonmilitary use of fissionable material or atomic energy has been sufficiently developed to be of practical value, the Commission shall prepare a report to the President stating all the facts with respect to such use, the Commission's estimate of the social, political, economic, and international effects of such use and the Commission's recommendations for necessary or desirable supplemental legislation. The President shall then transmit this report to the Congress, together with his recommendations.

That is what the law provides; that is what the law Congress passed in 1946 laid down as a requirement for Presidential action. That is a provision of the law, binding upon the Atomic Energy Commission as well as upon the President of the United States.

Now let us see whether it was followed.

The Atomic Energy Commission has not yet prepared and presented the report required by section 7 (b) of the McMahon Act. Mr. President, I wish to say that, in my judgment, this bill should not have been allowed to reach the floor of the Senate until the Atomic Energy Commission and the President of the United States had carried out their obligations under the 1946 act. One year ago the Commission informed the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that such a report at that time would be premature. The President's message of February 17, submitting drafts of proposed legislation prepared by the Commission, and providing for industrial participation in the atomic energy program, made no mention of the required section 7 (b) report. The testimony of AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss before the joint committee, during its June 1954 hearings, cannot be taken as substantial compliance by the Commission with the requirement of law.

If a section 7 (b) report is premature, as the Commission indicated last year and still appears to believe, judged by its election not to present the required report, then Congress at this time should not be undertaking consideration of S. 3690.

The failure of the Commission to submit its report raises the serious question of whether its apparent support of the administration atomic energy bill is the result of its independent judgment or compliance with another Presidential directive.

The lack of a report on the social, economic, political, and international

effects of a change in the present law to allow private use of atomic energy and materials is not a matter to be taken lightly, either by the Congress or by the people of the United States. The Congress is entitled, before legislating, to have available to it the expert analysis and advice of the Commission it created and charged with administration of the atomic energy program. In failing to furnish this required information or to explain its failure to do so, the Atomic Energy Commission in my judgment has been willfully and seriously negligent in its duty, not only to the Congress, but also to the American people, or it is being bypassed.

This section of the law is being bypassed by the Atomic Energy Commission; and in my judgment the Commission is deserving of severe censure from the Congress. That is what we ought to be acting up, rather than a bill which apparently has the support of the Atomic Energy Commission without the Atomic Energy Commission ever carrying out its clear duties and obligations under the act of 1946.

In the closing days of this session—with only a few hours in which to study a 104-page bill and 1,157 pages of hearings and testimony and to listen to debate on the bill on the floor of the Senate, and without the benefit of expert advice—the Members of the Senate are being rushed into a vote on S. 3690 which might well change the course of history, and which is certain to have profound effects on the future economy of our Nation and the economic well-being of our people.

I should like to make it very clear that I have no objection to the participation of private industry in the atomic energy program. A number of industrial firms are already sharing in research and development projects with the Atomic Energy Commission, and I am sure we all look forward to the day when private industry will be able to maintain its own plants in the atomic energy field. My concern is with the apparent rush to enact this proposed legislation long before it appears to be required.

At the present time the Commission is conducting a program involving five different types of atomic reactors. The Commission has stated that the probability of producing electricity from nuclear fuel at a cost competitive with electricity from coal, oil, or gas is good. It has also stated that this does not mean that such low-cost nuclear power will be obtained from the very first plants which might be built, but that it may well come from succeeding plants which, as a result of the experience with the first, it should be possible to construct and operate more economically.

Testifying before the joint committee on June 2, 1954, Thomas E. Murray, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, made the following statement:

> We are only now in the development stage. We have not yet reached the phase of competitive, commercial application. This is some years ahead. As I mentioned earlier, the 5-year reactor program submitted to the committee is aimed at making competitive nuclear power a reality. If the goal is accomplished, our feeling is that only a small number of full-scale privately owned and operated power reactors are likely to be on the line before 1965—in other words over 10 years from now.

Mr. President, I am confident that private capital will not be risked until the results of Government experiments with different types of reactor plants are known, and that it will be at least 5 years before an application is made by a private concern for a license to operate an atomic powerplant. No new legislative authority is required for private participation in experiment work at Government test plants. This being the case, what is the need for wholesale amendment of the McMahon Act at this time?

BILL PRIMARILY AFFECTS ELECTRIC POWER PRODUCTION

S. 3690 involves questions of Federal power policy more than atomic energy policy. When the safeguards for security, safety, and health have been taken care of, provisions for development of electric power come entirely within the field of power policy—not atomic policy. Make no mistake about it, S. 3690 is definitely and primarily a power bill, but it is a bill designed to turn over the power features of the atomic energy program to private industry rather than to guard the public interest in its $12 billion investment in atomic energy production.

Since President Theodore Roosevelt, Federal power policy has been recognized as an antimonopoly policy. It may be recalled that in his James River veto message President Theodore Roosevelt said it was his duty "to use every endeavor to prevent this growing power monopoly, the most threatening which has ever appeared, from being fastened upon the American people." Gifford Pinchot and George W. Norris have echoed these words. Our first objective in legislating on the matter of atomic energy power should be to implement this policy.

Here once again the Senate of the United States has an opportunity to learn from the lessons taught by liberals who preceded us in the Senate in decades gone by—liberals such as Norris and the La Follettes, Johnson, McNary, and Dill, liberals who have written a record for the protection of the public interest in a sound Federal power policy necessary to check the development of a private utility monopoly.

I ask the simple question, Are we to make use of the lessons taught by those great liberals who have gone before us, who in their day, too, were attacked and abused as dangerous, creeping Socialists, who were charged with an attempt to set up some kind of State economy, when all they were trying to do was to write into the law checks which would protect the public interest of the people of the United States against a private utility monopolistic combine.

They were successful; but here and now, under President Eisenhower, we are confronted once again with a reactionary administration which seeks to sell the economic freedom of the American people into a monopolistic economic bondage. Here is one liberal in the Senate who is going to call attention again to the great lessons taught by liberals before the little fighting band of liberals now in the Senate ever trod the carpets of this historic floor.

It is just as though we were to turn back the curtain and take a look at the scene when men such as La Follette, Norris, and Dill were fighting on the floor of the Senate and warning the American people as to what would happen if Congress did not adopt the kind of Federal power policy which great liberal Presidents of the United States, such as Theodore Roosevelt, urged be adopted. Theodore Roosevelt, in his great veto message on the James River bill, laid down basic principles for the protection of the public interest in a public power program which are as applicable today as they were on that day, before the ink on that veto message was dry.

Federal Power Commissioner Dale E. Doty in testimony before the joint committee on June 29, 1953, stated that legislation for grants or licenses by the AEC of the privilege of developing atomic energy should provide standards guiding the AEC's issuance of such grants or licenses to protect and promote the public interest in the development and utilization of the electric energy to be produced from atomic energy, as well as to protect those public interests in national defense and security which are particularly associated with the development of atomic weapons. The grant of the privilege should depend not solely on the negative consideration that national defense will not be harmed, but on the affirmative ground of benefit to the public interest in electric power and other products of the operation of nuclear reactors as well.

ATOMIC POWER DEVELOPMENT PARALLELS WATERPOWER LEGISLATION 50 YEARS AGO

A statement prepared by the Federal Power Commission for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy last year stated in part:

> Current proposals to develop peacetime uses of atomic energy may involve some of the same problems faced in 1908 when Federal waterpower legislation was first proposed and resolved in 1920 when the Federal Water Power Act was enacted (now pt. I of the Federal Power Act). For by 1908 the Nation had in waterpower, as it now has in atomic energy, a great energy resource, largely undeveloped, but believed to be potentially very valuable. * * * Similarly, today, the energy resource which the United States has, as a result of its expenditures of billions of dollars in atomic weapons research, cannot be developed without congressional approval because of Federal proprietary interests. * * * Thus it becomes pertinent to test any legislative proposals with respect to non-Federal development of atomic energy to see whether the public interest in atomic energy is protected and benefited as adequately as the Congress of an earlier generation sought to do for the Nation's interest in waterpower.

FAILURE TO PROVIDE FOR FEDERAL ROLE IN ATOMIC POWER GENERATION

In the 104 pages of S. 3690 the matter of power production from atomic energy is mentioned only once, and then under the heading of "byproduct energy." The historic safeguards applied for 35 years during Republican and Democratic administrations alike, to protect the public interest in power resources, are completely bypassed and neglected in this administration's atomic energy bill.

In my judgment, that was not an oversight, either; it was by design. This administration does not say anything except what I have mentioned, namely, a very brief provision, because a part of the program of this administration is obviously to turn the power potential of this country over to a private utility monopoly, and do it under the misnomer of trying to develop private power and private enterprise.

I say again what I have said before, that the trouble with this administration is that it does not know the difference between private monopoly and private enterprise.

The Federal Power Act assumes that in some instances the public interest will best be served by Federal development of a power source. Section 7 (b) of the act provides that—

> Whenever, in the judgment of the Commission, the development of any water resource for public purposes should be undertaken by the United States itself, the Commission shall not approve any application for any project affecting such development.

But instead the Commission is directed to submit its findings to the Congress with appropriate recommendations for the development of the natural resource.

Public development of power resources and marketing of power at reasonable prices is the best way to discourage monopoly prices in the power field. Public competition keeps prices in line by furnishing a "yardstick" for the determination of what is a reasonable price. A yardstick of this kind will be sorely needed in the early days of atomic energy power development and marketing. I wish to stress this point perhaps above all others in my speech this afternoon. I believe that once again a historic issue has reappeared on the floor of the Senate. It is the issue represented by the question: Is the Senate of the United States going to protect the heritage of all the people of this country in the power potential of America by writing into this bill a public power yardstick guaranty; or are we going to walk out on these great statesmen of the past? When this issue on a previous occasion was before the Senate, in connection with the development of electric power generated by falling water, they had the foresight to write such a guaranty into the power laws of the United States. Yet we have a bill before us into which those guaranties are not written.

That is why a group of us in the Senate have submitted and will offer amendments designed to keep faith with the great leaders of the Senate in the years gone by, when they wrote such guaranties into the power acts enacted by Congress.

YARDSTICK OR GOLF STICK

There is no public power yardstick in the pending bill. In fact, sometimes I wonder what kind of stick is in this bill. I read with some interest an article in Look magazine entitled "Ike's Cronies," and I noticed some discussion of a very distinguished American, of whom I am very fond as a golfer, Bobby Jones. I am not blind to the fact, however, that he is also a director of one of the great power companies, the Southern Co., and I also know that it is a major member of the Dixon-Yates combine, with which the President has directed the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a contract in regard to not atomic energy, but electric power.

It raises a question in my mind if what we are doing is substituting the golf stick for the public power yardstick. The golf stick does not supply the public with any protection.

In submitting the bill to us without section 7 (b) of the act of 1946 being complied with, the President of the United States opens himself up to exactly just such surmises. He opens himself up to the question: What influences are being brought to bear, and by whom, upon the President of the United States, that he would urge such a contract and that he would urge such a bill, without the provisions of section 7 (b) of the 1946 act being complied with, either by the Atomic Energy Commission or by the President himself?

PEOPLE AND PRESS BECOMING AROUSED

Mr. President, in my judgment, as a result of the debate which has taken place on the floor of the Senate on this issue, an increasing number of people all over the country, as my mail and my telephone calls give evidence, are beginning to become greatly concerned and alarmed as to what the President of the United States is up to, and are becoming very much concerned as to what the proponents of the bill are trying "to get by with." The people are beginning to recognize, Mr. President, as they did years ago when they found, with regard to the development of power by falling water, that they must look to their representatives in the Congress of the United States to protect their interests from a piece of legislation that is obviously bad. It is rather heartening and reassuring to see the response which this debate has elicited from the newspapers of America. It is rather encouraging that more and more editors and increasing numbers of columnists are raising some signal flags of warning to the American people that this bill is not one of those run-of-the-mill bills in the Senate of the United States. It is a bill which will have a terrific historical impact upon the economic welfare of the American people for generations to come.

That is why I think it should be thoroughly debated. That is why the Senator from Oregon is going to cooperate with other Members of the Senate who are bound and determined to see to it that a thorough and full record is made on the many features of this bill before the debate comes to a conclusion.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS L. STOKES

One of the newspaper columnists to whom I wish to pay a very deserved tribute and sincere compliment at this time is Thomas L. Stokes, who, in the July 16 issue of the Washington Star, wrote a column under the heading "Development of Atomic Energy—Fear Expressed That Private Interests Will Get an Upper Hand in Utilizing Nuclear Resources."

In my opinion, Tom Stokes is one of the great journalists of America. He is one of the journalists who, in my opinion, personifies what I consider to be the primary ethical obligation of free journalists, namely, to write the truth on the basis of the facts as he finds them or honestly believes them to be. He recognizes that favorite old motto, biblical in origin, of such progressives as the senior La Follette, who, for many years, on the masthead of his Progressive magazine in the State of Wisconsin carried the motto "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make ye free."

Tom Stokes, Mr. President, has written time and time again, on issue after issue, and, while on a goodly number of issues I have found myself in disagreement, on the merits, nevertheless, his writings on those issues have made me recheck and think through points of view and conclusions previously formed. Tom Stokes, in my judgment, always pushes his pen in keeping with the great journalistic ethic which I have just mentioned. As a result, I think he is one of the great educators of America, and that he has done much to enlighten the American people and give them a better understanding of the facts involved in controversial political issues. In this particular column, Mr. President, he has written in keeping with that high standard of journalistic ethics. He says:

DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY—FEAR EXPRESSED THAT PRIVATE INTERESTS WILL GET AN UPPER HAND IN UTILIZING NUCLEAR RESOURCES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It may sound somewhat melodramatic to say that Congress is on the eve of one of the great legislative decisions of its long history.

But that hardly seems an exaggeration as to what it does about the bill to revise the Atomic Energy Act that is now before the Senate.

Unless the bill as it was presented to the Senate from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is amended to protect the public against the monopoly that some experts believe is inherent in its patent and other provisions, then future generations may be in for a lot of headaches.

There is a background of experience to warn us. That is the way we permitted our earlier source of energy—electricity developed from water power and steam power—to be exploited by private combines that got bigger and bigger and more and more powerful, took higher and higher tolls from the consuming public, and finally invaded and polluted our politics until the Government, moving under the impulse of public wrath, finally stepped in to straighten it all out. That wasn't so long ago, in fact is still clear in the memory of many of us.

Out of that we developed regulatory laws that offer a pattern to guide us in development of atomic power.

We start fresh now with atomic energy, with all that experience behind us. We will indeed be negligent—as well as fools—if again we let powerful and selfish private interests get a monopoly grip not only on atomic power, but also in utilization in other fields that radiate from the atom—medical science, agriculture, processing of food, and so on.

We, the taxpayers, already have invested $11 billion in atomic development, mostly for military purposes. We have, therefore, quite a stake. It belongs to us. The terms by which we permit private interests to develop atomic power for peacetime uses become consequently the overriding consideration before Congress and with us.

There will likely be more noise and clamor about other issues in the Atomic Act revision bill.

One of these issues concerns how much we shall tell our allies about military use of atomic power. Another has to do with the recent order by President Eisenhower to the Atomic Energy Commission to purchase power from a plant to be built by a private syndicate, instead of having TVA, which has been the supplier of power for AEC, build a steam plant and add to its own capacity. Supporters of TVA in Congress see this arrangement as not only bad business for the Government and costly to it and the consumer but also as an entering wedge to hamstring TVA's usefulness as a yardstick. They are seeking to stop execution of the contract by amending the atomic energy bill.

These two matters are extremely important in themselves, and of considerable public import and interest. But the public should be cautioned not to let these controversies hide what is done about cutting in private interests on development of atomic power.

This last involves two changes in present law. One affects patent rights which heretofore have been controlled tightly by the AEC. Under the bill before the Senate, patent rights are to be opened to private interests and under terms which are criticized as not properly protective against monopoly. Because of criticism, some alterations were made. One of these extends for 5 years the AEC's power to require the holders of private patents to make them available to others if such patents are important in production or utilization of nuclear fuels or atomic energy. But some familiar with the operation of patent law in such a field still believe that the public is not adequately protected.

Aside from patents, the bill also authorizes the AEC to issue licenses to private interests for construction, ownership, and operation of facilities to produce and utilize nuclear fuel and atomic energy. Ownership of nuclear fuel still would be retained in the Government.

It is here that production of power is involved. Yet the bill does not provide for preferences to public bodies or cooperatives in distribution of power, either from private plants that are licensed or from public atomic powerplants that might be constructed by the Government. Such preferences long have been in our laws dealing with hydroelectric power. It is true that the utilities are now engaged in a campaign to break these preferences down and, in fact, are on the point of success in various areas—at Niagara Falls, at Clarke's Hill along the Savannah River in Georgia and South Carolina, and in some projects being planned for the Pacific Northwest, among others.

If the utilities could prevent preferences for public bodies and co-ops in the atomic energy law, it would be quite a victory at the very outset. They may get away with it, of course. They have their highly paid lobbyists right here, at the ear of your Representatives, and you, the public, are always a long ways off.

I have read the entire Stokes article into the RECORD, because I think it is such an excellent one, and contains such sound warnings as to the dangers of the bill, that there should be in the RECORD reference to a voice other than the voices of Senators. Here we have the voice of a great mind in the journalistic profession, which, in my judgment, in a brief column, has really gone to the heart of some of the major dangers of the bill.

I wish to commend Tom Stokes for the brilliance and the insight he discloses in his analysis of the bill. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to heed his warning, because something tells me that as the American people come to understand that warning, they are going to heed it, and if Members of the Senate do not follow a course of action in amending the bill consonant with the warnings which Tom Stokes has set forth in his column they will ask a good many questions, one of them being, "Why didn't you heed it?"

THE BILL MAKES NO PROVISION FOR HISTORIC POWER SAFEGUARDS

Experts from the Atomic Energy Commission have testified before the Joint Committee that atomic reactors which 10 years from now can be expected to produce power at 7 mills per kilowatt-hour or less are likely to be plants of 100,000 kilowatts of electrical generating capacity or larger, costing many millions of dollars. Only the Federal Government or large corporations or investment trusts will be able to finance projects of this magnitude. For at least 20 years the people of the United States will have to depend upon giant private power combinations or the Federal Government for their supplies of power produced from atomic energy.

Section 44 of S. 3690, the administration's proposed new Atomic Energy Act, is the "power section" of the bill. It provides:

Byproduct energy: If energy which may be utilized is produced in the production of special nuclear material at production or experimental utilization facilities owned by the United States, such energy may be used by the Commission, or transferred to other Government agencies, or sold to publicly or privately owned utilities or users at reasonable and nondiscriminatory prices. If the energy produced is electric energy, the price shall be subject to regulation by the appropriate agency, State or Federal, having jurisdiction.

Section 44 is one of the sections which was carried over intact from the 1946 McMahon Act. It was written when the atomic energy program was centered primarily upon the development and production of atomic weapons. As stated in the minority report of the Joint Committee on S. 3690, this section was written when atomic power was still a remote possibility and the section pertaining to its production was embryonic. Now that we stand on the threshold of the atomic power era and consider legislation designed to usher it in, singular, indeed, is the fact that the new legislation does not enlarge upon the embryo, so far as AEC production of atomic power is concerned.

Despite the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission has assumed the role of power broker with regard to the Dixon-Yates long-term contract which it is entering into in compliance with a Presidential directive, if not stopped, the AEC has steadily maintained that it wants to stay out of the atomic power business. Chairman Strauss describes the AEC's planned power reactor program for the next few years as a minimum program by choice. This role seems to have Presidential approval. President Eisenhower said in his message of February 17:

The creation of opportunities for broadened industrial participation may permit the Government to reduce its own reactor research and development after private industrial activity is well-established.

A draft of the proposed legislation accompanying the President's message contains this interesting language:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Commission to engage in the sale or distribution of electrical energy for commercial use except such energy as may be produced by the Commission incident to the operation of research and development facilities or facilities for the production of fissionable material.

The majority report of the joint committee on S. 3690 apparently construes this restriction to apply to section 44. It states in this regard:

This section will permit the Commission to dispose of that utilizable energy it produces in the course of its own operations, but does not permit the Commission to enter into the power-producing business without further congressional authorization to construct or operate such commercial facilities.

ADVERSE EFFECT UPON PUBLIC BODIES AND RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OPS

Rural electric power systems and other small producers and distributors of power today generate only a small percentage of the power they use. About half of their power is obtained from commercial power companies, and about 30 percent from the Federal Government. The great number of these systems represents a tremendous financial investment by American small businessmen and farmers.

In the not too distant future, power produced from nuclear sources will be lower in cost than power from conventional sources, if the atomic powerplant is large enough. If the smaller systems are unable to obtain the cheaper power from the Federal Government the utility giants will be in a position to victimize them or to put them out of business by refusing to furnish them with cheap power and underselling them on the customer market. The history of monopoly big business in America shows that the giants of industry have not hestitated to resort to such practices when the opportunity has been afforded them.

Not only have they not hesitated, but that has been their policy; not only have they not hesitated, but that is the chief device they use for squeezing the small operator out of business. Yet we have the administration coming forward with a bill having in it not a word which will protect the interests of the rural electric cooperatives of the United States, once the private utilities begin to produce power generated from atomic energy. To the contrary, we have in the report filed with the bill, and in the pronouncements of the President of the United States contained therein, clear proof and evidence that the President does not intend that the cooperatives and the small-business men shall be protected by public-preference clause from this kind of squeeze play, which has characterized the development of monopoly in the United States throughout our history.

That is why, with some emphasis, I raise this warning today. That is why I want to be certain that the RECORD is clear because, Mr. President, the record must be made on this point, so that no Member of the United States Senate can

ever go back to his constituents and say, "I did not understand that. That was not called to our attention. It was a very long bill and the report was extensive. It came up in the dying days of the 83d Congress. I never knew that that matter was involved in the bill. I am sorry, but, you know, I am so busy in Washington, I have so many things to do, and the strain, stress, and work of the job is so terrific that sometimes these details just slip by me."

Mr. President, this is one detail I do not intend to let slip by the knowledge of any Member of the United States Senate, if my warning them can call their attention to it. I am putting it into the RECORD now, and next week, on various occasions, I shall repeat it, so that the warning flag will be up.

There is no provision in the bill to protect the cooperatives and the small-business men and the electric-power consumers from being transgressed upon by the private monopolies which will come to dominate the atomic-energy field if the bill in its present form becomes law.

Those who can read know of the warning, and those who can understand the English language can see for themselves that there is no protection in this bill for the little people of America. Senators will have a chance next week to vote on some amendments that will correct this glaring deficiency in the bill, because Senator GILLETTE and other Senators of whom I am proud to be one, has introduced an amendment which will incorporate in the bill a public preference clause. This, in conjunction with section 44 and a new section 45 proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], would provide a public power yardstick. The Johnson amendment would make it possible for the Atomic Energy Commission and Federal power agencies to proceed to generate power in Government plants for Government use and to be marketed to co-ops, PUD's, industry, and private utilities. That does not mean the Government will not also buy power from private utilities.

Many who are discussing this subject are dealing in nonsense and hogwash. Advocates of the bill talk about protecting the public, but at the same time deny the jurisdiction, authority, and power of the Atomic Energy Commission, or some other agency of the Government, to proceed to build atomic energy plants capable of producing power on a commercial basis and making such power available as a public power yardstick.

Mr. President, I was somewhat amused earlier this afternoon when I heard a speech on the Republican side of the aisle comparing TVA to some sort of a communistic enterprise in the United States. I thought it was a very funny speech. But it is a speech the American people are going to hear about between now and November 1954, because, in my judgment, it lays down one of the cardinal principles of the economic philosophy of the Eisenhower administration in respect to TVA. I shall await with interest the repudiation of that principle from the White House any time between now and election day in November 1954.

Mr. President, when Republican Senators rise on the floor of the United States Senate and make that kind of speech and preach that kind of political dogma, I intend to be one who will hold them politically responsible for that kind of attitude. There it is now, as an historical fact, for all to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a speech which leaves no room for doubt that there are those who think that TVA apparently has some kind of a communistic pattern connected with it; whereas the Senator from Oregon asserts here today that TVA is one of the mighty pillars—yes, it is one of the keystones—in the great temple of American private enterprise, because it is one of the fine cooperative ventures between Government and private industry that makes possible a strong private enterprise system in the Tennessee Valley.

The suggestion, Mr. President, that the people of the United States had been subjected to some kind of a communistic pattern by one of the greatest Presidents and one of the greatest liberals, in my judgment, who ever lived in the history of the United States, Franklin Roosevelt, demonstrates itself for the nonsense that it is.

The Republican Party is going to find, before it gets through with the TVA issue, Mr. President, that once the American people come to have their memories refreshed as to the sound economic and political principles upon which the TVA was founded, they will not be ready to destroy TVA.

I was highly amused when it was suggested, in the Republican speech made this afternoon to which I have referred, that the American people in other areas of the country are weary of paying tax dollars for the benefit of people of the Tennessee Valley. The fact is that in the Tennessee Valley we are dealing with great self-liquidating projects which have created, and are creating, tax dollars which are going into the Treasury amounting to many times the cost of such projects.

The tax dollars, coming from new industries, that flow into the Treasury because of the impetus produced by the TVA and the powerful shot in the arm it has given to private enterprise in the Tennessee Valley, are so many times greater than the small amount private utilities in that area would ever pay into the United States Treasury, if they were allowed to keep their stranglehold over the economic life of the Tennessee Valley, that all it takes is a pencil and a pad of paper and a knowledge of second-grade arithmetic to convince anyone that the Tennessee Valley Authority is one of the soundest economic projects in which the American people ever invested their money.

I wish to summarize that point, Mr. President, because it is vital to those of us who live in the Pacific Northwest. We hear the same phony argument in the Northwest about our multipurpose dams. We are accustomed to the argument that those of us who are advocating great multipurpose dams are creeping Socialists. Well, at least that is a kinder description than used to be sometimes applied to Norris. That is a kinder description than used to be applied to the elder La Follette, Dill, Couzens, Borah, Ladd, Johnson, and the other liberals who preceded us in the Senate, and who fought for the development of a sound power policy. But even if harsher words were used, I do not intend to let the critics get away from the economic fact that the self-liquidating—which means self-paying—multipurpose dams which have been built in the Pacific Northwest have resulted in the development in that area of private enterprise that would be almost nonexistent if the Government had not, through those dams, made cheap power available in the Pacific Northwest.

Our economic future depends upon cheap power. One reason the Senator from Oregon fights so vigorously on the floor of the Senate against the development of the so-called partnership scheme of the President of the United States is that he knows it for what it is. It is but a clever smokescreen in an attempt to hide the effort to undermine the multiple-purpose-dam program of the Pacific Northwest and to turn these great public resources over to a private-utility-monopoly combination. So I raise my voice against it when I see it showing its ugly head in connection with this atomic-energy program, because it is identical to, and represents again, at but another point, the undermining and undercutting attack by the President of the United States upon the people's heritage in the natural-resource potential of America.

Mr. President, we have to fight on this point. We have to fight on it here in the Senate, and we must fight on it on the hustings. We must take it to the political platforms of the country. We must fight on it wherever this issue is raised for consideration by free men and women, because I believe that it is no mere phrase or figure of speech or matter of language, but it is a statement, a verbal symbolism, that presents a profound truth, when I say, as I said yesterday afternoon on the floor of the Senate, and as I have said again today, and as I now repeat, that the great danger of this bill, in its present form, is that if enacted in the form in which it is now written, the Congress, including the Senate, will sell the American people for generations to come into a monopolistic economic bondage until such time—if the bill is enacted—that it is erased from the statute books.

So my plea is not to enact the bill in the first instance. My plea is that this is the time to prevent the kind of economic slavery this particular bill represents; this is the time to strike a blow for economic freedom for the private-enterprise system in the United States, because there is no connection between private monopoly and private enterprise. Private monopoly is equivalent to economic fascism and communism. Mr. President, it makes no difference whether the welfare of the people is subject to dictation by economic fascism or by economic communism. The fact is that if a segment of the economy is turned over to a monopolistic combine, that combine, not the people or their Government, rules the economic life of the people.

I know that in the haste and the stress of the many issues that today are bom-

barding the thinking of the American people, it is necessary to be on guard against intellectual fatigue on the part of the public. I think some symptoms of such fatigue are to be found today in the Nation. The people are so perplexed and confused, that they are saying "What are we to believe? We hear one thing, and then we hear another. We are simply exhausted over the conflicting points of view."

As a result of such intellectual fatigue, Mr. President, many persons are yielding to the self-satisfying and self-comforting psychological reaction of wishful thinking. They want to believe what they want to believe. They simply do not want to believe that an administration would permit the development of the kind of danger about which I am warning today, and so they have a tendency to take comfort in the old rationalization, "Why, it just cannot be so; that just cannot happen."

But, Mr. President, again I point out that it is happening. Again I warn the American people to remember that the tremendous power of the big business forces in the United States, that is represented by this administration, are taking over the people's rights in the field of natural resources, on issue after issue. We have been fighting, and we have fought, at this session of Congress. We have lost some battles; but when we have been turned back we have remained grouped in orderly fashion, awaiting another day when we will go forward.

I am pleading that we do not turn this contest into another defeat for the principles of power policy developed over 50 years. I am pleading that a majority of the Members of the Senate recognize, before it is too late, that with this bill we find a line on which to make the fight for the preservation of the public's interest and the public's rights in the development of atomic energy for the benefit of future generations of Americans, not for the selfish benefit of the profiteering dollars of the tribute takers, the private utility would-be monopolists.

WE NEED A POSITIVE PROGRAM OF FEDERAL POWER DEVELOPMENT

If the people of the United States are to realize the maximum power benefits from their $12 billion investment in the atomic energy program—if they are not to become the victims of monopoly power practices in the atomic power field—a positive program of atomic power production by the Federal Government is essential.

TRADITIONAL SAFEGUARDS FOR UTILITY CONTROL OMITTED

Section 7 (a) of the Federal Power Act provides that in issuing preliminary permits or licenses for the development of any waterpower resource, "the Commission shall give preference to applications therefor by States and municipalities" provided the plans of such public agencies are equally well adapted to meeting the requirements of the act for full use of water resources. "Municipality" is defined to mean "any city, county, irrigation district, drainage district, or other political subdivision or agency of a State competent under the laws thereof to carry on the business of developing, transmitting, utilizing, or distributing power."

Public preference clauses in power laws give the people who own the natural resources the first chance at developing those resources. A local body is limited as to power sites, while a private utility company may have many opportunities to invest its capital in other locations. In the event that a public body some day is able to finance its own atomic power plant, it should have a preference over an outsider who desires to sell power in its area when it comes to getting a license for a power plant from the Atomic Energy Commission. The administration's atomic energy bill contains no such public preference clause in the licensing section.

On May 10, 1954, Walker L. Cisler, president of the Detroit Edison Co., representing a group of privately owned electric power, industrial, and engineering firms associated in the Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison & Associates atomic power development project, testified before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Mr. Cisler submitted a written statement which read in part:

> The power companies engaged in this project are seeking the opportunity to utilize this new source of heat energy from atomic reaction, in common with all others at any time engaged in electric power production, without favoritism or preference for any public or private body. * * *We do not believe that private industry should have any preference as against the Federal Government or units of local government. Similarly, the Federal Government should not create a preference giving to itself or local units of government a preference against private industry.

What could be clearer? That spokesman for the private monopolies said, in the course of his testimony, they are seeking this asset without having any public preference provision written into the law.

PRIVATE UTILITIES HAVE INSIDE TRACK

Private power companies are already engaged in the atomic energy development program. As was shown in the joint committee hearings, public bodies other than the Federal Government have been unable to participate in the power development program. Present participation by the private companies assures that they will be the first to apply for and obtain licenses for atomic power production. Lack of knowledge in the field and financial limitations make it extremely unlikely that for many years the States or municipal groups will be able to enter the area of atomic power production.

Representatives of the giant utilities who demanded that the new Atomic Energy Act be written without public preference clauses obviously had two things in mind, one, they wanted a bill which contained none of the usual safeguards of the public interest contained in the Federal Power Act, and two, they were looking ahead to the time, 2 or 3 decades from now, when some of the larger public bodies might consider building their own atomic powerplants. The representatives of the people in the Senate should be equally farsighted and act now to protect the public interest.

Every law governing federally generated power in the last 50 years has contained a provision according preference to municipal, cooperative or other public bodies in the purchase of power from Government projects. It would avail these bodies little if the Federal Government were allowed to produce and market power but they were unable to buy it. Section 44 of the administration atomic energy bill, covering the marketing by the Atomic Energy Commission of byproduct electric energy, contains no such preference provision. The section should be amended in line with the established Federal power policy and program; and we intend to offer such an amendment next week.

A BLANK CHECK FOR THE PRIVATE UTILITIES

Safeguards to protect the public interest have been formulated by Congress over the years and incorporated in the licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act. Aside from section 271, providing that nothing in the act shall affect the authority or regulations of Federal, State, and local regulatory agencies, S. 3690 contains no recognition of the public interest in securing electric energy from this new source at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business practices and the right of the atomic power licensee to obtain a reasonable profit on his investment.

The bill does not contain a provision requiring agreement by the applicant for a license, where the end is generation of electric power for sale, to claim no more than its net investment in such facilities for ratemaking purposes.

There is no provision for the right of the United States, after reasonable notices, to take over, maintain, and operate a facility at the end of the license period on payment to the licensee of its net investment.

There are no provisions in the bill setting up specific hearing and notice procedures in connection with license applications to assure full protection of the rights of interested parties.

The bill lacks provisions for Federal accounting control of licensees where such licensees are not also engaged in the transmission of electricity or sale of electricity in interstate commerce for resale.

These and other safeguards of the public interest in power production and marketing are conditions attached to all licenses for hydroelectric power developments under the Federal Power Act.

Why not have them in this bill? The reason, I think, is obvious, because through this bill the private utilities are making a concerted drive to obtain monopolistic control over the production of electric power from atomic energy, and they are receiving the complete, wholehearted cooperation of the Eisenhower administration. If they did not have it, the administration would have written into the bill some of the safeguards I have just enumerated. They are safeguards that are found in or govern every single hydroelectric power bill enacted by Congress in pursuance of what has been our Federal power program.

As indicated by the Federal Power Commission statement previously quoted, they should be applied to licensing for atomic-power production in order to assure that the public interest in this great new resource is protected. The administration's atomic-energy bill would allow the Atomic Energy Commission to turn over to favored utility companies a resource in which the people have already invested $12 billion, and which has a value many times that amount, under licenses unconditioned except for the requirements of national security and public health and safety.

The attitude of the President and his party with respect to the benefits expected by the people from the atomic-power program apparently coincides with that of the National Association of Manufacturers, which quoted in its booklet, Free the Atom, the following statement made by Mr. Alfred Iddles, president of the Babcock & Wilcox Co., one of the companies now participating in the atomic program, at a hearing of the joint committee last year:

> The argument has been made that the United States taxpayers, who have paid the bill to the extent of some $10 billion to date in the development of atomic energy, will not receive any return on their investment if the law is modified to permit private industry to utilize the accumulated knowledge, and that only a relatively few industrial companies will benefit. We believe that the taxpayers' expenditures have been primarily a military investment and, as such, we have already received the benefit in terms of national security at a critical period when equal security was unobtainable by other than atomic weapons.

Is not that interesting? I do not know how dumb he thinks we can be. But let us analyze that statement for a moment. What Mr. Iddles is trying to say, and trying to get by with, is that because in the first instance we spent the money in order to develop an atomic energy program for the production of atomic weapons, the American people have received all the benefit that should accrue from the expenditure of $12 billion of their own money, and therefore any other benefits which may accrue from this expenditure ought to go to private monopoly.

I have heard a great deal of non sequitur reasoning in my life. I have listened to a great many fallacies audaciously advanced. As a lawyer I have observed much special pleading. But I do not know that I have ever seen a clearer example of an affront to the intelligence of the American voter than that statement by the representative of monopoly. Of course we developed the atomic energy program as a defense measure for the production of atomic weapons which would help us win the war against the enemies who confronted us in World War II. But it does not follow that when the war is over we should then give any investment we made in the development of a great project that can produce tremendous quantities of power for the benefit of all the people through a private enterprise system, to a group of private monopolists. It does not follow because such projects helped win the war, that out of a feeling of charity engendered by the good fortune we had in winning the war, we ought to give all the economic benefits flowing from such projects to private monopoly.

I do not know whether Mr. Iddles knows it or not, but if he does not I will let him on a big secret. The American people would laugh at him if he should try seriously to get them to accept his argument that now, out of a sense of deep gratitude because the atomic energy program produced atomic bombs which helped to win the war, they should turn over to private monopoly the peacetime benefits of the program.

If there remains any doubt of the intention of big business to take over the people's atomic power resource and exploit it without regard for the public interest, it should be dispelled by that statement of the spokesman of the National Association of Manufacturers.

PATENT PROVISIONS INVITE MONOPOLY

The huge expense involved in atomic power plants will limit the amount of competition which will exist in the atomic-energy power field. If the administration has its way, there will be little or no competition for the giant utility companies from the Federal Government. Conditions are ripe for the giants to establish a monopoly in the atomic power business.

One of the things that can assure that there will be a monopoly operation in the field of atomic power is the possibility that the few companies now engaged in atomic research and development in the Government program may, by virtue of their experience and their position of being "on the spot" where inventions and discoveries occur, get patent equities and so preclude prospective competitors from entering the field and availing themselves of the atomic technology which has been paid for with the tax money of the people of the United States.

Mr. Iddles, the president of a company which has been in on the ground floor of the atomic-development program, who testified at a May 10, 1954, hearing of the joint committee was asked the following question:

> Do you feel that it would be reasonable if some device could be worked out so that no undue advantage in the patent field either by past experience or equipment or anything of that kind might accrue to certain so-called favored companies for a period of time?

Again Mr. Iddles revealed the attitude of big business in the atomic-energy program when he answered:

> I will remark that whereas this is not a generality applying to all manufacturers, it happens that all of my competitors are already in the business, and if I can beat them out in doing the next job in competition better, and get a patent on it, I ought to be able to do so. They have all supplied the equipment.

That is generous of him, is it not? The generosity of the big business "boys" is remarkable. However, it is a generosity that is directed only at selfish aggrandizement. They seek to be generous only in connection with a Government program that enhances their interests. That is exactly what Mr. Iddles' testimony means. What he is really saying is, "I am going to get it if I can. To heck with the public interest."

That is why in the Senate we have the watchdog job resting on our shoulders. That is why we sit here as the guardians of the public interest. That is why we must make certain that legislation does not go through the Senate which would promote the kind of selfish interest and selfish economic philosophy demonstrated by Mr. Iddles in his testimony last year before the joint committee.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 bans patents for inventions or discoveries which concerned the production of fissionable materials or the utilization of such material in atomic weapons. Patents could be granted in the nonmilitary field, but they were subject to a "public interest" declaration under stated conditions, in which case the Atomic Energy Commission and its licensees automatically were entitled to their use, with reasonable compensation to the owner.

S. 3690 provides in section 152 that whenever a patent has been declared affected with the public interest, the Commission automatically is licensed to use the invention or discovery covered by the patent, but another person desiring to use the patented invention or discovery must apply to the Commission for a patent license, which the Commission has the discretion to grant under certain conditions.

Under the McMahon Act the declaration of a patent to be "affected with the public interest" was mandatory, provided that (a) the invention or discovery covered by the patent utilizes or is essential to the utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy, and (b) the licensing of such invention or discovery is necessary to effectuate the policies and purposes of the act.

Under the new administration bill an applicant for a patent license must prove to the satisfaction of the Commission that the use of the invention or discovery is of primary importance to the use of fissionable material or atomic energy, and of primary importance to the effectuation of the policies and purposes of the act.

Section 105 (a) of S. 3690 applies the stringently limited test of primary importance in contrast with broader conditions under which patents are now deemed to be affected with the public interest under the McMahon Act.

The patent owner is entitled to a hearing on the matter of whether or not the discovery or invention is affected with the public interest, and it is a possibility that if he were overruled in his argument that the patent should be withheld from the public interest sphere, he could appeal the Commission's decision to the courts and delay the issuance of licenses, perhaps for years.

After the Commission has declared the invention or discovery to be affected with the public interest, the applicant could then file his license application under section 152 (b) of the bill. The Commission, under the bill, would be empowered to grant the license if it finds that the use of the invention or discovery is of primary importance to the conduct of the activity in which the applicant

proposes to engage, which in the usual case would be the production of power.

An additional condition to be met by the applicant after satisfying all of the primary importance tests is contained in section 152 (e) of the bill. The applicant would have to prove that he could not otherwise obtain a patent license from the owner of the patent on terms which the Commission deemed to be reasonable for the intended use of the patent to be made by the applicant.

It can readily be seen that it would be a difficult thing for a newcomer into the field of atomic-energy power production to obtain licenses for the use of patented discoveries or inventions which would be necessary to engage in the manufacturing of atomic-energy power. As stated in the minority report of the joint committee on S. 3690:

> The application that can survive this procedure will be an impressive one indeed. The patent attorneys may derive more satisfaction from section 152 than the would-be user of the invention.

SO-CALLED COMPULSORY LICENSING WOULD BE SHORT LIVED

The administration bill provides finally with regard to the patenting of inventions and discoveries that the provisions for the so-called compulsory licensing of patents shall expire on September 1, 1959. I have previously quoted testimony to show that the reactor-development program will take at least 5 years, and that it will be more than 10 years before more than a few companies will enter the field of atomic power production and marketing. Provisions for licensing the use of patented discoveries and inventions which are limited to 5 years will, in my judgment, accomplish little in the way of preventing the establishment of a patent monopoly by the favored companies now participating in the atomic-energy development program.

Section 151 (c) of the bill would require persons who have made or hereafter make any discoveries or inventions useful in the production or utilization of special nuclear material or atomic energy to file a report with the Commission, containing a complete description of the discovery or invention unless such description is contained in an application for a patent filed with the Commissioner of Patents.

Although drastic penalties are provided for violations of certain provisions in the bill, no penalty is provided for failing to report inventions or discoveries under section 151 (c).

At the present time Government contracts with private participants in the atomic-energy development program contain so-called type A, B, and C patent clauses, which require those who make discoveries or inventions while engaged in the program to turn them over to the Government.

In his testimony before the joint committee on May 10, 1954, Mr. Albert Iddles was asked about the possibility of companies now participating in the program using their favored position to advantage in the matter of patents. I should like to quote from pages 97 and 98 of the joint committee hearings an exchange of questions and answers between Representative CHET HOLIFIELD and Mr. Iddles:

Representative HOLIFIELD. You want to place your company in the position that because of this long experience it can step in and get patent equity advantages, and at the same time preclude others not having had that experience and not being fortunate enough to obtain some of the future limited contracts from obtaining the advantage of this technology which has been paid for by the people's money, is that not true? That is your position?

Mr. IDDLES. It happens that the Atomic Energy Commission has been extremely successful in preventing our monopoly, and our competitors have been equally well-provided with opportunities.

Representative HOLIFIELD. That is true, but that is because the McMahon Act had provisions in it and because the contracts had clauses in them. I notice as part of your testimony that you advocate that the Atomic Energy Commission—on page 2 of your testimony:

It is expected that this change will lead to a corresponding modification in the patent clauses used in research and development contracts issued by the Commission and its prime contractors. So what you are in effect asking is that if no patent provisions are put in the bill, that the Commission also refrain from using type A, B, and C patent clauses, which it now puts in its different contracts, and which has given to the Government that protection which you mentioned. Is that not true?

Mr. IDDLES. I hope that the new law does eliminate those clauses because I know of several instances in which companies have had bright ideas that they have not divulged to anybody because they would not give them out.

Representative HOLIFIELD. That is a very interesting statement on your part. We have been contracting with these companies and we have been paying them the taxpayers' money, and they have come across as a result of those contracts certain bright discoveries, and they have refrained from bringing them out in the open because they wanted to hold it for their own special interests.

Mr. IDDLES. No, sir.

Representative HOLIFIELD. Is this acting in good faith with the Government?

Mr. IDDLES. Yes, sir. Those ideas did not emanate from anything that was learned from the Atomic Energy Commission or any Government information. They are bright ideas concerning how to put something together for a particular circumstance.

Representative HOLIFIELD. We were talking about contracts for the research and development in the atomic energy projects, sir, when you made your statement.

Mr. IDDLES. Anything that comes up under a research and development program from information that is obtained from Government sources is presumably sent back to the Government, which is O. K.

Later on in the testimony there was the following exchange of questions and answers:

Representative HOLIFIELD. So during this period of time when we are developing these reactors which you say will possibly be from 5 to 10 years, there will be no protection to the Government against favored participants patenting these processes or mechanical inventions, even though the 5-year compulsory licensing provision is put into the act.

Mr. IDDLES. Would you have it otherwise?

Representative HOLIFIELD. So if we have to have protection for the Government, we would have to have it at least 10 years according to your statement.

Mr. IDDLES. Would you have it otherwise?

Representative HOLIFIELD. I am asking you the question, sir. I am seeking information on this subject.

Mr. IDDLES. The more incentive that is provided, the faster you will have inventions and development work carried on. I do not honestly think that the Government or the people of the United States are going to suffer from letting industry have those patent rights.

Representative HOLIFIELD. But you would preclude all industry from having those rights.

Mr. IDDLES. No.

Representative HOLIFIELD. You would want those rights to accrue to the favored few who participate on Government contracts.

Mr. IDDLES. No; I did not say that.

Representative HOLIFIELD. That is the natural result of your statement, sir.

Mr. IDDLES. No; because there are all kinds of competitors in all parts of this field that are being engaged in this work. Some of them might come along 10 years from now and try to get into the field and be handicapped. So it is now with the design of the steam turbine. A man that now wants to build a 100,000-kilowatt turbine is terribly handicapped because of the patents owned by General Electric, Allis-Chalmers, and the others.

Representative HOLIFIELD. They got those patents as a result of the expenditure of their own money, and not the expenditure of the tax money of the people. The tax money did not build that technology.

Mr. IDDLES. The taxpayers' money is not determining these new inventions, either.

On May 19, 1954, Mr. Iddles addressed a letter to the joint committee asking that his answers to Representative HOLIFIELD be withdrawn from his testimony. Apparently Mr. Iddles realized some time after his May 10 appearance before the committee that he had, to us a colloquialism, "let the cat out of the bag," insofar as the attitudes of the industrial giants who are in on the ground floor of the atomic energy program were concerned.

In my judgment the statements of Mr. Iddles before the joint committee demonstrate the truth of the charge that big business first-comers in the atomic energy program see the opportunity to control and monopolize the production and marketing of atomic power through ownership of basic patents.

Mr. Iddles testimony also goes to show that the 5-year so-called compulsory licensing provisions of S. 3690 would have little or no effect in warding off a patent monopoly.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE HOLIFIELD

Mr. President, having mentioned the name of that great Representative from California, CHET HOLIFIELD, who is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to say this about him for the RECORD at this time. I think the statesmanship he has demonstrated as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy should commend him to the people of his district and to the people of the United States. I believe every man and woman in the United States owes a great debt of gratitude to CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, for the diligence he has exercised in calling the attention of the American people, through the hearings which have been conducted on this bill, to the shortcomings and dangers of the bill. That represents, I think, statesmanship of the highest order; and

I wish particularly to congratulate him on the magnificent job he has done in the preparation of the minority views of the Joint Committee on this bill.

In my judgment, American history will reflect great credit on the work of CHET HOLIFIELD in connection with the atomic-energy program. I think the voice of warning he has raised throughout the hearings and in the minority views, and is presently raising on the floor of the House of Representatives as this matter is under discussion, is a voice which should be heeded by the entire Congress before the bill is passed. It is a voice which should be heeded by way of writing into the bill the major amendments proposed by CHET HOLIFIELD, of California.

As the representative of the Independent Party in the Senate, Mr. President, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to pay my high respects to CHET HOLIFIELD and to express my very deep regard for his statesmanship.

HOW MUCH FINANCIAL RISK IN ATOMIC POWER PRODUCTION?

Spokesmen for industry are loud in their claims that private industry is now investing large sums of money in the atomic-energy program and that such investment involves considerable financial risk. Listening to these claims, one might be talked into believing that corporations participating in the development program and even those entering the atomic power business, stand a chance to lose great amounts of money. There is evidence that the costs of industry's present participation in the program are paid for by the American people and that investment in the power business will be underwritten—if S. 3690 is enacted into law—by the Federal Government in the form of a substantial subsidy.

In fact, Mr. President, one of my objections to the bill is that it is, as I view it, a complete giveaway to the private utilities of the total cost of a power program which they would own and control and monopolize. If we study this bill I think we shall find in it one sleeper clause after another which would have the effect of giving away to private monopoly the people's heritage in the atomic energy program.

We see some evidence of this in the testimony, on May 10, 1954, of Mr. Walker Cisler, president of the Detroit Edison Co., who stated that money now being spent in the atomic energy research and development program by his company is absorbed in the operating costs of the company, and that it is a factor in the establishment of the company's rate structure by the Michigan Utility Commission. In other words, the people of the State of Michigan are paying for Detroit Edison's participation in the program by paying higher prices for power hearings, part I, page 85.

The testimony of Mr. Cisler makes it very clear that the policy of his company has been to figure into the costs of the operation of the company, the rate base, the expenditures which have been put into the operation of atomic energy development, and the rate payers, the consumers of the company in Michigan, have paid the bill. Of course, that is a typical device of the private utilities. That is why the consumers of electric power across the country are paying, in their electric bills, the high cost of the national advertising program of the power combines of the United States, which are propagandizing the American people with fallacious stuff to the effect that the public power yardstick is some form of creeping socialism. This advertising, by way of political propaganda, is being paid for by the rate payers of the private utilities throughout the country.

I have been heard to say before that what Congress needs to do is to pass a law which will deny to the private utilities any right to incorporate in their accounting systems the cost of that kind of political advertising.

There is no reason in the world why the electricity users of Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, California, Oregon, or any other State in the Union, should have to pay, in their electric power bills, the cost of the political advertising propaganda of the private utilities.

Here we get in the record of the case further testimony, which contains the admission, in this instance, of Mr. Cisler, that what the private power companies are doing, so far as their atomic energy development costs are concerned, is including it in their determination of the rates to be paid by their electric users. They are the ones who pay the bill.

We can be quite certain, Mr. President, that when the deal is consummated the people will pay for this giveaway to the private monopolies.

EARLIER AEC-WHITE HOUSE PROPOSED BILLS REQUESTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. President, I have asked the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to be on the floor while I present my next argument. In keeping with the courtesy he always extends to the junior Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Iowa is present, and I desire to present the argument now, because it is really based upon a desire on the part of the Senator from Oregon for information, if the assumption I make is correct.

Mr. President, on the basis of what I have been led to believe, the bill should not be voted upon for several days, so that Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to study and compare it with the bills which President Eisenhower is reported to have recommended to the committee.

I do not know what he asked. I have been advised that early in 1954, before the hearings, that the Atomic Energy Commission sent over to the joint committee, with Budget Bureau approval, two separate bills.

One was an amendment to the bill providing for the exchange of information on uses of atomic materials with certain foreign countries.

The second dealt with encouraging the peacetime use of atomic power.

I have examined the committee hearings carefully, but I find no trace of the proposals which were cleared by the White House. Apparently they were not even dignified by publication and public consideration.

Instead, a Cole-Hickenlooper draft was the subject of hearings; then there was a clean draft of the Cole-Hickenlooper bill, and finally the bill now being considered was developed by the committee. And even after it was introduced by the cochairmen, the committee developed further amendments.

I would like to inquire of the Senator from Iowa if copies of the two-package proposals of the AEC, cleared by the White House, are available so I can introduce them into the RECORD, thus making them available to all Members at least by the first thing on Monday morning.

Certainly the Congress should clearly understand any differences between what the President wanted and the present bill.

I am disturbed that the two bills were not made public, so that the witnesses who appeared before the joint committee could comment on them, and could give Congress the benefit of the public view.

It may be suggested that members of the Atomic Energy Commission testified in favor of the Cole-Hickenlooper bill. Their testimony did not have Budget Bureau clearance. I have not had the time to determine—as I should like to determine before I vote on this measure—what changes they proposed in the draft, and whether the changes were made.

This is particularly important because some of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle may want to use the President's bills in drafting amendments to the bill, so as to make it conform to his views, and then help put down the Republican opposition to the things he wants.

It would be amazing if President Eisenhower asked for the international provisions contained in the Cole-Hickenlooper bill now before the Senate. If that is what he wanted, then he has backed away from the bold approach to the matter which he made before the United Nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two administration drafts may be printed in the RECORD, if my assumption is correct, and if the members of the Joint Committee, or the committee staff, can supply me with them if, in fact, they ever existed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall have the two drafts in perhaps 5 minutes. I am happy to place them in the RECORD verbatim.

There has been no concealment or attempt to conceal. The drafts were sent to the committee as tentative recommendations for approaches to these two phases of the problem by the Atomic Energy Commission.

One draft, in the nature of a separate bill, had to do with the international exchange of information. The other draft had to do with the development of power and the opening of the present law to experimentation, research, and development by industry, private and public.

Some substantial revisions of the Atomic Energy Act have been indicated for some time. The Joint Committee considered that it was the part of wisdom to approach a comprehensive review and

correction of the Atomic Energy Act, and approached its work from that standpoint.

The general provisions and the general policy and theory contained in the two drafts sent to the Joint Committee by the Atomic Energy Commission have effectively been placed into the bill which we are considering now. As I have said, I shall, for the benefit of the Senator, as quickly as the one I sent there can get back from the office of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, make available a copy of each draft, which can be placed in the RECORD at this point, following the Senator's remarks, or at any other point desired.

I may inform the Senator from Oregon that I now have a copy of each of the recommended acts as they came from the Atomic Energy Commission. So far as one of the mimeographed copies of the proposed acts is concerned, it is a clean copy. That is the one contemplating the opportunity for peacetime research of power by private industry. The other draft, which has to do with the general subject matter of exchange of information internationally, is the shorter of the two proposed acts. It has been used by the committee staff, and there are some marks through it, but I shall ask the staff to work with the clerk so that the bill may be printed in the RECORD as it was originally drawn, and without making any deletions of any kind, because that is the actual bill. Therefore, I make available those two copies to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his cooperation. I ask unanimous consent that the two drafts be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Without objection, the two documents will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The documents are as follows:

An act to encourage the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy

Be it enacted, etc.—

PREAMBLE

Research and experimentation have progressed to the stage that the large-scale utilization of atomic energy for peacetime purposes appears possible within the foreseeable future. The development of a new source of economic electric power and of other industrial applications will contribute significantly to the material well-being of mankind. Widespread participation and investment will speed the Nation's progress toward this objective. However, the continuing significance of atomic weapons for military purposes and the unique safety problems associated with the utilization of fissionable material require public regulation of such participation.

In enacting the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 the Congress foresaw the necessity of future revision of the act. Such revision is now necessary to encourage the development of the peacetime uses of atomic energy. However, until peacetime applications of atomic energy have been further developed, and until experience has been gained in the licensing and regulation of peacetime uses of atomic energy, the act will necessarily remain subject to further revision from time to time.

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION OF FISSIONABLE MATERIALS

"SEC. 4. (a) Definitions: As used in this act, the term "process," when used in relation to fissionable material, means to process, fabricate, or refine fissionable material or to separate fissionable material by means other than isotopic separation from other substances in which such material may be contained; and the term "produce," when used in relation to fissionable material, means to process fissionable material, to separ te fissionable material by isotopic separation from other substances in which such material may be contained, and to produce new fissionable material.

"(b) Prohibition: It shall be unlawful for any person: (1) to produce fissionable material, except as provided in subsections (c) or (f), or (2) to utilize fissionable material, except as provided in subsections (c) or (f), or in sections 5 (a) (4) (A) or (B) or 6 (a), except under and in accordance with a license issued by the Commission pursuant to section 7.

"(c) Operation of the Commission's production facilities: The Commission is authorized and directed to produce or to provide for the production of fissionable material in its own facilities. To the extent deemed necessary, the Commission is authorized to make, or to continue in effect, contracts with persons obligating them to produce fissionable material in facilities owned by the Commission. The Commission is also authorized to enter into research and development contracts authorizing the contractor to produce or utilize fissionable material in facilities owned by the Commission to the extent that the production or utilization of such fissionable material may be incident to the conduct of research and development activities under such contracts. Any contract entered into under this section shall contain provisions (1) prohibiting the contractor with the Commission from subcontracting any part of the work he is obligated to perform under the contract, except as authorized by the Commission, and (2) obligating the contractor to make such reports to the Commission as it may deem appropriate with respect to his activities under the contract, to submit to frequent inspection by employees of the Commission of all such activities, and to comply with all safety and security regulations which may be prescribed by the Commission. Any contract made under the provisions of this paragraph may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing that advertising is not reasonably practicable and partial and advance payments may be made under such contracts. The President shall determine at least once each year the quantities of fissionable material to be produced under this subsection.

"(d) Irradiation of materials: The Commission and persons lawfully producing or utilizing fissionable material are authorized, subject to the provisions of section 7 with respect to activities licensed thereunder, to expose materials of any kind to the radiation incident to the processes of producing or utilizing fissionable material.

"(e) Manufacture of facilities: Unless authorized by a license issued by the Commission, no person may manufacture, produce, export, transfer, or acquire any facilities for the production or utilization of fissionable material. Licenses shall be issued on a nonexclusive basis for such periods of time, not to exceed the period which in the opinion of the Commission is necessary to accomplish the purposes of the license, as the Commission may specify and in accordance with such procedures and upon such conditions as the Commission may by regulation establish to effectuate the policies and purposes of this act. Such licenses shall specify the activities in which the licensee is authorized to engage and shall be nontransferable. The Commission shall, prior to the issuance of any license, notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission of the proposed license and the proposed terms and conditions thereof, except such classes or types of licenses as the Commission with the approval of the Attorney General may in advance determine would not significantly affect the consistency of the licensee's activities with the antitrust laws. Thereupon the Attorney General after consultation with the Federal Trade Commission shall, within 90 days after receiving such notification, advise the Commission whether, insofar as he can determine, the proposesd license would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Upon the request of the Attorney General the Commission shall furnish or cause to be furnished such information as it may possess which the Attorney General determines to be appropriate or necessary to enable him to give the advice called for by this section. The Commission shall advise the Attorney General whenever in its opinion any activities licensed pursuant to this subsection involve or threaten to involve a violation of the antitrust laws. Nothing in this act shall impair, amend, or modify the antitrust laws or limit and prevent their application to persons licensed pursuant to this section. Licenses issued under this section shall contain a condition requiring the licensee to reimburse the Government for the cost of personnel security clearances required pursuant to section 10 (b) (5) (B) (i). The Commission may revoke any license issued pursuant to this subsection from any licensee who willfully violates any condition of such license or any applicable provision of this act or of any applicable regulation or order issued pursuant to this act, or from any licensee who fails, upon notice from the Commission of any such violation, to take within a reasonable time such action as the Commission may require to correct or prevent the recurrence of such violation. Any such revocation shall be determined on the record after opportunity for a hearing in accordance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, subject to such regulations as the Commission may find necessary to safeguard restricted data: *Provided,* That the Commission shall have the authority to suspend any such license prior to a hearing whenever it deems such action to be necessary in the interest of the common defense and security.

"(f) Exemption for research and medical therapy and processing contracts: Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit or to require a license for (1) the manufacture, production, acquisition, or transfer within the United States of facilities which are useful for medical therapy or in the conduct of research and development activities specified in section 3 and which do not, in the opinion of the Commission, have a potential production rate adequate to enable the operation of such facilities to produce within a reasonable period of time a sufficient quantity of fissionable material to produce an atomic bomb or any other atomic weapon; (2) the production or utilization of fissionable material incident to the use of such facilities for medical therapy or to the conduct of research and development activities in any such facilities; or (3) the processing of fissionable material under contract with and for the account of the Commission.

"(g) Exemption for agencies of Department of Defense: Nothing in this section

shall be deemed to prohibit, or to require a license for, (1) the manufacture, production, acquisition or operation by any agency or contractor of the Department of Defense of facilities utilizing fissionable material for research and development activities or for the application of atomic energy to military uses, or (2) the production of fissionable material incident to such utilization.

"(h) Security regulations: The Commission is authorized to issue or prescribe such regulations or orders as it may deem necessary to control the dissemination of restricted data by any person licensed pursuant to section 4 (e) or exempted pursuant to section 4 (f) in such a manner as to assure the common defense and security and to prevent access to such data by unauthorized persons.

"(i) Byproduct power: To the extent that energy which may be utilized is produced by the Commission incident to the operation of research and development facilities or facilities for the production of fissionable material, such energy may be used by the Commission, transferred to other Government agencies, or sold under contract to public or private utilities or persons. Such contracts shall be for such periods of time as the Commission may deem necessary and shall provide for payment of not less than the fair market value of the energy sold. The Commission shall obtain the advice of the Federal Power Commission concerning the proposed terms of sale prior to entering into any contract for the sale of energy under this subsection. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Commission to engage in the sale or distribution of electric energy for commercial use except such energy as may be produced by the Commission incident to the operation of research and development facilities or facilities for the production of fissionable material."

SEC. 3. Section 5 (a) (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Ownership of fissionable material: All right, title, and interest within or under the jurisdiction of the United States, in or to any fissionable material, now or hereafter produced, except fissionable material acquired by any person pursuant to paragraph (4) below or which is lawfully produced by any person in accordance with sections 4 (f) or 7, shall be the property of the Commission, and shall be deemed to be vested in the Commission by virtue of this act. Any person owning any interest in any fissionable material at the time of the enactment of this act, or owning any interest in any material at the time when such material is hereafter determined to be a fissionable material, shall be paid just compensation for any material ownership of which is vested in the Commission by virtue of this act."

SEC. 4. Section 5 (a) (4) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Distribution of fissionable material: The Commission may sell, lease, loan, or otherwise make available fissionable material owned by it, and may authorize the sale or transfer of fissionable material by persons owning such material, to applicants requesting such material (A) for the conduct of research or development activities either independently or under contract or other arrangement with the Commission, (B) for use in medical therapy, or (C) for use pursuant to a license issued under the authority of section 7. The Commission is directed to distribute sufficient fissionable material to permit the conduct of widespread independent research and development activity, to the maximum extent practicable. In determining the quantities of fissionable material to be distributed, the Commission shall make provision for national military requirements as determined by the President and such provisions for its own needs and the conservation of fissionable material as it may determine to be necessary in the national interest. The Commission shall not distribute or authorize the transfer of any fissionable material to any applicant who is not equipped to observe such security standards to guard against loss or diversion of such material and such safety standards to protect health and to minimize danger from explosion or other hazard to life or property as may be established by the Commission."

SEC. 5. Section 5 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding the following subsections 5 (a) (6) and 5 (a) (7):

"(6) Recall and confiscation of fissionable material: The Commission may recall or confiscate any fissionable material, including material acquired pursuant to section 5 (a) (4) or produced in connection with an activity licensed pursuant to section 7 or exempted pursuant to section 4 (f), from any person who is not authorized to possess such material or who wilfully uses such material in violation of any applicable provision of this act or of any applicable regulation or order issued pursuant to this act or in a manner other than authorized under or pursuant to this act, or who fails, upon notice from the Commission of such violation, to take within a reasonable time such action as the Commission may require to correct or prevent the recurrence of such violation. Any such recall or confiscation shall be determined on the record after opportunity for a hearing in accordance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, subject to such regulations as the Commission may find necessary to safeguard restricted data; provided, that the Commission shall have the authority to take immediate possession of such material prior to a hearing and pending final determination whenever it deems such action to be necessary to the public health or safety or in the interest of the common defense and security.

"(7) Safeguarding of fissionable material: The Commission is authorized to issue or prescribe such regulations or orders as it may deem necessary to guard against the loss or diversion of any fissionable material acquired by any person pursuant to section 5 (a) (4), or produced by any person in connection with any activity licensed pursuant to subsection 7 or exempted pursuant to section 4 (f), and to prevent any use or disposition thereof which the Commission may determine to be inimical to the common defense and security."

SEC. 6. Section 7 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"LICENSES

"SEC. 7. (a) Authority: In order to encourage the development and to insure the exploitation of atomic energy for peacetime purposes, the Commission may issue licenses authorizing persons to utilize, process or produce fissionable material within or under the jurisdiction of the United States for the production of energy, scientific research and development, medical therapy, the production of byproduct materials or other similarly constructive purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) Issuance of licenses: The Commission is authorized to issue and renew licenses, on a nonexclusive basis, to applicants (1) whose proposed activities will advance or strengthen the utilization of atomic energy for peacetime purposes and will serve a clearly constructive purpose proportionate to the quantities of source or fissionable material to be utilized or consumed and (2) who are equipped to observe such security standards to guard against the loss or diversion of such material and such safety standards to protect health and to minimize danger from explosion or other hazard to life or property as the Commission may establish. The Commission shall issue such licenses for such periods of time, not to exceed the period which in the opinion of the Commission is necessary to accomplish the purposes of the license, as it may specify and in accordance with such procedures and subject to such conditions as it may by regulation establish to effectuate the policies and purposes of this act. Such licenses shall specify the activities in which the licensee is authorized to engage and shall be nontransferable. Prior to the issuance of any license or the denial of any application therefor, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register, to the extent consistent with the safeguarding of restricted data, notice of the principal terms and conditions of the proposed license or of the reasons for which the Commission proposes to deny the application, including a description of any arrangement or contract proposed to be made with the applicant pursuant to section 7 (d) or (e). The Commission shall afford a reasonable opportunity for any person who would be materially affected by the issuance or denial of a license or by any such proposed arrangement or contract to submit to the Commission any relevant facts or arguments in support of or in opposition to the proposed license or the proposed denial of the application. Licenses issued under this section shall contain a condition requiring the licensee to reimburse the Government for the cost of personnel security clearances required pursuant to section 10 (b) (5) (B) (i). The Commission shall, prior to the issuance of any license, notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission of the proposed license and the proposed terms and conditions thereof, except such classes or types of licenses as the Commission with the approval of the Attorney General may in advance determine would not significantly affect the consistency of the licensee's activities with the antitrust laws. Thereupon the Attorney General after consultation with the Federal Trade Commission shall, within 90 days after receiving such notification, advise the Commission whether, insofar as he can determine, the proposed license would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Upon the request of the Attorney General the Commission shall furnish or cause to be furnished such information as it may possess which the Attorney General determines to be appropriate or necessary to enable him to give the advice called for by this section. The Commission shall advise the Attorney General whenever in its opinion any activities licensed pursuant to this section involve or threaten to involve a violation of the antitrust laws. Nothing in this act shall impair, amend, or modify the antitrust laws or limit and prevent their application to persons licensed pursuant to this section. No license may be given to any person if, in the opinion of the Commission, the issuance of a license to such person would be inimical to the common defense and security.

"(c) Regulation of licensed activities: The Commission is authorized and directed to issue or prescribe such regulations or orders as it may deem necessary:

"(1) to control the dissemination of restricted data by any person licensed pursuant to this section in such a manner as to assure the common defense and security and to prevent access to such data by unauthorized persons;

"(2) to prohibit or control the production, possession, use, transfer or export of any byproduct material produced or capable of being produced incident to any activity licensed pursuant to this section, to the extent the Commission deems the control of such material to be necessary in the interest of the common defense and security; and

"(3) to establish such standards and instructions governing activities licensed pursuant to this section, including standards and instructions governing the design, location and operation of facilities used by the

licensee in the conduct of such activities, as the Commission may deem necessary to protect health and to minimize danger from explosion or other hazard to life or property.

"(d) Arrangements with licensees: The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts and arrangements with persons licensed under this section for such periods of time as the Commission may deem necessary or desirable:

"(1) after making provision for national military requirements, for the Commission's own use and for the conservation of such materials, as provided in section 5 (a) (4), to sell, lease, or otherwise make available to such licensees such quantities of source, fissionable or other special materials as may be necessary for the conduct of activities licensed pursuant to this section; and

"(2) to provide for the processing in facilities owned by the Commission of source, fissionable, byproduct or other special materials owned by or made available to such licensees which is utilized or produced in the conduct of activities licensed pursuant to this section.

The Commission shall establish prices to be paid by licensees for material or services furnished by the Commission pursuant to this subsection. The Commission shall, insofar as practicable, establish prices on a nondiscriminatory basis, which in the opinion of the Commission will provide reasonable compensation to the Government for such materials and services and which will not discourage the development of sources of supply independent of the Commission. In the event that requests by licensees to the Commission for materials or services exceed the materials or services available, preference shall be given by the Commission to those licensees whose activities are most likely, in the opinion of the Commission, to contribute to the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy and to the economic and military strength of the Nation. Any contract or arrangement made pursuant to this subsection may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. title 41, sec. 5). Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to limit the Commission's authority to loan fissionable material with or without charge to licensees or other persons for the conduct of research and development activities.

"(e) Purchase by the Commission of Fissionable or byproduct materials:

"(1) The Commission is authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire such quantities of fissionable or byproduct materials owned or produced by any person licensed under this section as the President may determine to be required in the interests of the common defense and security. Prices paid by the Commission shall not exceed either (a) the estimated cost to the Government of producing similar material in facilities owned by the Commission, or (b) such amount as will, in the judgment of the Commission, provide reasonable compensation to the licensee taking into account the estimated costs to be incurred and the estimated revenues to be derived by the licensee in the conduct of his licensed activities. Any contract or agreement made pursuant to this subsection may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5). The Commission may requisition any fissionable material or any interest in such material upon a determination by the President that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security. Just compensation shall be made for any such material requisitioned under this subsection.

"(2) Any license issued pursuant to this section shall contain a provision requiring the licensee, upon the request of the Commission, to produce, for delivery to the Commission, such fissionable or byproduct material in such quantities and of such types as the licensee's facilities may be capable of producing and as the Commission, with the approval of the President, may determine to be required in the interests of the common defense and security. The licensee shall be entitled to just compensation for any material produced and delivered to the Commission pursuant to this subsection.

"(3) In the event of failure by the licensee to comply with the provisions of his license in accordance with paragraph (2), the Commission may take immediate possession of and operate the licensee's facilities for the production of such fissionable or byproduct materials as the Commission may require. Just compensation shall be paid as rental for the use of such facilities.

"(f) Revocation of licenses: The Commission may revoke any license issued pursuant to this section from any licensee who wilfully violates any condition of such license or any applicable provision of this act or of any applicable regulation or order issued pursuant to this act, or from any licensee who fails, upon notice from the Commission of any such violation, to take within a reasonable time such action as the Commission may require to correct or prevent the recurrence of such violation. Any such revocation shall be determined on the record after opportunity for a hearing in accordance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, subject to such regulations as the Commission may find necessary to safeguard restricted data; provided, that the Commission shall have the authority to suspend any such license prior to a hearing whenever it deems such action to be necessary to the public health or safety or in the interest of the common defense and security.

"(g) Regulation of utilities: Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the authority or regulations of any Federal, State, or local agency with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power.

"(h) Reporting of technical information:

"(1) Any person licensed pursuant to sections 4 (e) or 7 of this act shall make available to the Commission such technical information and data concerning his activities pursuant to such license as the Commission shall request. The Commission is authorized to utilize such information or data in the performance of its activities under this act.

"(2) The Commission is further authorized and directed to make such information and data available to other licensees or potential licensee whenever it determines (A) that the use of such information or data is essential in the production or utilization of fissionable material and (B) that the disclosure of such information or data to such other licensees or potential licensees, in each instance, is necessary to carry out the purposes and policies of this act. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply, however, to any information or data developed after [insert date approximately 5 years after expected date of enactment of this amendment].

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the right of any licensee to an award or to the payment of just compensation pursuant to section 11 in respect to the use of any invention or discovery based upon or incorporating any such information or data.

"(i) Report to Congress: Whenever in its opinion the utilization of fissionable material for any industrial, commercial, or other nonmilitary purpose has been sufficiently developed to be of practical value, the Commission shall prepare a report to the President stating all the facts with respect to such use, the Commission's estimate of the social, political, economic, and international effects of such use and the Commission's recommendations for necessary or desirable supplemental legislation. The President shall then transmit this report to the Congress together with his recommendation."

SEC. 7. Section 8 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(d) Requisition by President: The President may requisition any fissionable material or facilities for the production of fissionable material authorized or licensed to be owned by any person pursuant to this act when such action is necessary to effectuate the provisions of any such international arrangement. Just compensation shall be made for any material or facilities so requisitioned."

SEC. 8. Sections 11 (a) (1), 11 (a) (2), and 11 (e) (2) (C) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, are amended by deleting therefrom the words "in the production of fissionable material or."

SEC. 9. Section 11 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Nonmilitary utilization:

"(1) It shall be the duty of the Commission to declare any patent to be affected with the public interest if (A) the invention or discovery covered by the patent utilizes or is essential in the production or utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy; and (B) the licensing of such invention or discovery under this subsection is necessary to effectuate the policies and purposes of this act.

"(2) Whenever any patent has been declared, pursuant to paragraph (1), to be affected with the public interest—

"(A) the Commission is hereby licensed to use the invention or discovery covered by such patent in performing any of its powers under this act; and

"(B) Any person may apply to the Commission for a license to use the invention or discovery covered by such patent, and the Commission shall grant such license to the extent that it finds that the use of the invention or discovery is necessary to the conduct of an activity authorized under this act.

"The owner of the patent shall be entitled to a reasonable royalty fee for any use of an invention or discovery licensed by this subsection. Such royalty fee may be agreed upon by such owner and the licensee, or in the absence of such agreement shall be determined by the Commission. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any invention or discovery made or conceived after [insert date approximately 5 years from expected date of enactment of this amendment]."

SEC. 10. Section 13 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. (a) The United States shall make just compensation for any property or interests therein taken or requisitioned pursuant to sections 5 and 11, or for any material requisitioned by or required to be produced and delivered to the Commission or for facilities of which the Commission may take possession pursuant to section 7 (e). The Commission shall determine such compensation. If the compensation so determined is unsatisfactory to the person entitled thereto, such person shall be paid 50 percent of the amount so determined, and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided by sections 24 (20) and 145 of the Judicial Code to recover such further sum as added to said 50 percent will make up such amount as will be just compensation."

SEC. 11. Section 16(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whoever wilfully violates, attempts to violate, or conspires to violate, any provision of this act other than those specified in subsection (a) and other than section 10 (b), or of any regulation or order prescribed or issued under sections 4 (h), 5 (a) (7), 5 (b) (4), 7 (c), 10 (c), or 12 (a) (2)

shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both, except that whoever commits such an offense with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $20,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both."

SEC. 12. Section 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by deleting paragraph (g) and substituting therefor the following paragraphs (g) and (h):

"(g) The term 'facilities for the production of fissionable material' shall be construed to mean any equipment or device capable of such production and any important component part especially designed for such equipment or devices, as determined by the Commission, but includes equipment or devices capable of processing fissionable material only to the extent that such equipment or devices are in the opinion of the Commission peculiarly adapted for such purposes.

"(h) The term 'facilities for the utilization of fissionable material' shall be construed to mean any equipment or device capable of utilizing fissionable material and any important component part especially designed for such equipment or devices, as determined by the Commission, but includes equipment or devices capable of utilizing energy released in the course of nuclear chain reaction of such material only to the extent that such equipment or devices are, in the opinion of the Commission, peculiarly adapted for such use."

An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (a) (3) (C) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Prohibition: It shall be unlawful for any person to * * *

* * * * *

"(C) directly or indirectly engage in the production of any fissionable material outside of the United States, except that the President may authorize the Commission, in accordance with such conditions as he may prescribe for the protection of the common defense and security of the United States to grant exceptions to this clause (C)."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (d) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) General provisions: The Commission shall not—

"(1) distribute any fissionable material to

"(A) any person for a use which is not under or within the jurisdiction of the United States;

"(B) any foreign government, except that notwithstanding any limitation of any provision of this section the President may authorize the Commission, in accordance with such conditions as he may prescribe for the protection of the common defense and security of the United States, to enter into direct arrangements with the governments of other nations involving the distribution of fissionable material to such governments for research or industrial use: *Provided,* That no fissionable material shall be distributed to any foreign government except upon receipt of assurances from the recipient government that such material will be used only for research or industrial purposes and will not be used for weapons or other military purposes; or

"(C) any person within the United States if, in the opinion of the Commission, the distribution of such fissionable material to such person would be inimical to the common defense and security."

SEC. 3. Section 10 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Policy: It shall be the policy of the Commission to control the dissemination of restricted data in such a manner as to assure the common defense and security. Consistent with such policy, the Commission shall be guided by the following principles:

"(1) That until Congress declares by joint resolution that effective and enforceable international safeguards against the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes have been established, there shall be no exchange of restricted data with other nations, except that the President may authorize the Commission, in accordance with such conditions as he may prescribe for the protection of the common defense and security of the United States, to enter into arrangements involving the communication to other nations of:

"(A) restricted data necessary to assist other nations in the development of industrial applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes;

"(B) restricted data necessary to assist nations which are participating with the United States in the defense of the free world, including regional defense organizations such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in the development of defense plans, the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons, and the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons; and

"(C) restricted data on refining, purification, and subsequent treatment of source materials; reactor development; production of fissionable materials; health and safety; and research and development relating to the foregoing.

"(2) That the dissemination of scientific and technical information relating to atomic energy should be permitted and encouraged so as to provide that free interchange of ideas and criticisms which is essential to scientific progress."

SEC. 4. Section 10 (b) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term 'restricted data' as used in this section means all data concerning the theory, design, and manufacture of atomic weapons, the production of fissionable material, or the use of fissionable material in the production of power, but shall not include any data which the Commission from time to time determines may be published without adversely affecting the common defense and security: *Provided,* That in the case of data which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine to relate primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons the determination that the data may be published without adversely affecting the common defense and security shall be made by the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly: *Provided further,* That the Commission shall remove from the restricted data category such data as the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine to relate primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons and which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine can be adequately safeguarded, as classified defense information, under other applicable statutes. Action by the Commission pursuant to the preceding proviso shall not be regarded as excluding the applicability of any other laws, including sections 793 and 794 of title 18 of the United States Code."

SEC. 5. Section 10 (b) (5) (B) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(viii) The Commission shall determine the scope and extent of personnel security investigations to be made for the Commission by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Civil Service Commission on the basis of the nature and significance of the access to restricted data which will be permitted: *Provided,* That nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Commission to authorize any contractor, prospective contractor, licensee or prospective licensee of the Commission to permit any employee of an agency of the Department of Defense or of its contractors or any member of the Armed Forces to have access to restricted data required in the performance of his duties where the head of the appropriate agency of the Department of Defense or his designee has determined, in accordance with the established personnel security procedures and standards of such agency, that permitting the member or employee to have access to such restricted data will not endanger the common defense and security."

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Iowa has demonstrated again the same spirit of cooperation which he has extended to the Senator from Oregon in the 9 years I have been a Member of the Senate. I should like to say that, so far as I am concerned, I know the spirit has been mutual, because I have sought to cooperate on the same basis with the Senator from Iowa.

I do not know anything about the two drafts. I simply wanted to have them in the RECORD, if they existed, so that they could speak for themselves, and we could draw our own inferences and conclusions in regard to them. I thank the Senator from Iowa very much for his cooperation.

BUILT-IN SUBSIDY FOR BIG BUSINESS

Discovering the subsidy offered private industry in S. 3690 involves only a basic understanding of the atomic energy utilization process and a study of the provisions of the bill with regard to the use of special nuclear material by private commercial operators.

Generation of electric power from nuclear material follows the basic process used in manufacturing atomic weapons, and both operations utilize the same nuclear fuel. In the manufacture of weapons, piles of nuclear material are burned in an atomic reactor to get plutonium ash. Great heat is generated in the reaction process. Electric power is to be generated by using that heat in steam plants. In the military use of atomic energy, the end product is plutonium ash, and by the byproduct is electric energy created by utilization of heat. Commercial use of atomic energy looks to power as the end product and plutonium ash as the byproduct. Both operations create the precious plutonium ash which is so valuable for use in our national defense program.

Section 2 (h) of the atomic energy bill makes the finding that "it is essential to the common defense and security of the United States that title to all special nuclear material be in the United States while such material is in the United States."

The bill proposes that the Federal Government shall relinquish its exclusive ownership rights in facilities for production or use of special nuclear material, but retain ownership of the material itself.

It necessarily follows that the Federal Government, which owns any nuclear material produced in privately owned plants, cannot refuse to take and pay for what is produced. I now quote from the

minority report of the joint committee on S. 3690:

As a consequence, the incidents of private and public ownership are intermingled in such a way that not only may vexatious problems of administration and accounting control arise, but the private companies licensed for a maximum period of 40 years to own and operate production facilities (atomic reactors) legally can depend on the Government to compensate them adequately for whatever they produce during the lifetime of the license. This constitutes a built-in subsidy for licensed atomic enterprise until about the year A. D. 2000.

NO LOSS OF MATERIAL IN POWER PROCESS

Admiral Lewis Strauss, AEC Chairman, has stated that fissionable material is not perishable. An AEC report to the joint committee on June 2, 1954, describes an atomic reactor now being operated by the Commission which "will also breed new fissionable material, that is, produce as much as it consumes or more."

The administration atomic energy bill provides that the Government shall purchase at a fair price any special nuclear material that is produced, and that it shall make a reasonable charge for any special material which it distributes to licensees—Sections 52 and 53.

In determining a fair price to be paid by the Government, the Commission is directed, in section 56 of the bill, to "take into consideration the value of the special material for its intended use by the United States." The section also provides that the Commission "may give such weight to the actual cost of producing that material as the Commission finds to be equitable."

Section 53 of the bill lists the factors to be taken into consideration by the Commission in determining a reasonable charge to be collected by the Government for nuclear material. With respect to commercial licensees, the Commission is directed to make uniform, nondiscriminatory charges for the use of the material.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION CRITICIZES BILL

A Federal Power Commission analysis of the proposed legislation at the request of the joint committee pointed out the lack of legislative standards in the bill and the bill's subsidy implications. Commenting upon the fair price provision, the analysis stated:

There is not and probably never will be a free market to provide a standard of what a fair price would be * * * there is little, if anything, in the legally established concepts of utility regulation that can be deemed to provide meaning for the term "fair price." (Hearings, pt. II, p. 1131.)

As a lawyer, I would say that a fair price, in my judgment, would be much less, if there were no restrictions contained in the bill to prevent the Government as such from developing a Government atomic-energy power plant program; in other words, if there were not given to the private utilities a monopoly which, in my judgment, the bill gives to them. Then, of course, the uranium product, or fissionable product, which would go to the private utilities under some lease arrangement, would not bring, in my judgment, nearly as much in value as it would if there were provided a public competitive yardstick under a program in which the Government would also develop electric power from this process.

When we consider what the Government would pay in return for the plutonium ash, we realize we are dealing with a piece of property which is bound to be of tremendous value because of its importance to the defense program. And again, if there is given to the private utilities the monopoly of the manufacturing of that process, we would have a hard time, in my judgment, even if the decision were left to the court, on the basis of judicial standards of determining value. It is worse in this case because it is being left to the Atomic Energy Commission. We cannot disregard the fact that we would pay an extremely high price for the plutonium ash in comparison with the lease price which would be charged the utilities for the leasing of the uranium, in the first instance, out of which, in the long run, would be developed the plutonium ash.

I think that is a sleeper in the bill, a catch we must watch out for, and we must attack from two angles: first, from the angle of seeing to it that the bill is amended in such a way that the Government will be able to do its own power generating, particularly for Government use and the use of public bodies; and, second, in my judgment we must write into the bill what the Federal Power Commission says are some very much needed standards of valuation, rather than the very general terms in the bill which are not even identical when they come to deal with fixing the value of the uranium, as compared with fixing the value of the plutonium ash.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Lest a misconception arise, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the fact that the bill does not give a monopoly to private industry. Any public or quasi-public body, utility district, municipality, REA, the TVA, and of such organizations, will have just as much right to participate in this program and to apply for, and receive, licenses as will any private utility. The bill so provides.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that my good friend, the Senator from Iowa, was not here earlier this afternoon when I discussed this phase of the bill. I shall stand on the record I have made. I think the language of the bill to which the Senator from Iowa refers is very empty, because of certain physical facts which will confront us for the next 10 years. No REA's or cooperatives or municipalities will, in the present stage of the development of atomic power, build a reactor.

What we must take pains to remember, Mr. President, is that in the building of the reactors, only so many of them can be built in the country, and the number is relatively small, because if they are built large enough, and if they are not large enough to begin with, they will not be economically feasible, either for the benefit of the Government or for a private utility, and if only a certain number of them are built across the country, there will automatically be a monopoly. Furthermore, the electric cooperatives and municipalities do not now have the funds that will be needed to build reactors; and if licenses are given to a private utility combine spotted throughout the country by building reactors in certain critical areas, we might just as well forget about the cooperatives or the municipalities ever building a reactor 15 or 20 years from now.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not follow the Senator's line of reasoning, because certainly the public or semi-public groups and cooperatives are as capable of going into this field in the same way private capital is willing to go into it and invest in it. The opportunity is provided in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. There are scores of reasons why they will not do it now, at the present stage of development of atomic energy. Let us not forget that a select group of private utilities have been working on the development of atomic energy from the beginning. They have been engaged in the development and acquiring the know-how, and they are aware what the hidden potentialities of atomic energy are; and in view of the hidden subsidies provided by this bill, they will be in a fine position to grab off, right now, the desirable locations for the construction of reactors, and in that way they will obtain the subsidies. They will have the advantages of a virtual monopoly of patents.

Furthermore, the bill does not contain provision for having any Federal Government units develop power on a commercial basis. In the bill Government units are limited to the development of power as a byproduct; and when we come to the byproduct-power section, we see some very interesting restrictions on what they shall be able to do with the byproduct power.

A part of the objection I am presenting this afternoon to the bill is that the bill, as drafted, does not give effective preference to public bodies. That is why I believe it so essential to write into the bill a provision giving the Atomic Energy Commission and Federal power agencies the authority and the right to build some plants, so as to generate some power for the people, and so as to sell some power under preference provisions in line with general power policy. That should be done in order to have cheap power generated for the benefit of the people.

It is important to have included in the bill a provision setting forth clearly a public-power yardstick which will have some meaning to it, by way of a public-power program, through the construction of atomic-energy reactors owned by the people, as represented by their Federal Government.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No doubt the Senator from Oregon is aware of what I am about to say, but I should like to call it to his attention again, at this

point, namely, that so far as public and semipublic bodies and cooperative bodies are concerned, in respect to the power field, the TVA has an extensive study and experimental program in connection with this matter; and the REA's are studying the matter, and have a program in regard to the possibilities of atomic-power development, through their connection with Fairbanks-Morse. So the cooperative groups and the REA's are interested in it and are exploring it, just as the privately owned utilities are; and the TVA has its segment investigating and looking into and canvassing the possibilities of atomic-power development.

So I believe it is not exclusively—even at the present time—in the hands of the private utilities, insofar as examination and exploration of this field are concerned.

Again I assure the Senate that I have no fear that the bill will exclude the other bodies and groups in the field of atomic energy, from proper exploitation of it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer a very simple test to settle the disagreement between the Senator from Iowa and myself. The very simple language we shall vote upon, possibly next week, contained in the Johnson and Gillette amendments to the bill, will, if incorporated in the bill, remove any doubt as to whether the power will be developed, in part, for the benefit of all the people, through guaranteeing a public-power yardstick. Let us write into the bill provisions which will authorize the Atomic Energy Commission and Federal power agencies to develop some Government-owned plants for the generation of power, as such, to be made available to the people, as such. That will constitute a check on monopoly, and will make it possible for the Atomic Energy Commission and other Federal agencies, through that kind of a Government plant, really to breathe life and meaning into any public preference.

If we really wish to check private monopoly and if we really wish to have a public-power yardstick of control against them, then, first, the Senate should adopt our amendments, providing that the Atomic Energy Commission and Federal power agencies shall have authority and jurisdiction to build some of these plants, too, and market their power under the preference clause.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to say a few words about the Federal Power Commission's criticisms of the bill. A Federal Power Commission analysis of the proposed legislation at the request of the Joint Committee pointed out the lack of legislative standards in the bill and the bill's subsidy implications. Commenting upon the "fair price" provision, the analysis stated:

> There is not and probably never will be a free market to provide a standard of what a "fair price" would be * * * there is little, if anything, in the legally established concepts of utility regulation that can be deemed to provide meaning for the term "fair price." (Hearings, pt. II, p. 1131.)

The FPC also asked this question:

> If persons are to be permitted to use the energy resource resulting from the Government's expenditure of billions of dollars on atomic research and production, are they to pay anything for that privilege?

Although licensees for development of hydroelectric resources under the Federal Power Act are required to pay an annual license fee, S. 3690 makes no provision requiring that private persons making use of the atomic energy resource pay for such use.

The FPC concluded:

> For all the bill now provides, the AEC may pay more for the ashes than it charges for the fuel. If the Government is thus to subsidize the electric utilities and other persons developing atomic energy by paying operating costs in addition to giving them the license privilege without charge, it would seem that Congress should fix that policy—not attempt to pass the responsibility to the AEC, the Review Board, the courts, or anyone else.

I completely agree with that point of view of the Federal Power Commission. If there are those who say, "It is not a sound position for the Federal Power Commission to take. It is misinterpreting the act and misjudging its implication," I say it raises at least a doubt. It raises at least a charge of ambiguity in the bill, and it calls for clarification.

TOO MUCH DISCRETION IN AEC

In my judgment the Atomic Energy Commission is allowed an amazing amount of discretion in the administration bill with regard to receipts and disbursements of the taxpayers' money. The provisions of the bill leave wide open the possibility that the Government may buy back nuclear material for a higher price than it charges when it distributes it, especially in view of the provision which allows the private producer's operating costs to be considered in making up the fair price to be paid. The Commission may very well set a low price to the licensees for unprocessed material and pay a high price for plutonium ash. This would be a windfall for the utility companies operating the plants who would already be making huge profits from the sale of power. Even if the fair price and the reasonable charge were the same, the private operator would be making his profits on the nuclear material if he had a breeder reactor which produced more material than it burned.

The built-in subsidy feature in S. 3690 would give to the private operator who had already been given the right to exploit a $12-billion investment of the people without even the payment of a license fee, the assurance that his operation would be without expense and that he could probably make a profit from the operation even if he never sold a kilowatt of power. It is no wonder that the giants of industry are eager to get in on the atomic energy program.

The social implications of adoption of this kind of legislative proposal were discussed by Edward R. Murrow in his broadcast of June 7, 1954. I quote from the text of the Murrow broadcast:

> But more interesting—and surely more significant—is another issue raised by the Commission in its report to Congress. This has to do with the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The Commission recommends that private industry take this over from the Government. This is what the report says: "Obtaining full participation of the Nation's electrical energy producers and equipment manufacturers in the development and production of nuclear power is, in our judgment, the best way of securing the maximum return on the public investment in this phase of our atomic energy program."
>
> Previously in the report the Commission had said, in effect, that we are a society of private enterprise and should remain so. Nuclear power, it said "should be produced and distributed by the private and public power systems and not by the Commission." And that, it argued, would let nuclear power "confirm and strengthen, rather than change, our way of life." But what the Commission proposes may itself be a change in our way of life. It is not easy to find a name for the kind of society it would produce. Obviously it would not be socialism, for though the people put up the money for atomic development and now own the process and the plant, the profits under socialism, (if there are profits) would go directly or indirectly to the people. But just because something isn't socialism it isn't automatically free or private enterprise. In free enterprise the capital is put up by private persons—at a risk—and that is what entitles them to the profits they make. Obviously it wouldn't be free or private enterprise to collect the equivalent of $75 from every person in the United States for nuclear development, which is what the Government has done. This is public money and the discovery and the industry now belong to the public. Of course, if private industry "buys its way in," and the public is reimbursed for its capital outlay, that could end up as private enterprise. But the AEC doesn't suggest this should happen. And nothing is being said about it so far in Congress. It just isn't explained how the public property is to become private property. I should mention that giving public property to private persons, or selling it at nominal cost, is not necessarily reprehensible. It was worthily done by Abraham Lincoln in the Homestead Act, for example. But it is not the same to give away a whole range of new knowledge and a vast equipment that have cost the public an outlay of $12 billion. This is not said to object to atomic energy for peaceful purposes becoming a function of private enterprise. Most Americans will agree that this is a valid objective. But one is entitled to know just how this public property is to become private property. And we may need a new name for the kind of society we might become.

Murrow went on to say, in this excellent broadcast:

> As I said, it isn't socialism, but it also isn't pure private enterprise. If one assumes that neither the administration nor Congress wants to arrange simply a gigantic handout of the public property, what do they have in mind? It is not a mixed economy, even though the proposal is that the Government stop making nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and go on making it for defense. For it is not characteristic of a mixed economy to turn over publicly financed and operated functions to private persons. Another name for the proposal may be subsidy. Letting private industry benefit from the nearly four billions it cost simply to develop nuclear energy and use part of the public's plant and equipment, would be one of the most sensational subsidies of all time. Must we learn to call our form of society in the atomic era "subsidized free enterprise?" One should hope not. It sounds like doubletalk. To quote again from the AEC report, the aim is "securing the maximum return on the public investment." But the maximum return to whom? Is it to the public which put up the capital? Or is it to private corporations? These questions are worth thinking about.

Earlier this afternoon in this speech I expressed my high regard for Tom Stokes and the great job he is doing in helping to awaken the American public to the serious dangers in this bill. I now wish to pay my compliments to Ed Murrow. We have heard about that broadcast from a great many sources. The broadcast had about as terrific an impact on the American people, I think, as Murrow's telecast on Senator McCARTHY. The American people have great confidence in the keen intellect of Ed Murrow, and I wish to commend him for the job of public education he did in this broadcast. When he closed it with the sentence, "These questions are worth thinking about," in my judgment, he described the issue which is now before us in the Senate. The questions he raised are questions about which the Senate had better do some thinking before we come to vote on the pending bill.

I think Murrow is quite right. We cannot call this private enterprise. We cannot call this free enterprise. I would suggest, instead of Murrow's phrase "subsidized free enterprise," that what it is is "subsidized private monopoly." This bill is a subsidy bill for private monopoly. This bill is a bill which will result in the American people giving free to the private utilities a monopolistic stranglehold over the development of an atomic energy program for the purpose of generating power and selling it back to the American people at the rates that private monopolies usually charge, which are invariably higher than the rates charged when they have to compete against the public power yardstick. The bill contains no public power yardstick provisions for the development of electric power through an atomic energy program.

THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM OF GIVING AWAY THE PEOPLE'S NATURAL RESOURCES

In 1953 the Eisenhower administration gave away to the oil companies of the Nation the valuable resources of the people of the United States in the offshore oil lands, resources worth hundreds of billions of dollars. That giveaway was heralded with great publicity and delivered with pious pronouncements.

In 1954 the same Eisenhower administration proposes to give away to the utility giants of the Nation a new resource in which the people of the United States have invested $12 billion and which has a potential value greater than that of all the oil, gas, coal, and water resources of the country combined.

This giveaway is being attempted in the form of a number of amendments to the McMahon Act, by a bill which is being rushed through the Congress in the closing days of the session without adequate consideration, unless a few of us insist on standing on the floor of the Senate for the next few days and forcing a full public discussion of what we consider to be the very serious defects of this bill.

NO NEED FOR CHANGE IN THE PRESENT LAW

There is no need for legislation at this time to enable private industry to participate in the development of the atomic-energy program. Industry is already involved and taking a full part in the atomic-energy research and development program. Legislation to allow the possession and use by private operators of nuclear material and atomic energy production facilities will not be needed until the program has reached the phase of practical application of processes developed under the present program.

In fact, I may say that private industry has not lost a dollar, but has prospered in the atomic energy development.

I attended a little luncheon yesterday with a group of Senators, where there was some discussion of this bill. In the course of the discussion one of the Senators said that during the war private industry got behind the Government and helped to develop the atomic energy program.

That struck me as a rather amusing statement, because what happened was that the Government got behind private industry and Government and industry, working together cooperatively, as they should, in the interest of national security, developed the atomic energy program. However, industry did not lose anything by it.

To listen to some, one would think that industry's economic neck was not in the wringer during World War II, as well as the economic neck of all the rest of us. One would think that the very survival of industry, as well as the very survival of all the people, was not at stake in World War II, to hear some of those argue about what industry did during World War II. Industry did no more than its patriotic duty, no more than the boys who fought in uniform, and no more than the civilians on the home front did on the industrial line of America, no more than the farmers making possible the development of the materials and food which were needed in order to back up the boys in uniform.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am never very much impressed by the argument that we owe industry some giveaway in regard to the atomic energy program because during World War II industry cooperated with the Government in developing the atomic energy program. It was industry's patriotic duty to do so, and it did not lose a dollar by doing it.

In fact, the Government backed up industry in the development of that program to the profit, in dollars and cents, of industry and it was still a profit long after industry got through paying any excess profit taxes.

Therefore, I do not bleed for industry because of any argument what industry did during the war now places upon us some obligation to give away the people's heritage in the atomic energy program. I do not weep for industry with crocodile tears or any other kind of tears. In my judgment, under the amendments some of us are urging industry would still prosper. Under the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee, by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], by the Senator from Oregon, and by other Senators, industry would prosper under the Atomic energy program; but the people would be protected in the several respects I have argued for this afternoon.

PROPOSED JOHNSON AND GILLETTE AMENDMENTS

First, we would be provided the right of the Federal Government, through its appropriate agencies, to develop its own power plants, if it should decide that in the public interest such a program should be followed in some sections of the country, just as we have done in the development of electric power through falling water in the TVA project.

Second, there would be established a public power yardstick by the marketing of that and byproduct power under the public body preference clause.

They are amendments which will be in keeping with the spirit and intent of a strong private enterprise system, in contrast with the dangers of a private monopoly system. It is the latter system, I respectfully submit, which this bill develops, not the private enterprise system, and the lease and purchase provisions should be revised to remove the subsidy element now imbedded in the bill.

I should now like to quote from the report of the Atomic Energy Commission, made by the Member Murray to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on June 2, 1954: He said:

> We are only now in the development stage. We have not yet reached the phase of competitive, commercial application. This is some years ahead. As I mentioned earlier, the 5-year reactor program submitted to the committee is aimed at making competitive nuclear power a reality. If the goal is accomplished, our feeling is that only a small number of full-scale privately owned and operated power reactors are likely to be on the line before 1965—in other words over 10 years from now.

I respectfully say to my friend, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that is the answer of a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. That is why, Mr. President, the cooperatives and the municipalities are not going to rush in at this time and ask for licenses to develop reactors which will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. The figures vary as one reads the record on the bill, as I have, but it appears that there will not be any commercially feasible reactor that will cost less than $200 million.

In my judgment, Mr. President, it is stretching the imagination pretty far and violating the rules of credulity to argue on the floor of the Senate, as my good friend from Iowa has done, that there is nothing to stop some little cooperative or a municipality from getting in on the ground floor. From a financial standpoint, it happens to be impossible for them to do so. Where is there a little rural electric cooperative with $200 million to spare to build one of these reactors? Where is the municipality that can do it? The catch is what I cited a few minutes ago. The language is empty; it does not mean anything, because the private utility combines see the chance for an economic "killing." They can get a license now to spot check this country with a few reactors needed to supply all the power that could possibly be sold by way of atomic-energy generation. If they have the license now, they have the monopoly now.

I shall not be fooled by these sleeper clauses in the bill. I shall not be fooled by meaningless language in the bill. If the proponents of the bill really mean it when they say the bill will provide for better development and better generation, all they have to do is to support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] which would give to the Federal Government the jurisdiction, the authority, and the right to build some of these reactors and to market the power under the public preference clause to co-ops, PUD's, municipalities, industry and private utilities.

I have quoted the utility witnesses. That is not what Iddles wants. That is not what Cisler wants. That is not what those who are now on the ground floor of development want. They have a bill here which would put the Government out of it. We shall try to put language in the bill that will put the Government into it, because the Government must be put into the development of electric power from atomic energy if we are going to protect the public interest from the kind of monopolistic control that will flow from this bill if we do not put the proper language into it.

It is just that simple, Mr. President, but we must say it over and over again. We have got to pound away on it. We have got to get the American people, by the old process of repetition of the truth, to recognize it. By repeating the truth we may finally get them to discard the point of view which has been developed by repetition of a lot of falsehoods. By repetition of the truth we may be able to get the American people to see through the false propaganda of private utilities which has been flooding the country for sometime past, and by a repetition of the truth that this bill has not a single effective safeguard of the public interest in it from the standpoint of a public power yardstick, we may in the days ahead—and I think we will—cause the American people sufficiently to understand the situation so that they will demand that the Senate adopt the simple amendment to which I have been referring, namely, an amendment which will clearly give to the Federal Government the authority, jurisdiction, and right to build some of these reactors for the benefit of the people.

President Eisenhower himself stated to the Congress in his message on February 17, 1954, "the act in the main is still adequate to the Nation's needs." When he urged some revisions in the Atomic Energy Act at that time he indicated that they were needed only to allow cooperation with our military allies in the atomic-energy field. I am satisfied from what I have been told by members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that this can be accomplished without changes in the present law, at least without the changes proposed by the majority of the committee in the present bill.

WE MUST BE SURE OF WHAT WE ARE DOING

America and the world are entering into a new era. Utilization of nuclear energy for industrial and power purposes can greatly improve the living conditions of millions of people whose chances for a better life have been restricted by their inability to get power at reasonable prices. Before we consider the adoption of legislation which proposes to provide what is done with this great new power resource we should be very sure that we know what we are doing.

Fifty years of development of another great power resource—the falling water of our Nation's rivers and streams—have established guides for the development of atomic-energy power. In my judgment, the Congress of the United States would be acting in a completely irresponsible manner if, in legislating on atomic power, it did not make use of knowledge gained in the hydroelectric power program. This experience has been incorporated into law during Republican and Democratic administrations; yet the proposed legislation in S. 3690 makes no reference to the established power policy of our country and sets up no positive standards in its place.

We must not enact a proposal which would allow America's greatest potential source of power to be turned over to the private utility monopoly without safeguards to protect the interest of the American public in its $12 billion investment in atomic energy.

We must not pass a bill, Mr. President, such as this bill in its present form, which would help to sell the American people into a monopolistic economic bondage for decades to come.

OWNERSHIP BY TEXAS OF SUBMERGED LANDS EXTENDING THREE LEAGUES INTO THE GULF OF MEXICO

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] inserted in the RECORD editorials from newspapers concerning the boundary of Texas in the Gulf of Mexico, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] referred to a visit which the junior Senator from Texas had at the White House with reference to the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I released yesterday concerning the meeting and the general subject of the three-league boundary of Texas with reference to submerged lands 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 OF SENATOR PRICE DANIEL, JULY 15, 1954, ON TEXAS THREE-LEAGUE BOUNDARY IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

In a visit with President Eisenhower at the White House today, he assured me that there was no change whatever in his position that Texas owns the submerged lands extending 3 leagues, rather than 3 miles, into the Gulf of Mexico.

There is no question but that the Submerged Lands Act passed by the Congress and signed by the President in 1953 restored to Texas all submerged lands within its historic 3-league (10.5-mile) boundary in the Gulf of Mexico. However, I had heard a report from the recent State bar meeting in San Antonio that Attorney General Shepperd was under the impression that the Eisenhower administration might not recognize the 3-league boundary, and that Attorney General Brownell might try to push us back to 3 miles. That is why I brought up the question with President Eisenhower today.

I planned to do this immediately after hearing of the report last week, and my inquiry certainly has no reference to subsequent involvement of the question in the Governor's race. I am sure the people of Texas know that my long interest in the tidelands fight and my conference with the President today have no connection with any present political campaign.

I reviewed with the President his letter written to Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, last year, which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 25, 1953, in which he referred to this Houston, Tex., speech of October 14, 1952, as follows:

"The next day, October 14, I made specific reference to the State of Texas:

"'Just a 107 years ago the United States Senate decided that the public lands of Texas were not worth $10 million. * * * So the United States said Texas, "Keep your debts—and keep your lands. We don't want either." And so the State of Texas paid off the $10-million debt of the Republic. It kept its 400 million acres of lands, including the submerged area extending 3 marine leagues seaward into the Gulf of Mexico.'

"My position is the same today. It was further amplified by the administration representatives in the hearings before the Senate and your committees considering the legislation.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

President Eisenhower authorizes me to say there is "no change in his position whatever." He seemed surprised that the question has been raised again, and I feel sure that our full 3-league (10-mile) boundary will not be challenged by this administration.

Even if challenged by some future administration, it would have no chance of success, because the Submerged Lands Act covers all lands out to the boundaries which existed at the time any State entered the Union. That phrase was written into the law especially for Texas, and the entire legislative history shows this to be true. In fact, both in the House and in the Senate, amendments were offered to limit all States to 3 miles, but these amendments were overwhelmingly defeated after the Texas boundary situation was explained.

Attorney General Brownell recognized the Texas 3-league boundary in his testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in 1953. He said:

"In order that there may be no misunderstanding, generally speaking what we have in mind is the 3-mile line, except for the coasts of Texas and the west coast of Florida, where 3 leagues would generally prevail."

Secretary of Interior McKay testified to the same effect with regard to Texas in his appearance before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as follows:

"Senator DANIEL. May he complete that statement. I thought maybe he would say something about his understanding of the Texas 3-league boundary.

"Secretary MCKAY. That is what I wanted to say. I am with Texas on that, 3 leagues to sea."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article concerning the same subject be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

NO DISPUTE ON TEXAS BOUNDARY

WASHINGTON.—Senator DANIEL said today he has no knowledge of any differences between President Eisenhower and Attorney

General Brownell over interpretation of the extent of Texas' title to offshore lands in the Gulf of Mexico.

He told a reporter he sent word to Brownell yesterday that he would like to discuss the question with him, but in replying through an intermediary Brownell said it looked to him as though the President had sufficiently covered the matter during DANIEL'S visit to the White House Thursday.

After that visit DANIEL told reporters Eisenhower had authorized him to say that he had not changed the position he has always held—that Texas is entitled to offshore lands and their oil resources reaching 3 leagues, rather than 3 miles, into the gulf.

Confirming this yesterday, White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty said Eisenhower always believed and still believes that the historical boundaries of Texas extend 3 leagues—about 10½ miles—off its coast.

After DANIEL'S statement Thursday John Ben Shepperd, the Texas attorney general, said that J. Lee Rankin, the United States Assistant Attorney General, has challenged Texas' claim to the lands beyond the 3-mile limit. Neither Rankin nor Brownell would comment yesterday.

Asked today about this reported conflict between the White House and Justice Department, DANIEL said he knew of no disagreement between the two. He said he hadn't talked to Brownell about the matter because it seemed to him the President's position as outlined to him personally left no doubt that "this whole matter has been completely decided in favor of Texas."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I simply wish to add that so far as any dispute having arisen concerning the boundaries at this late date, at least a hundred times during the argument on the submerged lands bill last year it was stated by both proponents and opponents of the measure that the gulfward boundary of Texas is 3 leagues instead of 3 miles.

I should like to invite attention to the fact that the report on the bill by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in stating the boundaries and the acreage covered by the bill clearly shows in appendix F, on page 76 of the report, that the Texas boundary is figured as 3 leagues rather than as 3 miles, and the acreage is specifically stated so that there can be no doubt as to what boundaries were involved insofar as the State of Texas is concerned.

I do not believe there is any real conflict in the administration over this matter, and I wish to point out that so far as Congress is concerned, the issue was settled, because an attempt was made on the floor of the House and of the Senate to add an amendment which would specifically limit all States to 3 miles.

As the Presiding Officer will remember, that attempt was made twice in the Senate. The amendment was overwhelmingly defeated after the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and I had explained the Texas 3-league boundary. The proposal likewise was defeated in the House. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] showed that Florida had the same situation on its gulfward boundary.

After the defeat of the amendments which attempted to limit us to 3 miles instead of 3 leagues, the Senate will remember that an amendment was added which specifically provided that the effect of the act, in the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean would be limited to 3 miles, and in the Gulf of Mexico to 3 leagues, rather than 3 miles.

Mr. President, on April 29, 1953—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 3, pages 4171 to 4176—during consideration of the Submerged Lands Act, I gave the history of Texas 3-league boundary and cited the many times it had been recognized by the Congress. The Senate defeated the pending amendment which would have limited Texas to 3 miles instead of 3 leagues, just as the House had done previously.

AWARDS FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO CONSERVATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Thursday, July 15, 1954, at a dinner held in the Statler Hotel, and sponsored by a group of organizations interested in the conservation of natural resources, a national award was presented to Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, for distinguished service to conservation. The same action was taken with reference to Representative LEON H. GAVIN, of Pennsylvania.

The organizations which sponsored the dinner and which presented the awards are the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

The chairman of the meeting was Bernard DeVoto, who delivered an address reviewing the work of those interested in conservation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statements made by these organizations in connection with the presentation of the awards to Representative METCALF and Representative GAVIN.

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

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR NATIONAL AWARD TO LEE METCALF FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO CONSERVATION

LEE METCALF'S alert and continuing work in the Nation's Capital has won him widespread respect and admiration. By virtue of his profound interest and comprehensive understanding of conservation and its objectives and problems, the recipient has, during his first term of office as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, emerged as a defender of the principles of better management and wise use of natural resources for the benefit of all the people. Among his many achievements in attaining an enviable record in the 83d Congress, he was a foremost leader in successful actions that turned aside attempts by those who chose to overlook the fundamental privileges of all Americans in the national forest lands in order to obtain special concessions for minority groups; he sponsored legislation that would make possible improved management of public domain lands; and he directed the attention of Congress to the diversion of duck stamp funds while appealing for adequate appropriations with which to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. It is in gratitude for this outstanding public service and in appreciation of his accomplishments that this national award and bronze plaque are presented to Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, by the undersigned national conservation organizations.

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA.
NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION.
WILDERNESS SOCIETY.
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR NATIONAL AWARD TO LEON H. GAVIN FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO CONSERVATION

Since the 78th Congress, LEON H. GAVIN'S continuing interest has been the promoting of better management of the vast treasures of natural resources held in public trust by the Federal Government and in assuring equal privileges for all who would benefit from these resources. During his long and active career in the House of Representatives of the United States, he has become known as a fearless champion of the national forest system. His trade-marks are his firm convictions that, consistent with sound management policies, the privileges of all users of the national forests be recognized, and his unyielding stand in opposition to those who would obtain special privileges at the expense of others. He has been a forceful advocate of the appropriation by Congress of adequate funds with which to carry out the study and management of fish and game resources on these public lands. In recognition of his outstanding service and untiring efforts to secure the best management and wise use of the country's natural resources in the public interest, the undersigned national conservation organizations are privileged to present this national award and a bronze plaque to Representative LEON H. GAVIN, of Pennsylvania.

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA.
NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION.
WILDERNESS SOCIETY.
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE.

RECESS TO 10 A. M. ON MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Monday next at 10 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, July 19, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 17 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Charles Ernest Loucks, O6949, United States Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Mack Macon Green, O16539, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Arthur Letcher Irons, O16526, Dental Corps, United States Army.

Col. James Glore, O28758, United States Army.

Col. John Robert Burns, O16509, United States Army.

Col. Robert Vernon Lee, O28882, United States Army.

Col. Marshall Stubbs, O17706, United States Army.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be captains

Abbott, Donald I., O60517.
Abelson, Albert N., O57434.
Aboe, Kenneth R., O69577.
Abt, Alan B. O60323.
Achee, Sidney W., O60583.
Acker, Ivan B., O60474.
Acuff, Earl C., O60178.
Adams, Alfred M., O65721.
Adams, Billy J., O59933.
Adams, Dexter W., O62247.
Adams, Howard E., O57244.
Adams, Marvin L., O60612.
Adams, Thomas E., Jr., O59949.
Adcock, Robert L., O60565.
Adkins, Aaron C., O60512.
Adkins, Alvin E., O65940.
Adoue, Eugene L., O58805.
Affleck, David W., O58806.
Ahearn, John R., O59918.
Ahearn, Neal J., O65591.
Akin, Karl E., O59900.
Albertson, James J., O62197.
Aldridge, Thomas C., O58807.
Alexander, David B., O59956.
Alfonso, Albert F., O57240.
Allard, Henry G., O58808.
Allbee, Howard G., O68069.
Allbright, Marion C., O63678.
Allen, Herbert B., O60349.
Allen, Philip J., Jr., O60585.
Allen, Warren P., O62825.
Allen, William E., O60661.
Allis, John D., O60616.
Allison, Charles C., O65729.
Allison, William A., O60176.
Allred, William M., O58809.
Allyn, John O., O65941.
Ambrose, Don C., O62179.
Amity, Richard F., O60407.
Anderson, Allen R., O62116.
Anderson, Kenneth S., Jr., O62252.
Anderson, Melvin C., O60805.
Anderson, Reuben L., Jr., O57129.
Anderson, Richard C., O58810.
Anderson, Richard L., O60567.
Anderton, Edward C., O61094.
Andreasen, Eugene K., O57431.
Andres, Charles, 3d, O58811.
Andrews, James L., O58812.
Andrews, William J., O58162.
Anthony, Thomas J., O58813.
Antrim, Ralph C., Jr., O65170.
Applegate, William H., O65007.
Applin, Paul L., Jr., O57968.
Apt, Robert, O58814.
Arendt, Morton, Jr., O65942.
Armstrong, George E., O65598.
Armstrong, John R., O65159.
Armstrong, Nemesio A., O59898.
Arnett, Vern R., O60369.
Arnold, Emmett R., O60396.
Arnold, Richard D., O58815.
Arnold, Richard J., O58816.
Aron, Joel D., O57076.
Ashley, Lewis J., O62231.
Astarita, Edward F., O60821.
Atchison, Frank E., O58817.
Athanason, Frank A., O58818.
Atkinson, Donald E., O65071.
Avery, Albert M., Jr., O59894.
Avery, William H., Jr., O58819.
Awalt, Thomas Y., Jr., O57496.
Axelson, Rudolph A., O59838.
Bache, Claude V., O61100.
Backhaus, Gus, 3d, O60714.
Baeuchle, Alfred A. O59901.
Bailey, Jack S., O62209.
Bailey, Paul O., O60515.
Bailey, Richard A., O60622.
Bailey, Walter D., O65945.
Baird, Andrew W., O57499.
Baker, Dallas O., O58820.
Baker, James O., O60316.
Baker, Joe, Jr., O63359.
Baker, John E., O65151.
Baker, John W., O63380.
Baldwin, Cecil C., O60226.
Baldy Paul A., O59773.
Balitis, John J., O60414.
Ball, Doric W. J., O62258.
Ballard, Donald S., O58821.
Ballinger, Eldon L., O61202.
Ballou, William R., O60701.
Bandeen, William R., O57193.
Bang, John D., O63056.
Bangert, Robert L., O60217.
Baran, Stanley, Jr., O60519.
Barber, John W., O65009.
Barbero, Eugene C., O61994.
Barbero, Richard J., O60717.
Barker, Edmund J., O60330.
Barnes, Alfred, O63099.
Barnes, Harry C., O58822.
Barnett, James W., Jr., O57087.
Barnett, Robert B., O58823.
Barnitz, Gerald W., O60669.
Barr, William H., O59470.
Barrett, Ernest F., O65114.
Barrett, George B., O62265.
Barrett, George B., Jr., O60601.
Barrett, Ross P., O58824.
Barrick, Thomas McC., O60493.
Barrow, George R., O59480
Barth, Sam L., O57511.
Bartholdt, William E., O60630.
Barwick, William R., Jr., O61089.
Bass, Marshall B., O62204.
Baswell, Carl F., O58826.
Bates, William E., Jr., O59939.
Batiste, John O., O58827.
Batts, John T., O59774.
Bauer, Eugene R., O69586.
Baxley, John B., O59919.
Baxter, James O., O60478.
Beard, Daryl A., O60506.
Beard, Kenneth R., O61095.
Beard, Rutland D., Jr., O57813.
Bearden, William A., O60491.
Beasley, Thomas A., O65074.
Becicka, Leonard, O58828.
Beck, William J., O58829.
Beckett, James E., O59839.
Becton, Julius W., Jr., O65716.
Beer, Warren G., O59966.
Behenna, Douglas L., O65034.
Bein, Robert K., O60379.
Beinke, Walter, Jr., O57357.
Beirne, Daniel R., O57366.
Bellinger, John B., Jr., O57136.
Belnap, Glen D., O63088.
Belser, Adolph L., O59913.
Benedict, William G., O65117.
Beninate, Nicholas A., O59464.
Bennett, Peter B., O62830.
Bentley, Richard S., O59490.
Bentley, Robert D., O65044.
Benton, Lucien C., O60549.
Berger, Alvin C., O65948.
Bernard, Robert J., O58830.
Berner, Bent E., O60611.
Berres, John P., O62276.
Berry, Charles, O60490.
Berry, Milton M., O59886.
Berry, Sidney B., Jr., O57233.
Bertholf, Russell W., Jr., O63083.
Bertram, Edward H., Jr., O57327.
Best, Charles E., O58831.
Betz, John J., Jr., O58832.
Biere, Emerson T., O58834.
Bierer, Eugene S., O57311.
Big, Bernard, O58835.
Biggs, Thomas R., O63104.
Bilharz, Dwight L., O65952.
Billinghurst, Edward P., O63069.
Bjostad, Louis B., Jr., O65138.
Black, Gorham L., Jr., O65111.
Blackburn, William A., O60625.
Blackford, James C., O58836.
Blair, Robert C., O59840.
Blair, Thomas G., O60678.
Blake, Leslie M., O62183.
Blakeslee, James A., O57272.
Blalock, Bill R., O63348.
Blankenship, Frank J., O60389.
Blodgett, Rexford J., O60657.
Blunck, Stanley R., O58837.
Boehm, William C., O63051.
Boggan, Edgar W., O59928.
Boggs, James R., O65954.
Boisvert, Joseph R., O65018.
Bolton, Virgil W., O69595.
Boone, George M., Jr., O60335.
Booth, James R., O65052.
Booth, Merritt B., Jr., O65698.
Borcheller, Karl H., O57038.
Borg, Charles A., Jr., O57078.
Borland, Frederick H., O65162.
Boss, Keith A., O57308.
Bott, Frank M., O65481.
Bourquardez, Charles C., O60337.
Boutelle, Maurice H., O62126.
Bowen, Thomas W., O57090.
Bowen, William C., Jr., O61201.
Boy, Edmund G., O63073.
Boyd, Donn T., O62181.
Boyle, Peter J., Jr., O58839.
Boylston, William L., O59775.
Bradford, Robert K., O62173.
Bradley, Jerry F., O65489.
Brandewie, Robert A., O60373.
Brannock, Robert C., O64995.
Brash, William W., O65042.
Bratton, Joseph K., O57077.
Bratton, William DuB., O60190.
Braun, Walter R., O60509.
Brazier, Vincent M., O60653.
Breen, Patrick J., O62129.
Brennan, John W., O57124.
Brettell, James A., Jr., O69600.
Briggs, John L., O58840.
Bringham, William N., O60665.
Britt, Colon R., Jr., O57806.
Brizius, Charles A., Sr., O58841.
Brockett, Charles K., O60199.
Brockmeier, William E., O57651.
Broida, Donald, O60641.
Brooks, Glenn P., O60694.
Brooks, Roland St. J., Jr., O60336.
Brooks, William A., O69601.
Brouillette, Frederick, O65057.
Brown, Albert J., O60321.
Brown, George K., Jr., O58842.
Brown, Haldon D., O62136.
Brown, Hugh M., Jr., O58843.
Brown, Lorence F., O60223.
Brown, Richard F., O59841.
Brown, William A., O60815.
Brown, William D., O60426.
Browne, Mark L., Jr., O58844.
Bruger, Edward J., O60516.
Bryant, Jackson M., O62151.
Bryant, James B., O65490.
Bryant, John T., Jr., O58845.
Bryant, Robert L., O58164.
Bryant, Vernon W., O58127.
Buchanan, Crawford, O69605.
Buchanan, Everts R., O59842.
Buchanan, Thomas W., O60835.
Buckley, Harry A., Jr., O57335.
Budney, Clifford J., Jr., O59776.
Buie, David M., O59777.
Bulawsky, Lawrence H., Jr., O69606.
Bullard, William P., O58847.
Bullock, Frank E., O60319.
Bundy, Robert E., O60633.
Burch, Charles T., O63060.
Burch, Gerald C., O63283.
Burget, Frank R. O62120.
Burke, Martin J., Jr., O61098.
Burke, Thomas P., O62803.
Burnett, Bruce, O63096.
Burns, Richard F., O58121.
Burns, Robert T., O62820.
Burns, William C., O57092.
Burpo, Frank W., O65026.
Burrer, John D., O61208.
Burt, Robert E., O63053.
Busey, Matthew W., 3d, O60845.
Bush, Francis J., O64997.
Bush, Harry L., O59843.
Butler, Jerome J., Jr., O65146.
Byers, Lex J., O63366.
Byers, William E., O57200.
Byrd, Billy W., O58848.
Byrne, Daniel K., O58849.
Cadman, Walvin M., O60554.

Caid, Larry A., O69612.
Cain, Lloyd R., O58850.
Caldwell, Elmer I., O59778.
Caldwell, William B., 3d, O57280.
Call, Raymond L., O60618.
Callagy, Thomas A., O61093.
Callahan, Robert F., O58851.
Callahan, Vincent J., O60325.
Callanan, Edward F., O57215.
Callero, Milton F., O65064.
Campbell, Robert E., O69614.
Cancelliere, Francis P. 2d, O57287.
Candal, Miguel A., O61096.
Cannon, J. Parry, O58852.
Cantlebary, Leland R., O60350.
Cantor, David L., O60539.
Caponegro, Michael A., O60206.
Capps, Jack L., O57322.
Capuano, Joseph, O58853.
Caraccia, Marco J., O57694.
Carlson, Robert E., O57646.
Carney, Charles V., O60783.
Carpenter, Dalton O., Jr., O62188.
Carper, William C., 3d, O58854.
Carr, John E., 3d, O66141.
Carr, William D., O60420.
Carraway, William R., O59844.
Carrell, Robert F., O58855.
Carrigan, Kevin F., O62159.
Carrigo, Edward A., Jr., O58856.
Carroll, James H., Jr., O65000.
Carroll, Murray L., O57442.
Carroll, Robert M., O63355.
Carter, Cloud G., O58857.
Carter, Ircel L., O60836.
Carter, James T., O60358.
Carter, Leslie D., Jr., O57270.
Carter, Sherman F., O60550.
Cartwright, Roscoe C., O63039.
Casey, Herbert T., Jr., O59891.
Castellow, Eugene M., O58858.
Cathey, Eual A., O65137.
Catlin, Rupert W., O58859.
Catullo, Albert, O65144.
Caulder, LeRoy W., O65122.
Cerow, Donald A., O57315.
Cerrone, Michael, O62254.
Chandler, Norman P., O60817.
Chandler, William W., O57493.
Chapman, Lorin P., O58860.
Chase, Floyd A., Jr., O60360.
Chateau, Louis A., O60236.
Chesnut, James W., O65046.
Chester, Sigmund R., O58861.
Childress, Herbert J., Jr., O63301.
Chisholm, James H., O60343.
Chism, John W., O57676.
Chitty, John H., Jr., O57254.
Christ, Ernest W., O59936.
Christianson, George H., O60500.
Church, Edward H., O59940.
Churchill, Lake G., Jr., O57312.
Ciley, Colin D., Jr., O65484.
Clardy, Ray A., O65488.
Clark, Alphus R., O63059.
Clark, Chester M., 2d, O69620.
Clark, Egbert G., 3d, O62267.
Clark, Harlow G., Jr., O60339.
Clark, Harry E., O60357.
Clark, James L., O58743.
Clark, Julius E., Jr., O60841.
Clark, Richard W., O62242.
Clark, Thomas R., O57148.
Clark, William R., O60521.
Clarke, Carter W., Jr., O57314.
Clarkson, Richard L., O60792.
Clayton, Frank W., O60617.
Clement, Coleman C., Jr., O63111.
Clement, William J., Jr., O65039.
Clendenin, Thomas F., O60605.
Cleveland, John H., O59468.
Cloninger, Adrian S., O65726.
Clouser, Maurice L., O60232.
Coates, John M., O59814.
Cockerham, Sam G., O57340.
Cody, Henry L., O60443.
Coffey, Ray W., O57457.
Coffey, William D., Jr., O60341.
Cole, Earl F., O64999.
Cole, Jack H., O60456.
Cole, Richard A., O65080.
Cole, William M., O58148.
Coleman, Bruce S., O58862.
Coleman, James F., O58863.
Coleman, John D., Jr., O60785.
Coles, Clarence J., O60432.
Coller, Robert R., O28228.
Collier, William H., O58864.
Collins, John W., O63332.
Collins, Michael G., O65485.
Collins, Robert S., Jr., O63383.
Collins, Thomas H., O59895.
Compton, William I., O57447.
Condrill, Donald R., O63309.
Confer, Rodney R., O58865.
Conn, Archie E., Jr., O63307.
Connaway, Charles E., O65130.
Connelly, John R., O65135.
Conner, Donald A., O58866.
Conner, Ollie D., Jr., O65606.
Connolly, Richard J., O65139.
Connor, George C., O60557.
Conover, Roger F., O57105.
Conrad, Charles E., O58867.
Conrad, Clifton H., O63071.
Consolvo, John W., O60215.
Converse, Stanley P., O62262.
Cook, Carroll M., Jr., O60638.
Cook, Charles W., O65968.
Cook, DeWitt, O60510.
Cook, Robert J., O59922.
Cook, Sidney H., Jr., O58133.
Coon, John E., O59847.
Cooper, Paul A., O65133.
Cooper, Richmond J., O57155.
Cope, Edward H., O65037.
Cordero, Virgil N., Jr., O60181.
Corey, Jim, O57464.
Corkan, Lloyd A., Jr., O59811.
Cormack, Thomas B., O57125.
Cormier, Robert A., O65970.
Correll, David R., O60440.
Corrington, Roger A., O60621.
Cosby, Warren G., O65710.
Coughlin, John T., 2d, O58013.
Coveny, Robert F., O62167.
Cowan, Kenneth L., O60607.
Craft, Floyd G., O60627.
Craig, John S., O58868.
Cramer, Harry G., O28409.
Crandall, Walter M., Jr., O58869.
Crane, William H., O62222.
Crenshaw, Leon, O59457.
Cribb, William J., Jr., O60695.
Crockett, Creston W., O60462.
Crockett, John J., O59848.
Cronin, Morgan J., O58870.
Cronk, Robert A., O58871.
Crosby, Paul M., O60837.
Crouch, Charles L., O57269.
Crough, James A., O58872.
Crowder, Thomas H., Jr., O62178.
Crowell, Steven S., O65156.
Cruikshank, Ralph H., O60803.
Cubbison, Gordon R., O60234.
Culbertson, Paul V., O59849.
Cummings, Floyd M., O62835.
Cummings, Kenneth M., O60526.
Cummings, William J., O57807.
Cunningham, John D., O62223.
Cunningham, Robert F., O58873.
Curles, Cecil McK., O63298.
Currey, Wallace H., O62212.
Curry, Galen L., O61136.
Curtis, Walter R., O65005.
Cushing, Robert H., Jr., O57147.
Custis, Harry N., O65027.
Dahlquist, Frederick C., Jr., O60221.
Daily, William D., O59915.
Dale, Thomas W., O58874.
Dalton, David N., O63289.
Dalzell, Robert C., O60183.
Daniel, George McC., O60551.
Darby, Charles R., O58072.
Darden, Jack M., O60595.
Daum, William B., O58875.
Davidson, William C., O65125.
Davis, Charles E., O60726.
Davis, David L., O60365.
Davis, Glenn A., O63295.
Davis, Gordon R., Jr., O58876.
Davis, Ralph E., O59813.
Davis, Ralph J., O60619.
Dawson, Albert F., O59850.
Dawson, William J., Jr., O60801.
Day, Philip S., Jr., O57349.
DeBord, Norman D., O65720.
Decker, Charles de F., Jr., O58878.
Deehan, Donald E., O57181.
DeFranco, Theodore J., O60417.
deHaas, George D., O65978.
DeHaven, Oren E., O63382.
DeLaMare, Wendell F., O69628.
Dellinger, Lawrence M., O65011
De Marcus, John B., O59851.
deMarsche, Joseph M., O65723.
Demory, Richard S., O65079.
Dempsey, Albert P. Jr., O57443.
Dempsey, Frederick G., O63097.
Dempsey, James E., O63101.
Denison, Paul S., Jr., O58880.
Denney, Darel D., O60408.
Dennington, John F., O65083.
De Santis, Joseph A., O60362.
Devan, Vernon C., O62194.
Dibella, Alfred L., O59489.
Dickerson, Harvey G., Jr., O68094.
Dileanis, Leonard P., O60614.
Dill, Harold E., O65143.
Dillard, Oliver W., O60564.
Dillard, Robert J., O58881.
Dille, Richard T., O58882.
Dillion, William H., O58883.
Dingeman, James W., O57260.
Dixon, Albert V., O69630.
Dixon, Roland M., Jr., O65128.
Dobson, William C., Jr., O65982.
Doerflein, Donald P., O60547.
Dohleman, Kenneth E., O69632.
Dolan, Bernard J., Jr., O63321.
Domenech, John, O60487.
Donahue, Richard E., O60620.
Donnelly, James D., O60205.
Donnelly, Paul E., O59852.
Donoho, Louie W., O61135.
Donovan, Thomas W., O58884.
Doody, John J., O57360.
Dorsey, Clifford R., O69634.
Doty, Mercer McC., O57221.
Doty, Otis J., O62269.
Dougherty, Jack D., O65476.
Dougherty, John E., O60314.
Douglas, Leslie M., O58885.
Downes, Marlboro R., O59910.
Doyle, Lee T., O57115.
Dragotta, Harry A., O63336.
Drake, William T., O60429.
Drane, Elbert E., O60449.
Drury, Clinton A., Jr., O57517.
Ducote, Warren S., O60826.
Dufresne, George R., O62812.
Duggins, George J., O58886.
Duke, James O., O60502.
Dukes, Lonzie J., O58887.
Duncan, James R., O62221.
Duncan, Samuel K., O60393.
Dunhan, William H., 3d, O60419.
Dunn, Clyde, Jr., O60654.
Dunn, Wellington J., O63287.
Durham, Howard W., O59902.
Durr, Richard H., O58888.
Durst, Harold E., O66148.
Duruz, Paul B., O58889.
Dutchak, Eugene M., O57458.
Dyer, Joseph A., O60376.
Eagan, Warren C., O69638.
Earle, Frank H., O60831.
Earles, Carl T., O58890.
Early, Charles C., O65601.
Eaton, Richard J., O62227.
Ebbs, Joseph M., O68339.
Echols, James E., Jr., O63334.
Edmunds, Jimmie W., O65160.
Edmunds, Joseph A., O60390.
Edwards, Ralph, O62827.
Edwards, Robert B., O60562.
Egan, Frank J., O58891.
Egbert, John S., O57103.
Egg, Eugene C., O60609.
Eggers, George D., Jr., O60555.
Eickhoff, Albert P., O59853.
Elam, John K., Jr., O65986.
Ellard, Uell W., Jr., O58892.
Ellingsworth, James R., O63371.

Elliott, Harold N., O58138.
Ellis, August V., O58893.
Ellis, Ernest W., Jr., O65596.
Ellis, Thomas G., Jr., O65106.
Ellis, William R., O62814.
Elmer, Bryce L., O58894.
Ely, Robert L., Jr., O60211.
Embley, William H., O58895.
Emerson, Duane L., O57106.
Emerson, Earl E., Jr., O57642.
Emery, Jean R., O60544.
Emmons, Harris, O59854.
Enderle, Wallace O., O57196.
Endres, Edward P., O60571.
Engberg, Robert W., O65104.
Epps, Jones N., O60328.
Ertlschweiger, Herman, O58896.
Escola, Albert R., O60569.
Escue, Hodges S., O63375.
Estes, Clifford H., O65987.
Etchemendy, William W., O62152.
Etkin, Max, O60793.
Eubanks, Frank C., Jr., O62838.
Evans, Harry E., O62150.
Evans, Lloyd R., O59942.
Everett, George W., O60685.
Eyer, Arvine J., O62824.
Ezell, Bert P., O59818.
Fairfield, Ronald J., Jr., O62135.
Fairlamb, John C., O60681.
Falk, Byron A., Jr., O65171.
Fallon, Rudolph A., O62225.
Faris, Charles A., Jr., O69643.
Farmer, William K., O60486.
Farnum, Lawrence B., O61211.
Farrington, Thomas H., O60796.
Farwell, Faris T., O65063.
Fazakerley, Richard G., O58898.
Felix, Russell E., O60475.
Fenstemacher, Edgar R., O59780.
Ferrer, Ferdinand, O62831.
Fink, Donald P., O62236.
Finnegan, Robert R., O57329.
Fisher, Alex E., O65126.
Fisher, Bruce C., O60329.
Fisher, Charles H., O58142.
Fix, Joseph E., 3d, O60527.
Flaggert, James J., Jr., O63345.
Fleeson, George S., O59486.
Fleischman, Gordon K., O59477.
Fleming, Eugene C., Jr., O57372.
Fletcher, Paul M., O60189.
Fogel, William H., O58899.
Follett, Charles V., Jr., O62003.
Font, Joe A., O57454.
Fontana, Joseph A., O60439.
Foote, Ashby M., Jr., O57229.
Forbes, William A., O58900.
Ford, John O., O60891.
Foreman, William G., O63106.
Forrester, Eugene P., O57250.
Forsthoff, Charles W., O59485.
Fort, Alvin E., O62163.
Foshee, Jack N., O65602.
Foss, Romaine S., O59947.
Foster, James E., O58901.
Fox, Charles C., O65730.
Fox, Donald C., O65154.
Francis, Robert, O62122.
Frank, Alva B., O65991.
Franzen, Walter C., O63082.
Freed, Cleo S., O59463.
Freeland, Robert L., O65051.
Freeman, George L., O59781.
Freiman, William D., O65993.
French, Daniel L., O63850.
French, Seward F., Jr., O65994.
Freund, Benedict L., O60631.
Fry, Louis C., O65608.
Fulsang, Ejner, J., Jr., O60452.
Gabardy, Robert L., O58902.
Gaffke, Frank M., O65997.
Gaines, James S., O60655.
Galing, Bernard W., O60574.
Galloway, James V., O59782.
Galloway, Robert M., O62166.
Gambrell, John C., O58904.
Garcia, Orlando, O62138.
Gard, John D., O59820.
Garner, Hugh M., O60218.
Garrett, Edward J., O58905.
Garrett, Felix R., O60436.
Garrett, Franklin T., O59783.
Garrett, John K., O60684.
Garrett. Shirley D., O60687.
Garrison, David D., O57363.
Garvey, Daniel J., O58906.
Garwood, Charles E., O60552.
Gaver, Pierce H., Jr., O57202.
Gay, Joseph M., Jr., O62214.
Gaziano, Sam F., O59807.
Geiger, Robert A., O58907.
Gellnicht, Donald L., O58908.
Genebach, Lowell B., Jr., O57156.
Genero, Peter P., O63063.
George, Jack M., O69653.
Geraci, John P., O65127.
Gerardy, William L., O60667.
Gerecke, Henry H., O62160.
Gerlach, Shirl L., O63049.
Gerrity, John F., O58910.
Gershater, Ephraim M., O59959.
Gibbons, Benjamin F., Jr., O60816.
Giboney, Thomas B., Jr., O60708.
Gibson, Floyd S., O60844.
Giggey, Frederick W., O60532.
Gillis, John P., O60313.
Gillis, William D., O62833.
Gilman, John P., O57640.
Gilmore, Robert L., O67683.
Giuffrida, Louis O., O59903.
Glasser, Anthony P., O59810.
Glikes, Richard J., O60197.
Glinski, Douglass E., O65020.
Goad, Lewis H., O60450.
Goche, Leo N., O59937.
Godsey, Dale R., O63284.
Goldbranson, Carl E., O60451.
Golden, Alonzo J., O61210.
Goodell, Roscoe H., O60377.
Goodrich, John R., O65124.
Gordon, George W., O57643.
Gordon, James H., O60784.
Gore, William E., O58911.
Gorlinsky, Victor W., O65709.
Grabove, Maxwell, O59771.
Graeser, Herbert O., O62002.
Graf, Robert E., O57083.
Graham, Douglas M., O57510.
Gramling, Freddie W., O62115.
Grant, Robert T., Jr., O60346.
Graves, Harold K., O59855.
Graves, Robert P., O58912.
Gray, Columbus E., Jr., O59460.
Gray, Harvey W., Jr., O60582.
Green, Charles E., O58125.
Greene, Maurice C., O60435.
Greer, Edward, O57426.
Greetham, George A., O63342.
Gregory, Arthur P., O60788.
Gresham, William A., O59471.
Grezaffi, Joseph, O60613.
Griffin, Leonard F., O61092.
Griffin, Lorayne M., O63084.
Griffith, Girvan H., O60591.
Griffith, Stephen M., O57165.
Grigsby, Alfred J., Jr., O60727.
Grill, Henry S., O67686.
Grimsley, James A., Jr., O60632.
Grinnell, Douglas D., O62843.
Grogan, John F., O65040.
Grogan, Owen R., Jr., O63052.
Groseclose, Tom S., O63108.
Grout, Gilbert J., O65588.
Gunn, Raymond McC., O65118.
Gunsel, Robert C., O66157.
Gunter, Benjamin L., Jr., O62202.
Guthrie, Sidney C., O57451.
Gutting, Louis J., O62822.
Haberer, John B., O60194.
Hagman, Charles A., Jr., O63291.
Hahn, Eric L., O65075.
Haig, Ransom S., O65058.
Haines, Albert E., Jr., O65048.
Hale, John D., Jr., O60830.
Hale, Lindsey W., O65607.
Hale, William B., O59478.
Halgren, Spencer V., O57644.
Hall, Charles E., O60578.
Hall, Harry H., O58913.
Hall, Turner P., Jr., O60238.
Hallahan, Robert F., O57251.
Hamilton, John D., O57343.
Hamlet, James F., O60412.
Hammerquist, Robert E., O59969.
Hammond, John B., O65725.
Hamscher, George M., O62174.
Hanger, Albert H., O67692.
Hanks, William R., O58914.
Hanle, William O., O60348.
Hannon, Laurence K., O58915.
Hannum, Clifford P., O59965.
Hanrahan, William P., Jr., O67693.
Hansen, George K., O58916.
Hanson, James N., O65600.
Harbort, Walter J., O65478.
Harger, Clyde J., O66006.
Harlan, Lowell B., O69668.
Harouff, Donald L., O65165.
Harper, Adam W., O60399.
Harper, Douglas P., O58918.
Harper, James C., O63379.
Harper, Joseph W., Jr., O58919.
Harper, William H., O60670.
Harrelson, Joseph S., Jr., O62119.
Harrington, Richard H., O65038.
Harris, Carl W., O58920.
Harris, Harry B., O62165.
Harrison, Dennis J., O58921.
Harrison, Walter R., Jr., O57433.
Harsh, Richard S., O57303.
Harstad, LeRoy O., O60453.
Hart, Edsel F., O60186.
Hart, John L., O62261.
Hartman, Carl W., O62171.
Hartnell, George W., O57302.
Harwood, Richard, O65113.
Haskell, Louis W., Jr., O57283.
Hassell, John N., O63368.
Hassin, Donald J., O63361.
Haszard, Sidney S., O60457.
Hatch, Jay A., O57143.
Hathaway, Clyde T., O65599.
Hathaway, Leander R., Jr., O60645.
Hathaway, William S., O60588.
Hawkins, Strather W., O58157.
Hawkins, William S., O60808.
Hawthorne, Victor J., O69671.
Hayden, Oakes M., O60327.
Hayden, Ray R., O65131.
Hayes, Herbert W., Jr., O58922.
Hayler, Rodney G., Jr., O60528.
Haynes, Return C., O63102.
Hazard, Thomas W., Jr., O57319.
Heard, William C., O69672.
Hearin, Joseph N., Jr., O63848.
Heath, Ralph M., O66013.
Heckendorn, Robert J., O59945.
Heekin, David P., O60888.
Heidenreich, Ellsworth W., O60214.
Heilman, Daniel P., O60563.
Helmick, Glenn B., O59856.
Helms, John L., O60513.
Helton, Carl J., O65095.
Hemmings, Haven H., O65168.
Hempling, Leonard J., O59784.
Henderson, Joseph E., O69676.
Hendren, Allen T., O60406.
Hendricks, Jess B., Jr., O57168.
Hennes, Donald J., O63297.
Henry, Lee S., Jr., O63337.
Henry, William H., Jr., O63109.
Hensel, Raymond G., O66016.
Herbets, Joseph S., O57206.
Herrin, Herbert T., O62810.
Herron, Howard M., O59465.
Hess, Lewis, E., O59815.
Hettlinger, Walter, O59857.
Hibbard, Walter, Jr., O59858.
Hickerson, Elzie, O62141.
Hicks, Harold A., O65694.
Hicks, Joseph E., O65727.
Hiestand, Harry H., O65012.
Hill, Alfred G., O58924.
Hill, Glen A., O66018.
Hill, Herbert R., O65073.
Hill, Lucius G., Jr., O58925.
Hill, William B., O58167.
Hillman, Lawson R., O63344.
Hilmar, James E., O60651.
Hinges, Norman P., O60652.
Hinojosa, Ernest A., Jr., O57585.
Hitchcock, James M., O60198.
Hoddinott, George R., O59479.
Hodgdon, Raymond F., O60187.

Hodges, Genous S. Jr., O58926.
Hodson, Fremont B., Jr., O60543.
Hoff, Forest E., O63310.
Hoffman, Albert R., O63234.
Hoffman, Hugh F. T., Jr., O57259
Hoffman, John H., O62140.
Hoffman, John J., Jr., O62255.
Hogan, John D. A., Jr., O60720.
Holden, Needham C., Jr., O63105.
Holliday, Sam C., O57336.
Honour, Charles M., Jr., O65060.
Hooker, James F., Jr., O57138.
Horn, Charles S, O57205.
Horn, Maurice R., O59472.
Horne, Willard V., O60800.
Hotaling, Robert P., O62177.
Hougen, John H., O63107.
Houtz, James W., O62821.
Houtz, John W., O63326.
Howard, Charles W., O59785.
Howard, Harmon, O62180.
Hoyt, Lawrence V., O57218.
Hubbard, Wallace H., O57172.
Huck, Frederick R., O60421.
Huetter, John J., O63316.
Huff, Douglas A., O65062.
Huff, John S., O59859.
Huff, Richard A., O58928.
Huff, Tom, O58929.
Hughes, Irving C., O69690.
Hughes, John A., Jr. O61995.
Hughes, John B., Jr., O57160.
Hughes, John C, O58930.
Hughes, Walter P., Jr., O62816.
Huie, Douglas T., O57266.
Humberd, Quentin L., O59897.
Hume, Albert G., O58931.
Humphrey, William L., O59786.
Hundemer, James L., Jr., O58149.
Hunt, Alexander H., O66164.
Hunter, David H., O63335.
Huray, Frank T., O66025.
Hurd, George R., Jr., O60437.
Hurst, Cam J., Jr. O65491.
Hussey, Stanley J., O63323.
Hutcherson, Harold, O57516.
Hutchison, James H., O60282.
Hutson, Albert L., Jr., O58932.
Hutton, Robert B., O58933.
Iaderosa, Alfonso J., O60635.
Insani, John L., O69693.
Irby, Chester P., Jr., O60366.
Irick, Edward F., Jr. O60791.
Irvin, I. J., Jr., O62131.
Isaacs, Thomas R, O58934.
Ivie, Carl W., Jr., O59787.
Jackson, Kenneth F., O58159.
Jacobellis. Benedict R., O57228.
Jamison, Robert W., O60355.
Japinga, Robert M., O65142.
Jarrett, John A., O65016.
Jaugstetter, Joseph P., O65487.
Jeffers, Henry A., Jr., O60795.
Jenkins, Donald L., O69698.
Jenkins, John M., O58139.
Jenkins, Thomas F., O65085.
Jenkins, Wilbur G., Jr., O65099.
Jennings, John M., O60587.
Jennings, Richard M., O58935.
Jenson, Lloyd K., O59788.
Jersey, Donald H., O65699.
Jessup, John E., Jr., O62219.
Jessup, Maurice E., O59821.
Johns, Carol N, O63061.
Johnson, Albert C., O66028.
Johnson, Carl A., O58936.
Johnson, Carlton S., O63121.
Johnson, Charles McC., O57650.
Johnson, Clayton E., O62244.
Johnson, Jasper R., O62170.
Johnson, Marshall D., O58937.
Johnson, Raymond E., O63281.
Johnston, Walter F., O63302.
Johnstonbaugh, Merle A., O60590.
Johnstone, James D., 3d, O58938.
Jones, Gilbert C., O64998.
Jones, Harry T., O65119.
Jones, Hugh H., Jr., O65163.
Jones, J. Wesley, Jr., O57307.
Jones, James L., O57150.
Jones, Louis R., O57214.
Jones, Paul E., O62234.
Jones, Rees, O57235.
Jones, Roy M., O65115.
Jones, Russell B., Jr., O59860.
Jones, Thomas H., O65059.
Jones, Thomas T., O57113.
Jones, Walter F., O60208.
Joost, Horst K., O60353.
Joosten, William J., O61206.
Jordan, Jesse L., Jr., O63362.
Jordan, William F., O60704.
Jorgensen, Julius J., Jr., O65112.
Junge, Edwin B., O59964.
Junk, William P., Jr., O63358.
Jurden, Delbert A., O62241.
Kachavos, Charles J., O59491.
Kaczmarowski, Jerome H., O60454.
Kalgren, Raymond, O60338.
Kampe, Raymond L., O60430.
Kanelis, Tom, O58940.
Kaplan, Edward N., O60180.
Karl, Philip E., Jr., O60629.
Kast, Kenneth F., Jr., O62239.
Kaster, Paul R., Jr., O59483.
Katz, Phillip P., O59957.
Kaufman, Phillip, O63092.
Kaula, William M., O57089.
Kay, Paul J., O60126.
Kayner, Howard W., O67704.
Kean, John P., O57345.
Kean, Stephen T., O65001.
Keator, Hervey E., O58941.
Keebaugh, Harold G., O69705.
Keegan, Thomas F., Jr., O60676.
Keeling, William O., Jr., O58150.
Kellam, Lawrence M., O61099.
Kelley, Eugene, Jr., O63320.
Kelley, Jack E., O60711.
Kelley, Thomas W., O61240.
Kelsey, Jesse T., O57274.
Kendrick, Robert C., O68021.
Kern, Bernard S., O62201.
Kerr, Richard LaR., O59458.
Kershaw, Charles G., 2d, O58942.
Kerwin, Edward F., O58943.
Kiefe, Joseph C., Jr., O60850.
Kiernan, Joseph M., Jr., O57075.
Killiam, Howard W., O62268.
Killpack, Paul E., O58944.
Kimmick, Leonard, Jr., O60558.
King, Edward L., O65175.
King, Monroe D., O60322.
King, William P., O58945.
Kinley, Gordon L., O65693.
Kirby, Pierre P., O60624.
Kirchenstein, John J., O68123.
Kirchman, William W., O62185.
Kirk, Henry C., O60422.
Kirkpatrick, Monroe, O59926.
Kirkpatrick, Travis M., Jr., O59924.
Kirwan, Robert L., O57252.
Kiser, John F., O58946.
Klein, John H., Jr., O58176.
Knapp, Albert C., O59920.
Kneisl, Jerry A., O60499.
Knowlton, Bruce R., Jr., O59861.
Kobbe, Eric, O62175.
Koch, Kenneth W., O62190.
Koenig, James R., O59475.
Kogan, Rudolph W., O65098.
Komp, John S., O58947.
Kone, Kenneth M., O63330.
Konopnicki, Emil L., O67711.
Korems, Kendall W., O62246.
Kortum, Zane V., O69717.
Koseki, Reginald W., O65094.
Kranyak, Louis W., O63296.
Krause, Frederick C., O60702.
Kravitz, Seymour, O59492.
Kriwanek, Robert J., O60648.
Kryzanowsky, Constantine D., O62162.
Kuhlman, Arthur H., Jr., O59963.
Kunkel, Charles E., O58949.
Labadie, George V., Jr., O62118.
La Bounta, Gerald C., Jr., O66033.
Laird, Wheeler E., O58153.
La Londe, Wilfred G., O62195.
Lamar, Henry C., Jr., O58950.
Lamar, Howard H., Jr., O59504.
Lamb, Joe B., O62266.
Lambert, John E., O57450.
Lambourne, Robert D., O57851.
Lamison, Kenneth R., O58951.
Lamothe, Frank E., Jr., O65711.
Landau, Calvin J., O66034.
Landers, Joseph F., O65023.
Landry, Edward L., O69719.
Landry, Wilson A., Jr., O63378.
Lane, Albert G., O65003.
Lang, Jack B., O63381.
Lang, Vincent W., O62841.
Lanier, Donald H., O60559.
Latham, Willard, O65141.
Lawler, Thomas M., Jr., O65136.
Lawlor, Thomas A., O69723.
Lawrence, James R., O58952.
Lawrence, Renn M., O57696.
Lawson, James E., O62260.
Lawson, William F., Jr., O62176.
Lawton, William S., Jr., O60505.
Lay, James R., O63110.
Layton, Victor J., O59862.
Leahey, William E., O58953.
Lechner, Roy J., O60503.
Le Clair, John H., O58954.
Ledford, Gerald E., O60219.
Lee, Harold H., O63324.
Lee, Myron E., Jr., O65712.
Lee, Stanton K., O65719.
Leer, James M., Jr., O61204.
Lehman, Robert H., O62168.
Leist, William C., O60220.
LePage, Julien H., O59476.
Leu, Bernard J., Jr., O62205.
Le Vier, Earl R., O59925.
Levingston, Albert R., O60707.
Lewis, John D., O60682.
Lewis, John L., O69726.
Lewis, Marion A., Jr., O69727.
Lewis, Mose E., 3d, O59904.
Liddle, John W., O62233.
Liles, Roy L., O58955.
Lindholm, James R., O69728.
Lindsay, William B., O61203.
Lineker, George B., O66038.
Lippman, Gordon J., O60536.
Lipsey, William M., O60840.
Litle, Robert F., Jr., O66039.
Litschgi, Albert W., 3d, O59863.
Littlejohn, John C., O57886.
Livesay, Harvey R., Jr., O57114.
Livingston, Hoyt R., O60228.
Llana, Theodore, Jr., O59864.
Lober, William J., Jr., O69729.
Locke, Theodore F., Jr., O59951.
Lockhart, Leon H., O62117.
Lodle, Elwood G., O59958.
Loe, Robert J., O59960.
Loftin, Joseph R., O60312.
Lomax, Arthur E., O60488.
Long, George S., O65082.
Long, Herlihy T., O60715.
Long, Wesley T., O59887.
Longbottom, John H., O59916.
Longstroth, Alma G., O60666.
Lopez, Henry F., O62840.
Lorch, Robert C., O58957.
Lorentzen, Lloyd E., O59487.
Lorenz, Robert M., O63036.
Lovejoy, Norman B., O57118.
Lovett, Frank P., Jr., O60825.
Lowden, Charles B., O60642.
Lowman, Harry F., Jr., O59459.
Lowman, Theodore R., O58958.
Lowry, José H., O57495.
Lowry, Phillip E., O60721.
Luce, Edward G., O60356.
Luckie, Lorenzo F., Jr., O58959.
Ludy, Garland A., O65049.
Lukens, James R., O63331.
Lumpkin, Benjamin E., Jr., O57425.
Lundquist, Roy W. C., O63042.
Lutz, Roman J., O58961.
Lycas, John, O62137.
Lynch, William D., O65081.
Lynes, Donald LeC., O63080.
Lynn, Otis C., O65066.
Lyons, Joseph W., O59466.
Mace. John S., O59789.
MacGarvey, Paul D., O62132.
Macklin, James E., Jr., O57225.
MacLane, Robert C., O59865.
MacLean, Angus B., O60530.

MacLeod, William A., O60397.
Madden, Everett I., O65070.
Maddox, John H., O59912.
Madigan, William P., O66044.
Mahone, Worthington M., O65282.
Mahoney, Arthur E., O60523.
Maier, John E., O63058.
Maier, Robert J., Jr., O63075.
Mailheau, Robert T., O62172.
Mainer, George W., O60811.
Makarounis, Alexander G., O58962.
Mallett, David S., O57257.
Malmberg, Donald B., O59955.
Malone, Michael J., O58963.
Maloney, William L., Jr., O60600.
Maness, Harold M., O63339.
Manifold, Max D., O60345.
Manly, Clarence H., Jr., O59941.
Mann, James W., O57497.
Manning, James A., O64996.
Manning, John R., Jr., O57463.
Manning, Kenneth T., O60320.
Manning, William E., O60466.
Mantalas, John G., O63064.
Maple, John C., O57346.
Maranger, George J., O69525.
Marciniec, Walter F., O57133.
Maricle, Louis J., O65055.
Marlatt, Herbert E., O58964.
Marsh, Robert D., O60387.
Marshall, David S., O63288.
Marshall, James E., Jr., O60794.
Marshall, Robert W., O57284.
Marshall, Tandy G., O66046.
Martin, James C., O58965.
Martin, James S., O57660.
Martin, Jason H., O58966.
Martin, Merritt P., O62215.
Martin, Norman L., O63370.
Martin, Robert J., O62253.
Marvin, Wilmer C., O57641.
Marx, George H., O58967.
Mason, Phillip L., O60728.
Masters, John J., O60697.
Mathern, Louis G., Jr., O63349.
Mathews, Harry T., O60428.
Matthews, Stanley L., O60315.
Mattingly, Leroy B., O58968.
Mauderly, Allen J., O63369.
Maughn, William, Jr., O63085.
Maul, David D., O65169.
Maxwell, LaVern W., O59484.
May, Charles R., O60448.
May, Roy R., Jr., O59809.
Mayne, Robert K., O67721.
McAllister, Henry J., O60332.
McAlpin, Harvey O., O60581.
McAmis, James C., Jr., O60372.
M'Carver, Billy M., O62228.
McAuliffe, John F., O60354.
McBride, Richard M., O58071.
McCaig, Milton E., O62240.
McCann, Samuel E., O61200.
McCarthy, Leo C., O62123.
McCartney, Nevin L., O60508.
McCaslin, James K., O65031.
McClaflin, Frank L., O57369.
McClellan, Stan L., O58969.
McClelland, Don S., O57247.
McConkey, Kernon M., O63384.
McCormick, William F., Jr., O63076.
McCowen, George A., O65480.
McCoy, Eugene B., O63089.
McCoy, Paul G., O59501.
McCracken, Walter S., O58970.
McCravey, James L., O60649.
McCray, James G., O57277.
McCreary, John McC., O66180.
McCuen, John J., O57185.
McCullar, Francis M., O60174.
McCurley, Henry H., O60802.
McDonnell, Patrick J., O63849.
McEnery, John W., O57184.
McEntee, Francis A., O69737.
McFadden, Charles A., O60175.
McFadden, George L., Jr., O60722.
McFall, Kenneth T., O60586.
McFarland, Richard DeL., O58971.
McFarland, Robert R., O60479.
McGahee, Horace S., O60690.
McGiffert, John R., 2d, O58972.
McGough, Gordon H., O65041.
McGraw, Donald C., O57207.
McGuire, Robert D., O69740.
McKee, Charles F., O66050.
McKee, James, O60427.
McKeever, Joseph V., O58974.
McKelvey, Vincent T., O66181.
McKenna, Edward C., O66051.
McKenty, Samuel H., Jr., O63328.
McKinsey, Ray A., O60797.
McLendon, Eric L., O63340.
McMath, Robert P., O60603.
McMillan, Jenis C., O65036.
McMurray, Houston M., O57371.
McNamara, Homer C., Jr., O57432.
McNeal, John L., O65174.
McNeely, David W., O57364.
McNeese, Frank J., O60577.
McNeil, William R., O59931.
McNicol, Wallace N., O60820.
McNitt, Robert N., O65068.
McPherson, Robert B., O65013.
McSpadden, Garland R., O57139.
McSwain, Richard G., O63098.
Meadow, Sam, O62142.
Meakin, John L., O59907.
Medding, Walter S., O58975.
Meek, John W., Jr., O63095.
Mehosky, Edward C., O60688.
Meinzen, Walter E., O57242.
Meiss, Jack M., O62146.
Mello, Ralph T., O58976.
Merck, Carl J., O57801.
Meredith, Francis, Jr., O57498.
Merigold, Frank A., O63050.
Meritt, John F., O69743.
Merrell, George D., Jr., O60812.
Merrill, Samuel J., O65145.
Messer, Elmer J., O58977.
Metcalf, Donald J., O60712.
Metzdorf, Jack R., O62139.
Metzner, Warren H., O62191.
Meyer, David W., O59867.
Meyer, Harold J., O65097.
Meyer, Joseph H., O57153.
Meyer, Robert J., O69746.
Meyer, Walter P., O63314.
Middleton, Sanders D., Jr., O60203.
Miescher, Walter H., Jr., O65017.
Mihoch, John P., O69748.
Millard, Alfred J., O60489.
Millard, Richard C., O63356.
Miller, Darwin C., O60538.
Miller, Jack R., O57296.
Miller, Kurtz J., O65024.
Miller, Paul H., O63325.
Miller, Russell J., O63388.
Milton, John McK., O57341.
Milton, Wilburn E., O59943.
Mitchell, Richard F., O63338.
Mitchell, Terry C., O66056.
Mitchem, Winfred E., O60596.
Mitman, Henry D., O59911.
Mize, Clifford E., O60838.
Moffet, Charles W., Jr., O60807.
Moffitt, John P., O58979.
Mollison, Douglas A., O62213.
Monk, Eugene E., O59467.
Monroe, Keith La V., O62182.
Montgomery, George M., O66057.
Montgomery, Hunter M., O59495.
Montgomery, John J., O59868.
Montgomery, Raymond J., O60391.
Moore, Albert E., O63364.
Moore, Donald G., O60832.
Moore, Euless B., Jr., O63300.
Moore, Fred S., O62257.
Moore, Gene D., O63280.
Moore, Herbert S., Jr., O60677.
Moore, Howard McK., O63387.
Moore, John H., O65093.
Moore, Robert H., O65147.
Moore, Russell E., O60615.
Morath, Eugene E., Jr., O58980.
More, Berkeley D., O58981.
Morehead, Thomas G., O59869.
Morgan, John T., Jr., O60814.
Morrison, John H., Jr., O65121.
Morrisroe, William J., O62186.
Morrow, Charles, Jr., O58983.
Morrow, Jack G., O67730.
Morse, Harry W., O63294.
Morse, Herbert E., O60498.
Morton, Langdon L., Jr., O65603.
Morton, Paul A., O62127.
Morton, Robert E., O60483.
Moses, Albert R., O62235.
Mulligan, James R., O60191.
Mulvany, Floyd R., O60459.
Mumma, Harry F., O57456.
Mundie, William L., O58984.
Munford, Robert A., O57448.
Murnane, James J., O62144.
Murphey, James A., Jr., O60501.
Murphy, Eugene C., O66059.
Murphy, Francis J., O62156.
Murphy, James E., O66185.
Murphy, Meredith E., O65176.
Murphy, Powell D., O62842.
Murray, Charles M., O60630.
Myers, Allen L., Jr., O59968.
Nagata, George M., O60799.
Nance, Marvin L., O62161.
Nash, Vernon L., Jr. O59921.
Neff, Orrin D., O62189.
Nelson, Edwin B., O57167.
Nelson, Loyal E., O65714
Nelson, Raymond N., Jr., O59802.
Nemeth, Stephen A., O59870.
Netherton, Thomas H., O65552.
New, William R., O59961.
Newell, Roscius C., O58985.
Newman, Gilbert H., O59790.
Nicholas, Billy B., O65116.
Nichols, Glen L., O58986.
Nichols, William L., O58987.
Nicholson, Hubert M., Jr., O58241.
Nickel, William F., O63293.
Nisbet, Andrew, Jr., O58988.
Noble, Thomas P., O60334.
Noble, William E., O63363.
Nocita, John W., O65045.
Noice, Charles G., Jr., O63303.
Nolan, John M., O57452.
Nolde, Hubert E., O60542.
Noll, Robert J., O58989.
Norby, Allen R., O65696.
Noreen, Albert T., Jr., O60438.
Norrie, George, Jr., O65025.
North Louis J., O62199.
Norton, Doyt P., O65149.
Norwood, Leonard L., Jr., O58990.
Norwood, Wayne D., O60693.
Notbohm, William R., O60643.
Novick, Jehiel, O61993.
Nunn, Clifford C., Jr., O60465.
Oba, Juneus T., O66187.
Oberley, Thomas E., O58161.
Obradovich, Francis S., Jr., O63055.
O'Connor, Richard C., O62187.
O'Donnell, Edward H., O57683.
Ogden, Dorward W., Jr., O58991.
Ogilvy, Hubert W., O65134.
O'Kelley, William C., O59871.
Oliver, Kenneth M., Jr., O65054.
Oliver, Tillman C., O63299.
Olow, John L., 3d, O65067.
Olsen, Harold H., Jr., O63351.
Olson, James C., O60207.
Olson, Kenneth W., O57146.
Ondishko, Joseph J., Jr., O60576.
O'Neill, Brian B., O59896.
Orfalea, George A., O60455.
Ortega, George A., O66062.
Osborne, John R., O60537.
O'Shaughnessy, John P., Jr., O63317.
Osiecki, Frank S., O60425.
Osteen, John L., Jr., O57285.
Osterhout, Fred A., Jr., O66189.
Oswald, Donald C., O69762.
Overstreet, Gerald L., O65050.
Oxford, William B., O65065.
Pabst, Alfred A., O57169.
Packard, Donald F., O57162.
Packett, Wilbern L., O65004.
Padgett, Wade H., Jr., O62145.
Page, Alexander C., O60556.
Paradis, Joseph F., O63305.
Parker, John F., O65015.
Parker, John M., O58992.
Parker, Joseph L., O65172.
Parker, Orville Lee R., O66065.
Parker, Robert L., O58993.
Parks, Robert H., O59872.
Passell, David W., O62211.

Patch, William A., O57281.
Patrick, Wayne A., O66067.
Patterson, Clyde H., Jr., O58173.
Patterson, Edwin D., O57110.
Patterson, Robert W., O58994.
Patterson, William H., Jr., O58995.
Patton, Thomas J., O65155.
Paulmann, Edwin, O65010.
Payne, Charles G., Jr., O60637.
Payne, Robert B., O58996.
Peabody, Richard R., O63354.
Peale, Eugene L., O60520.
Pease, Quentin, O59934.
Peck, George E., O58126.
Pecoraro, Anthony, O59873.
Pendergrass, Alva W., Jr., O58169.
Penfield, Walter A., O65707.
Penick, Jack G., O62218.
Penny, Robert G., O59946.
Penrod, William G., O60441.
Perkins, Richard A., Jr., O59890.
Perry, Gerald L., Jr., O60184.
Perry, Harrison, O57096.
Perry, Hugh W., O57288.
Petersen, Robert J., O57334.
Peterson, Hartwin R., O60713.
Petrelli, John, O60413.
Petruzzi, Anthony B., O65105.
Petty, Edgar L., Jr., O62249.
Phillips, Charles L., O66191.
Phillips, Milton B., O62210.
Phillips, Robert L., Jr., O58997.
Phillips, William G., O69770.
Phillips, William R., Jr., O63304.
Piburn, Edwin W., Jr., O60380.
Piccirilli, Albert A., O60342.
Picou, Lloyd J., O58998.
Pierce, John W., O59874.
Pierce, Leon A., O58999.
Piercy, James E., O59000.
Pierson, Howard W., O60494.
Pike, Galen W., O57444.
Piper, Harvey D., O57449.
Piserchia, Joseph, O60656.
Pitchford, Harold I., Jr., O67738.
Pitts, Martin L., Jr., O57920.
Pizzi, Joseph E., O60216.
Plowman, Harry B., O60324.
Plumb, John F., O59001.
Plummer, Frank S., Jr., O63093.
Plummer, Walter W., Jr., O57182.
Poe, James E., O60700.
Policastro, John J., O62226.
Polichnowski, Henry J., O67741.
Polifka, Donald K., O60522.
Ponder, Lewington S., O59823.
Ponder, William A., O60589.
Porta, James R., O60431.
Porter, Hobert H., O63311.
Post, Alton G., O60317.
Post, Charles M., O59002.
Powell, David D., O57662.
Powell, George B., O65043.
Power, Joseph L., O62818.
Powers, George McL., O59003.
Presson, David R., O60195.
Preston, Leonard L., O57430.
Preuit, James V., O63360.
Pritchard, Charles E., O63041.
Procter, Gilbert, Jr., O62155.
Proctor, Frank D., O61097.
Psaki, Nicholas G., Jr., O62121.
Pulliam, George W., Jr., O62208.
Pumphrey, Richard T., O60703.
Putnam, William T., O59004.
Quackenbush, Harold G., O65110.
Quinnelly, James L., O60177.
Radcliff, Edward C., O60533.
Rafferty, John H., Jr., O60804.
Rahmann, John C., O66078.
Ramos, Rene, O59005.
Randolph, Jacob A., Jr., O63081.
Raney, Thompson L., O63054.
Ransier, John G., O63376.
Rasmusson, Harlan A., O65492.
Rathlev, Arnold, O59944.
Raum, Mark, O59006.
Rawlins, Claude H., O60594.
Rawls, Lucian R., Jr., O65713.
Rawn, William A., O60461.
Ray, William B., O60568.
Reade, Robert A., O60514.
Reagan, Paul F., O59008.
Reaugh, Vern W., O65029.
Redd, Walter W., O57441.
Redman, Albert, Jr., O62157.
Reed, Clyde E., Jr., O59927.
Reed, George M., O69774.
Reed, James B., O57921.
Reed, John E., O57809.
Rees, Kenneth R., O59875.
Reese, Neil, O65101.
Reid, Robert A., O65718.
Reid, Tom, O63040.
Reid, Wallace G., O60361.
Reidy, James F., O60636.
Reilly, Francis W., O59009.
Renneisen, Daniel J., O62133.
Resnick, Saul M., O57190.
Reynolds, Clifford C., Jr., O63279.
Reynolds, Donald H., O63035.
Reynolds, John W., O60829.
Rhine, Malcolm K., O63306.
Rhoads, Homer E., O59010.
Rhodes, Richard G., O59876.
Rhodes, Samuel T., Jr., O56992.
Rhodes, William H., O58154.
Rice, Foy, O65088.
Rice, Marvin E., O59011.
Richards, Barton F., O60471.
Richardson, George M., Jr., O60843.
Richardson, Walton K., Jr., O59013.
Richey, Thomas B., O59938.
Richmond, Melvin E., O60388.
Richters, Robert L., O65109.
Riddlemoser, Francis M., Jr., O59014.
Ride, Walter T., Jr., O63290.
Rider, Vance D., O60518.
Rider, Vernon R., O59488.
Ridlehoover, Edward M., O60222.
Riggs, Noble L., O59791.
Riggs, William G., O69777.
Riley, Evan F., O60370.
Rinaldi, Eugene, O59015.
Ring, Alfred C., O65153.
Ring, Kenneth G., O59016.
Ringel, Eugene J., O59017.
Ringenbach, Frank P., Jr., O60706.
Riordan, John B., O67745.
Rios, Edwin T., O63038.
Roach, Andrew J., O56994.
Roach, Neal H., O60689.
Roark, Carl F., O61996.
Robbins, Oliver LeR., O62153.
Robbins, Robert S., O62192.
Roberts, Harold B., O65008.
Roberts, John F., O59914.
Roberts, William G., O59018.
Robertson, Claron A., Jr., O57107.
Robertson, Jack L., O60716.
Robinson, Howard F., O63077.
Robinson, Neil, O59019.
Robinson, Norman L., Jr., O57210.
Robinson, Robert H., O69779.
Robinson, William B., O62813.
Roby, Houston S., Jr., O62834.
Rodenbeck, Eric O., O60375.
Rodgers, Elton C., O65100.
Rogan, John F., O62203.
Rogers, Benton M., O59020.
Rogers, Ernest R., Jr., O60374.
Rogers, Fred T., O59021.
Root, Charles W., O59950.
Roper, George M., Jr., O60359.
Rose, Charles W., O60400.
Rosengren, Warren J., O62158.
Rosner, Albert A., O65077.
Ross, Charles G., O60623.
Ross, John P., O60404.
Rosser, Francis C., O61130.
Rossman, Warren W., O63235.
Rosson, David R., O58174.
Rountree, Wadie J., O60606.
Rousseau, William J., Jr., O59022.
Row, Henry C., Jr., O60433.
Royce, Newton C., O60415.
Rudd, Edwin A., O57211.
Ruddy, Kenneth E., O57239.
Rumore, Sam, O69783.
Runft, Harold W., O63046.
Runkle, Robert L., O65724.
Ruppert, John P., O62273.
Rusanowsky, Alexander P., O62823.
Rusche, Ralph R., O59970.
Ruschmeyer, Gerald F., O62229.
Rush, Donald P., O62232.
Russell, Donald K., O62817.
Russell, George C., Jr., O59877.
Russell, George H., O59499.
Russell, James W., O60424.
Russell, Jay V., O60634.
Russell, Robert C., O62125.
Ruthe, Hans G., O62164.
Ryan, James W., O63070.
Ryan, Wendell J., O66088.
Sabota, Eugene G., O63066.
Sachs, William H., O60464.
Safar, Benjamin B., O60331.
Sampson, Samuel F., O59023.
Sanders, James H., O59908.
Sanders, Paul, O59953.
Sandkaut, Louis G., O57922.
Sando, Raymond W., O66090.
Sandrock, George W., O59905.
Sanelli, Alfred A., O60212.
Sapp, Bernard B., O62143.
Sarazen, John J., Jr., O57582.
Sargeant, Arnold M., Jr., O57313.
Sargeant, Edward W., O62250.
Satterfield, Robert A., O60482.
Sauermann, Herbert L., O65493.
Saum, James B., O59878.
Schabacker, William, O59792.
Schach, Raphael J., O65056.
Schaner, Louis T., O62200.
Schappaugh, George H., O66092.
Schiller, Melvin D., O60668.
Schindling, Robert C., O57645.
Schleh, Wittmer I., O62271.
Schless, William F., O57278.
Schlotterback, Walter B., O57195.
Schreiber, Thomas S., O57918.
Schuler, Carl T., Jr., O59024.
Schuster, John P., O69666.
Schwartz, Ferdinand L., O59793.
Schilley, James P., Jr., O65161.
Scott, Adrian, O60786.
Scott, Beverly S., O60580.
Scott, Craig C., O63079.
Scott, Dwain L., O63078.
Scott, Ebbin P., Jr., O60467.
Scott, James I., O63319.
Scott, Willard W., Jr., O57098.
Sears, Robert E., O60311.
Sears, Wallace R., O60447.
Secan, Frank D., O60201.
Seddon, John A., O63057.
Seely, Chesley K., O59025.
Seibert, August G., O59026.
Seibert, Donald A., O60224.
Sellers, Homer L., Jr., O65084.
Sellers, James H., O60834.
Semple, Charles C., O59929.
Severson, Orville D., O63090.
Seymour, Paul A., Jr., O60664.
Shaffer, Jarvis K., O59888.
Shapira, Norman I., O60239.
Sharpe, Edgar B., O62263.
Shearer, Francis J., Jr., O60227.
Sheffield, Merle G., O57173.
Shell, Claude O., Jr., O60798.
Sheppard, Jerome, O60468.
Sheppard, Robert D., Jr., O57800.
Sheppe, Frank W., O59803.
Shidler, Robert W., O63329.
Shields, Buren R., Jr., O60230.
Shields, Selvin E., O60382.
Shiely, Thomas P., O57437.
Shilling, Harold E., O60473.
Shipman, Kenneth, O60411.
Shirley, Courtney R., O59027.
Shockley, James W., O59028.
Shoemaker, Charles J., Jr., O62274.
Shoemaker, Leo W., O65028.
Shriver, Rowland B., Jr., O60495.
Shuffer, George M., Jr., O59029.
Shuster, William A., 2d, O57179.
Siegrist, Raymond E., O65120.
Sikes, Arthur E., O60531.
Simmons, Don F., O69793.
Simpson, Arthur R., O59030.
Simpson, Paul W., O65706.
Sinclair, Edgar M., O59031.
Sittner, Homer H., O60492.
Sitton, Victor L., O60394.
Skogsberg, Paul L., O62134.

Sleeper, Earl S., O63045.
Sliger, Ira T., Jr., O59032.
Slominski, Martin J., O59892.
Smith, Bartholomew P., O60790.
Smith, Charles A., O60566.
Smith, Charles D., Jr., O60827.
Smith, Dale M., O69795.
Smith, Donald E., O62001.
Smith, Eb W., Jr., O64994.
Smith, Harold T., O59795.
Smith, Harry E., O60233.
Smith, Harwell F., Jr., O57130.
Smith, Homer D., Jr., O59805.
Smith, Jack E., O60347.
Smith, Joseph H. S., O59033.
Smith, Kingsley J., O59034.
Smith, Lowell H., O60705.
Smith, Martin R., Jr., O59035.
Smith, Paul T., O69798.
Smith, Richard C., O60477.
Smith, Richard D., O65158.
Smith, Robert L., O65129.
Smith, Samuel C., O59036.
Smith, Samuel L., O59917.
Smith, Vance O., O63346.
Smith, Wilfrid K. G., O60548.
Smith, William A., Jr., O60546.
Smithey, Paul C., O59817.
Smithson, Robert W., O63086.
Smolenski, Felix S., O63037.
Smyth, Carl B., O65173.
Snell, Dillon, O62230.
Sneller, William A., Jr., O65728.
Snow, Frank G., O59879.
Snow, James A., O60385.
Snow, Marvin H., O63043.
Sollitto, Basil J., O59796.
Solt, Lowell K., O60200.
Southerland, John T., O60659.
Spahr, Delbert D., O60789.
Spector, Sam, O59037.
Spettel, Frank J., Jr., O59038.
Spigarelli, Americo W., O60822.
Spinelli, Joseph D., O63488.
Spitzmiller, Bob F., O60188.
Spruill, Victor F., O69799.
Stacy, James E., O63285.
Staigers, James MacC., O69800.
Staley, J. Wayne, Jr., O60842.
Stamey, Roderick A., Jr., O59804.
Staples, James T., O60444.
Starkey, Posie L., Jr., O63373.
Starr, Comfort K., O63292.
Starr, Robert N., O60351.
Starry, Donn A., O57249.
Stedham, Dan D., O66204.
Steele, Warren B., O63377.
Stein, Harold, O60540.
Steinke, John E., O57885.
Stelman, Chester R., O63352.
Stendeback, William, Jr., O63327.
Sternburg, Harry J., O57209.
Stevens, Carlton E., Jr., O65033.
Stevens, Richard R., O59039.
Stevenson, Charles B., O60639.
Steward, Cleveland R., Jr., O59040.
Stewart, Donald E., O69803.
Stewart, Loren F., O59462.
Stickney, Louis S., Jr., O69804.
Stigall, Arthur D., O69805.
Stinson, Gerald C., O61997.
Stivers, Fred, Jr., O65089.
Stoltenberg, Jack G., O65123.
Stone, Frank J., Jr., O60442.
Stone, James L., O65096.
Stone, Joel E., O58165.
Stone, Virgil M., O59923.
Stone, William M., Jr., O60485.
Story, Robert P., O57654.
Strawn, Louis F., O59041.
Street, Robert W., O59042.
Stringer, James K., O62184.
Strohm, Robert H., O65152.
Stryker, Emil J., Jr., O59043.
Stump, Robert M., O58134.
Sudnick, Norman E., O57587.
Suglia, Anthony S., O65108.
Sullivan, James J., O59044.
Summers, Archie W., O60237.
Sunder, Charles H., O57337.
Sunski, Chester F., O65087.
Swafford, Fred G., Jr., O63087.
Swangren, Gordon L., O59045.
Swann, Ralph J., O59046.
Swanson, Paul A., O59047.
Swearengen, George A., O57321.
Sweeney, Harvey E., O59048.
Swinehart, Lewis S., Jr., O59880.
Swomley, Neely M., O59881.
Swope, Leslie J., O62216.
Sylvester, Loren H., O62243.
Tackaberry, Thomas H., Jr., O60504.
Taibbi, Raymond V., O63044.
Tate, John K., O60210.
Taylor, Charles E., O60231.
Taylor, Donald L., O69811.
Taylor, J. Robert, O57226.
Taylor, John F., O59049.
Taylor, Mack, Jr., O57427.
Taylor, Richard F., O69812.
Taylor, William E., O63308.
Taylor, William M., O57453.
Teagle, Charles R., O65053.
Teague, Phillip E., O70155.
Tedick, Eugene, O59481.
Teel, Joseph F., O65164.
Teese, James L., O63386.
Tevis, Jack M., O65717.
Thatcher, David C., O59051.
Thaxton, Halbert C., O59052.
Thayer, George E., Jr., O69813.
Thomas, Charles M., O63357.
Thomas, Lawrence M., O60318.
Thomas, Wesley E., O60368.
Thomas, William G., Jr., O57144.
Thomas, Wray R., O60535.
Thompson, John W., O59053.
Thompson, Lawrence D., O60644.
Thompson, Paul A., O65604.
Thornton, Aubrey O., O69816.
Thornton, Paul E., O62815.
Tibbetts, Frederick E., 3d, O57164.
Tieman, Wilbert A., O65078.
Tierney, William P., O69817.
Timberman, William H., O62811.
Tippins, BeDell A., Jr., O65479.
Todd, John A., O60511.
Topham, Everett G., O65091.
Tousley, Pershing, O60204.
Townes, James E., Jr., O59906.
Townsend, Harry W., O60481.
Tracy, Ollie L., O63722.
Trainer, Clark W., O65006.
Travers, Francis A., Jr., O60709.
Travis, William H., O57292.
Trigg, Harry E., O60470.
Troiano, Lawrence V., O59797.
Tuberty, James T., O66109.
Tucker, Douglas B., O62169.
Tucker, William H., Jr., O63322.
Tudder, Elwin B., O60541.
Tugman, Robert F., O66110.
Tumlinson, Jack M., O60572.
Tupper, Fred A., O65032.
Tussing, Austin F., O69820.
Tuthill, Jack K., O60833.
Tutwiler, Guy I., O60698.
Twitty, William M., O59808.
Tye, Hiram S., O60692.
Tyree, Thomas B., O57111.
Tyson, Charles M., O63047.
Uffmann, Milton F., O60383.
Ulatoski, Joseph R., O62224.
Urrutia-Colon, Carlos E., O66112.
Utley, Jack C., O57519.
Vail, William H., O59954.
VanBuskirk, William D., O62147.
Van Eaton, John H., O60497.
VanHorn, Robert O., O60173.
Van Laethem, Fernand R., O63350.
Vaughan, Miles C., Jr., O62259.
Vaughan, Robert D., O69822.
Vaught, James B., O60570.
Vessey, John W., Jr., O65047.
Vincent, Clifton F., O57440.
Vogelgesang, Ernest J., O60507.
Vogt, Brady L., Jr., O60647.
Vogt, Robert L., O60691.
Voseipka, John R., O63365.
Vranish, Robert L., O60386.
Waddell, Edward S., O63068.
Wadsworth, John B., Jr., O57297.
Waggener, John G., O57084.
Wagner, George I., O60185.
Wagoner, Fred E., Jr., O57253.
Wagonhurst, Arland H., O65715.
Walden, John E., 2d., O57684.
Waldrop, Andrew J., O57808.
Wales, Perry W., O60608.
Walk, James F., O57300.
Walker, Fred M., Jr., O63333.
Walker, Homer L., O62220.
Walker, William L., O65022.
Wallace, Jerry G., O59812.
Wallis, Vernon V., O63072.
Walsh, John J., Jr., O59055.
Walta, Herbert H., O63343.
Walter, Lyle E., O57178.
Walters, Allie L., O59056.
Walters, Vernon J., O63074.
Wampler, Norman H., O60398.
Ward, David E., O60403.
Ward, Richard H., O62130.
Ward, Robert M., O57158.
Ware, Thomas A., Jr., O57219.
Ware, William B., O62114.
Warren, Hancel L. E., O65722.
Waters, Ace L., Jr., O65019.
Watson, Billy H., O59932.
Walson, Edwin A., O59469.
Watson, William R., Jr., O66118.
Wayman, Duane LeR., O60472.
Wayne, Norbert J., O65090.
Weaver, Charles L., O59935.
Weaver, Robert N., O69826.
Weaver, Wilburn C., O63407.
Webb, Lloyd E., O60575.
Webb, Ralph J., O65014.
Webb, Robert W., O57804.
Webber, Kenneth E., Jr., O57220.
Webel, Herman, Jr., O59899.
Weber, Richard G., O57192.
Webster, Dobson L., O59816.
Weddle, Charles E., O65695.
Weeks, Milton D., O62128.
Weggeland, Henry N., Jr., O59882.
Weisinger, Sherman, O59057.
Weisser, Seymour T., O62148.
Welch, John M., O57799.
Wellde, Raymond L., O60423.
Wells, Donal C., O60828.
Wendling, Donald E., O65150.
Wentzel, Donald B., O59800.
Wenz, Albert L., O65148.
Wesley, Craig T., O60193.
West, Oliver I., O65597.
Westermann, Thomas R., O62275.
Wheeler, Ernest E., O60418.
Wheeler, Harold L., O60696.
White, Charles I., Jr., O59059.
White, Charles R., O66210.
White, Joseph F., O63048.
White, Nevin C., O63286.
White, Richard V., O58172.
White, Wolfred K., O59883.
Whitehead, Ennis C., Jr., O57093.
Whitesel, William M., O59806.
Whiteside, David D., O62149.
Whitfield, Robert A., O57317.
Whitledge, Charles H., O62198.
Whitley, Arthur L., O57099.
Whitney, Philip McI., Jr., O57318.
Whitson, William W., O57097.
Whittemore, Kenneth S., Jr., O62999.
Whittington, Charles W., O59884.
Wickham, Robert E., O66121.
Wienecke, Herman E., O60673.
Wigner, Charles C., O59061.
Wilcox, George L., O65731.
Wild, Charles B., Jr., O63065.
Wilhide, Glenn C., Jr., O57189.
Wilkinson, Harry W., O69831.
Wilkinson, Richard F., O59062.
Willard, LeRoy L., O63313.
Williams, Dudley A., O60445.
Williams, Harry E., O61091.
Williams, John D., O60446.
Williams, Robert W., O60839.
Williams, Theodore C., Jr., O57462.
Williams, Tinker, O59063.
Williams, Vernon C., O63062.
Williams, Virgil H., O59064.
Williams, Walworth F., O57310.
Williamson, Leo C., O59065.
Wilson, Calvin O., O63094.
Wilson, Clifford C., O59066.

Wilson, Edwin C., O60650.
Wilson, Jode R., O68177.
Wilson, Kermit J., O60172.
Wilson, Leo L., O62836.
Wilson, Raymond C., O63723.
Winget, Kingston M., O62206.
Winslow, Francis J., O69836.
Winston, Sanford H., O62154.
Wintersteen, Joseph O., Jr., O58151.
Witko, Andrew B., 057170.
Wittlinger, Frederick J., O59069.
Wolf, Richard D., Jr., O59070.
Wolfe, Hiram M., 3d, O61090.
Wolman, Gus A., Jr., O57583.
Woltmon, Jack W., O60686.
Wood, Edwin, O60525.
Wood, John F., Jr., O63372.
Wood, Roy L., O59071.
Wood, Samuel C., O60598.
Wood, William S., O59072.
Woods, Altus L., Jr., O59885.
Woods, Wallace H., O69837.
Woodside, William W., O63315.
Woodward, Dean R., O62237.
Woodward, Samuel M., O59801.
Woolard, Reginald W., O59073.
Worth, William J., O62844.
Worthen, Robert D., O62207.
Wright, Charles D., O60662.
Wright, Lloyd G., O65103.
Wyatt, Willard S., O65166.
Wyckoff, Theodore, O63312.
Wymer, Harold W., O65587.
Wyrick, William E., O65072.
Yaggi, Albert S., Jr., O69839.
Yarbrough, John D., O62238.
Yerkes, Walter E., O57455.
Yost, DeVerne R., O60381.
Young, David R., O63091.
Young, James W., O60410.
Young, Raymond E., O60484.
Young, William V., O60604.
Youngblood, Lewis H., Jr., O59967.
Youngs, Evert C., O59074.
Zarnowski, Walter J., O65605.
Zeitz, Gordon F., O60352.
Zigmund, Frank J., O59075.
Zobrist, Paul S., O59076.
Zohn, Jerome, O60229.
Zuppann, Charles W., O60534.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be lieutenant colonels, Women's Army Corps

Bianchi, Elizabeth W., L42.
McGrath, Luta C., L226.
Sievers, Vera A., L20.
St. Clair, Laura M., L22.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Aiken, Andrea M., L328.
Cadell, Hedwig J., L136.
Coupe, Laura C., L266.
Ellis, Joan, L331.
Frank, Leta M., L329.
Gardner, Annie V., L125.
Irwin, Dorothy M., L262.
Lane, Mary C., L124.
Long, Margaret A., L127.
Rajski, Laures B., L267.
Reece, Ruth S., L134.
Reilly, Veronica A., L135.
Rice, Frances W., L129.
Roberts, Eleanor M., L270.
Sanders, Sarah L., L269.
Seawell, Sarah C., L128.
Sicks, Mary E., L330.
Stout, Ariel E., L126.
Thompson, Ruth D., L121.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion:

To be first lieutenants

×Adams, William A., O65939.
Albert, Benjamin B., Jr., O70246.
Albrecht, Jack R., O67892.
Albright, William L., O70247.
×Allen, William MacD., O67547.
×Ambrose, Homer, Jr., O65647.
×Arnaud, John F., Jr., O65645.
Aubright, Harry P., 3d, O65671.
Aycock, Herbert L., O70252.
Bachinski, Stephen W., O70253.
Backhurst, George F., O70254.
Bailey, Harry R., O70257.
Bannister, Bob C., O70261.
Barger, Ferdinand O., Jr., O70262.
Bass, Sampson H., Jr., O70265.
Bennett, Risden T., Jr., O70272.
Bernard, George L., O70273.
Bettis, Henry H., Jr., O70275.
Biglione, Normand J., O70276.
Blake, James F., O70278.
Boyd, Donald E., O70280.
×Brandenburg, Joe T., Jr., O65800.
Brogden, Wyndell E., O70286.
Brons, Russell L., O70287.
×Browder, John M., O67898.
Brown, John C., O70288.
×Brownlee, Robert W., O66138.
Callahan, Joseph J., O70295.
×Carey, Milton G., O68333.
Carpinteri, Paul S., O70170.
×Carter, Robert O., O65794.
×Cash, William G., O65771.
×Cassels, Kenneth G., O65657.
Cassens, Rudolph D., O65659.
Cavaleri, Edwin F., Jr., O70172.
Champion, Alfred N., O70300.
Clemens, Glen, O70175.
Coleman, William E., O70305.
×Cook, James M., Jr., O65969.
Cowan, Kenneth D., O70311.
×Crosby, John W., Jr., O65812.
Crutchley, Donald O., O70177.
Cummings, Eldon L., O70318.
×Davidson, Jay A., O65669.
Davis, Alvah B., Jr., O67914.
×Davis, Donald D., O65776.
×Davis, Ken A., O67563.
×DeVille, David A., O65790.
Dennis, Ralston K., O70324.
DesRoches, Bernard H., O65658.
×Dinkins, William H., O65653.
Donahoe, German D., O70327.
Dorchak, Steven, Jr., O65984.
Dufresne, Ernest J., Jr., O70181.
Fairey, John M., O70333.
×Fitzsimons, John F., O67570.
×Fleming, Jack R., O65661.
×Forsythe, David A., O69486.
×Francisco, Allan J., O68346.
×Fuqua, Harold E., O65795.
Garrison, Frank L., O70341.
×Gary, Robert P., O65650.
George, Raymond L., O70342.
×Gillin, Jerome M., O65772.
Gingrich, Robert B., O65774.
Gooler, Darrel L., O70345.
×Graham, William L., O66002.
Graziolo, Albert J., O70346.
Grimm, Philip D., O70351.
Haid, Donald J., O69496.
Hamilton, Donald M., O70359.
Harrington, George C., O70362.
×Harris, Richard L., O65806.
Harris, Harold D., Jr., O67576.
×Hathaway, Worten M., O65652.
×Haun, Philip D., O65769.
×Hayes, Daniel P., O66011.
×Helms, Howard F., O65789.
×Hendrix, Jamie R., O65666.
Hockett, Donald F., O70378.
Holden, Joseph B. J., O65663.
Holloman, Robert A., 3d, O70379.
Holwick, William B., O70381.
Hooper, Everett E., O65654.
×Hudson, James L., O66163.
×Hunzeker, William K., O67584.
×Jacob, Earl P., Jr., O65775.
×Johns, John H., O65861.
×Johnson, George R. H., O69511.
Jordan, Marcus C., O70396.
×Jordan, Pendleton A., 3d, O65664.
×Kern, John H., O65781.
×Kimball, Albert L., O65784.
×Kingery, Thomas E., O66032.
Kitchens, Ernest, Jr., O70203.
×Knight, Herbert E., O69518.
Knotts, Noel D., O70402.
Krafski, Richard S., O70404.
×Lamas, Albert A., O65793.
×Lembrich, Derald L., O65755.
Locke, Bert B., O70411.
×Locke, Donald K., O65816.
×Lodge, Warren J., O67595.
Luxemburger, John J., Jr., O70414.
Mantooth, William H., O70208.
Mapp, James H., O70420.
×Mason, James R., O69526.
×McGlone, John E., O67844.
×McKinley, John McK., O66182.
×McLean, Thomas S., Sr., O70110.
McMurry, Donald R., O70429.
McNulty, Edward S., O70213.
×Mercer, Robert B., O65651.
×Messier, Raymond E., O68201.
×Miles, Mark A., O65777.
Miller, Ward W., O70434.
×Monoriti, Elidio J., O66183.
×Morgan, James E., O65796.
×Morgan, Robert S., O65785.
Mulcahy, George J., O70440.
Murphy, James F., O70444.
Murray, Lynn O., O70446.
×Neale, James W., O65792.
Newburg, Robert LeR., O70450.
Newton, Robert D., O70452.
Norell, Dennis L., O70216.
Ochis, Ronald F., O70459.
×Osborn, Donald J., O66063.
Patterson, Bruce E., 070467.
Pawson, Wilbur A., O70220.
×Pete, John, Jr., O65786.
×Phillips, Harold B., O65778.
Pundt, Willie, O70478.
Quigley, Edwards M., Jr., O70223.
Quinnett, Robert L., O70481.
×Rackley, Everett W., O66077.
×Rankin, Fain M., Jr., O65655.
×Rathbone, William A., O66193.
Reason, Raymond, Jr., O70485.
Reish, Richard D., O70488.
Rife, William T., Jr., O70490.
×Riggs, Theodore S., Jr., O66195.
Rowe, James W., O70228.
×Russell, Donald N., O65791.
Schaub, Warren M., O69554.
Schroeder, Donald B., O70498.
Shaha, James H., O70232.
Shankle, Wade L., Jr., O70499.
Shelton, Henry R., O70234.
×Shelton, Mason R., O65788.
Shirley, Edward L., O70501.
×Shorr, Paul S., O65779.
Socky, Frank J., O70508.
Sola, Gerald C., Jr., O69560.
Speer, Robert M., O65804.
Stevenson, Robert D., O70515.
Stewart, Wilmer D., O70516.
Sutton, Harry L., Jr., O70522.
×Swarts, Sidney M., O67621.
×Tait, James, Jr., O65807.
Taylor, William W., Jr., O70524.
Thomas, Robert F., O70528.
×Tripp, Elmer B., O70052.
Tyler, William H., O65780.
Van Netta, Ernest A., O70544.
Vaughn, Edward J., Jr., O70545.
×Viterna, Robert O., O69569.
×Warden, James R., O65803.
Waters, William W., O69825.
×Watt, Gus H., O69571.
×Wayman, Wilbur St. C., Jr., O66119.
Weaver, Gene A., O70552.
×Weaver, Robert McT., O67633.
×West, Clayton E., O65783.
Wharton, Lonnie V., O65814.
Whitmore, James F., O70562.
Willard, Charles G., O70564.
×Willett, Paul J., O69832.
Willey, Donald E., O66124.

Williams, Fred D., O70565.
Windish, John E., O70567.
×Wise, Dennie P., Jr., O66126.
×Wong, Edwin S. N., O66211.
Woodrow, Ralph T., O70570.
Wooldridge, William D., O70571.
Wootten, Angus E., O70572.
Zabrosky, William C., O70576.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Anistranski, Charles, O70251.
Becknell, George P., Jr., O70268.
Caskey, John T., Jr., O70298.
Hall, Ellis F., Jr., O70357.
Henderson, Arnold C., O70372.
×Kneessy, Alfred D., O65665.
McFarland, Cowan J., O70427.
Moody, Robert W., O70435.
Moore, Lynn B., O70436.
Peterson, Merrill C., Jr., O70471.
Prince, Roy C., O70476.
Rogers, John E., Jr., O70493.
Ryan, Aaron, O70495.
Shea, George M., O70500.
Tuggle, Joseph M., Jr., O70534.
×Warnes, Allan T., O66645.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

×Clark, Mary J., L421.
Grimes, Mary J., L416.
×Heinze, Shirley R., L417.
×Hopfenspirger, Nancy M., L418.
Hutchins, Eleanor P., L420.
×Jebb, Margaret M., L422.
×Johnson, Miriam J., L424.
×Keith, Doris A., L412.
Lambeth, Maida E., L425.
×Lerche, Mary E., L426.
×Meacham, Martha R., L428.
×Polk, Doris D., L430.
×Rawlinson, Pollie L., L431.
×Stearns, Dorcas A., L437.
×Surratt, Clauda M., L439.
×Waters, Mary E., L441.
×Wilde, Elizabeth J., L442.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, approved May 16, 1950. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

×Dean, Martha, N2541.
Drnek, Kathleen L., N2615.
×Eckhoff, Genevieve E., N2548.
×Medina, Dolores, N2546.
×Smith, Elsie L., N2543.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Cruickshank, Helen E., M10151.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 408, 82d Congress; Public Law 759, 80th Congress; Public Law 36, 80th Congress as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress; and Public Law 625, 80th Congress:

To be major

Mixon, Basel M., Jr., MC, O493567.

To be captains

Aiken, Robert E., MC, O996208.
Bancroft, John E., MC, O390994.
Greenberg, Jerome H., MC, O982583.

To be first lieutenants

Fred, Ann C., MC, K2264636.
Garties, Richard G., JAGC, O955121.
Hubbard, Jack A., JAGC, O1102305.
Jones, Mary A., ANC, N792746.
Maher, John R., MSC, O989629.
Ramirez, Rosa J., ANC, N792840.
Tyson, William P., Jr., JAGC, O947341.
Vincilione, Ramona E., WAC, L1010216.
Workinger, George S., JAGC, O2268965.

To be second lieutenant

Hille, Robert A., MSC.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade specified:

To be captains

Arnold, Robert E., O28313.
Van Cleve, Joseph C., Jr., O27431.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Buchanan, Richard S.
Hotchkiss, John E., Jr., O4020386.
Ludwig, James M., Jr., O4020684.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

DeSilva, Rudolph H., O1329102.

To be second lieutenants

DiSimone, Frank B., O1936838.
Merritt, Jack N., O4009054.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Alves, Herbert A. Jr.
Ansted, Genoa W.
Aubry, Robert F.
Baierl, Donald F.
Benson, Joseph E., O1881087
Bickston, Walter J.
Boaz, Charles A.
Bossert, Paul W.
Boynton, Marshall E.
Broman, Ralph W.
Brown, John W.
Campbell, Donald R.
Campbell, George E. Jr.
Canja, Safron S., O4002605
Cate, Hugh C., Jr.
Chambers, John A., O4018380
Chandler, Edwin W.
Chenevert, Ronnie L.
Coggins, James E.
Cooksey, Jesse L.
Cone, Eugene B., O4020510
Cronin, Daniel W.
Croswhite, James L.
Daniel, John S., Jr.
Daniel, Robert N.
Davis, Roger K.
Dean, Bobby J.
Dirmeyer, Robert P.
Dunkelberger, William F.
Easley, Edwin S., O4014085
Eudy, Jay L.
Fetzer, Homer D.
Geasland, Floyd E.
Gerich, Robert A., O4014941
Gruene, Ernest K.
Guettler, Gerald C.
Gunter, Arlie L.
Hall, David R.
Harrington, Robert E.
Harrison, Ted
Hawkins, Laurence R., Jr.
Hendon, William A.
Hertzberg, Hugo H., Jr., O4020172
Hicks, Conrad O.
Hill, Elbert B.
Hines, Jere D.
Hobson, Charles, O1940525
Hogue, Gale W.
Holmes, Alan K.
Holt, Xavia M., Jr.
Honor, Edward
Hudson, Terrence W.
Jauch, Raymond M., Jr., O1915880
Jennings, Robert H., Jr.
Keller, Donald F.
Kennedy, Victor R., Jr., O4024391
Kramer, John K.
Kuntz, Philip L.
Lacey, David W.
Lamb, David O.
Larcade, Herbert C., Jr.
Laverty, Wayne B.
Leisy, Henry J.
Lord, William P., Jr.
Maloney, James P., O1940307
Mauerhan, Karl E.
McCarthy, Walter R., Jr.
McGee, Carl D., Jr.
McKenney, Hubert F., Jr.
McKeon, Joseph M., Jr.
McKinley, David J.
McKinnon, Wayne T., Jr.
McQuarrie, Robert W.
Menetrey, Louis C., O4019322
Metcalf, James L.
Miller, Henry T.
Mitchell, Robert D.
Moore, James M.
Moran, William J.
Moyer, Wilber R.
Murphy, Philip J.
Nagorski, Walter J., O4004111
Niland, James J., Jr., O4004112
Owen, Ernest J.
Owen, Johnny O.
Pate, Robert I.
Petros, William J., O4014090
Rasmussen, Ronald R.
Redmond, Robert S.
Reid, Frederick L., Jr., O4000355
Reynolds, Brian F.
Rose, Charles E., O4020773
Ross, Ralph R., O4011887
Roudabush, Donald R.
Semisch, Philip W.
Shelby, Jerry L.
Sonneborn, Charles L., III
Sutherland, James C.
Towers, Luther
Walter, John S.
Ward, Gayle G.
Weckerling, John H.
Williams, Louis F., Jr.
Wilmes, John J.
Wong, Johnson H.
Woodbeck, Jay W.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Anti-Semitic Activity in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 17, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement I have prepared containing certain extracts from a report and appraisal entitled "Anti-Semitic Activity in the United States."

The report was prepared and issued recently by the American Jewish Committee.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

These unfortunately are troubled times in which certain subversive and dissident influences unhappily are able to continue their work of spreading discord and weakening the fabric of our constitutionally prescribed form of government. The American Jewish Committee's report is most timely in this respect. It provides the tools that are needed for the constant vigilance that is required by our people if they are to protect their liberties.

As the president of the American Jewish Committee, Irving M. Engel, Esq., of New York, states in the foreword to the report:

"Organized bigotry, like all other social ills, is best counteracted when its nature and symptoms are known to the public. To gather and disseminate such knowledge, the American Jewish Committee has engaged in continuing research and analysis of anti-Semitic activity and has rendered reports of its findings from time to time.

"Today, as the American people cope with the worldwide threat of communism and bend their energies to resolve many other crucial problems, it is more than ever necessary to guard against malicious movements striving to foment racial and religious discord. Many of these movements have now abandoned their former overt appeals to bigotry in favor of more subtle tactics to which the public must be alerted. It is this circumstance that has occasioned the present report.

"Founded nearly half a century ago, the American Jewish Committee is dedicated to the great common task of all loyal Americans—the strengthening of unity among our citizens of all races and creeds to the end that this Nation and its free institutions may remain secure."

The report is keynoted by an extract from the annual report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, dated February 6, 1954, where, on page 5, the following statement appears:

"There are presently at work within the United States various and sundry hate groups, the leaders of which, while masking their activities under the guise of patriotism and devotion to the republican form of government, are in fact spreading dissension, discord, bigotry, and intolerance. In many instances, these organizations select ultrapatriotic names and devices to conceal their true and dangerous purposes. The subjects of the hate attacks are individuals or groups of religious and racial minorities among American citizens. The committee is by no means unaware of these activities, and investigation and documentation will proceed to the end that the individuals concerned may be disclosed for what they are. In the opinion of the committee, there are no degrees to subversion. It is not sufficient to be simply anti-Communist if one is anti-American at the same time."

It is true indeed that there are no degrees to subversion. Power mad zealots have too long been able to single out individuals or groups of religious and racial minorities among American citizens and subject them to hate attacks or casually snide implications that they should not enjoy the full exercise of the rights of citizenship which the Constitution provides for them. I regret to say that there have been such evidences even in my own State, but it always has and will be my privilege and my duty to the people of my State and the Nation to take a stand in opposition to them and expose them to the light of day.

The American Jewish Committee is a pioneer organization in the fight against bigotry and intolerance. It has chapters throughout our country and its members are leaders in their own communities. Its report is a sober and factual statement. The following extracts emphasize its principal points:

"In this time of worldwide tensions, it is more than ever important that we correctly appraise the force and scope of organized anti-Semitism—as distinguished from individual expressions of social and economic discrimination—in the United States.

"Until about 20 years ago, our country was comparatively free of this evil which had plagued the Old World for centuries. But with Hitler's rise in Germany, the anti-Semitic movement was forged into an exportable weapon which found its way into the hands of democracy's foes throughout the world.

"In the United States, this weapon has been wielded with varying effect over the years. Organized anti-Semitism has waxed and waned, but never has it vanished completely from the American scene; never has it ceased to be a threat, actual or potential, to our national unity and our free institutions.

* * * * *

"To achieve a proper perspective, it is necessary to understand that many anti-Semites have abandoned their former brash and obvious tactics. The more skillful hatemongers and cunning publicists have now developed a sense of public relations. They exploit current legitimate issues, toning down, if not eliminating, open anti-Semitism. They aim to win the support of respectable elements, rather than the lunatic fringe following which they so highly prized in Christian Front days.

"Thus, in the Presidential elections of 1952, when several thousand citizens in the States of California, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, North Dakota, and Washington voted for Gen. Douglas MacArthur on the Christian Nationalist Party ticket, these voters were expressing their confidence in an American hero. They were unaware that the general had not accepted the nomination, and that the party was actually a front for one of the most vicious and implacable anti-Semites in the country.

"Similarly, when many people in Los Angeles protested against the schools teaching about UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), they had at heart what they sincerely, albeit mistakenly, believed to be the best interest of our country. They did not know that many of the alarming rumors they had heard about UNESCO came from the propaganda of a man who makes his living stirring up hatred, and who once headed an organization which the Attorney General of the United States listed as Fascist.

"Such are the maneuvers whereby anti-Semites currently seek to influence public opinion. Thus far, their success has not been impressive; but the support and alliances they have gained by their deceptive tactics nevertheless constitute a potential danger.

"HOW THE CHANGE CAME ABOUT

"Overt anti-Semitism reached its high-water mark in the United States in 1939, when several hundred anti-Jewish groups, launched with Nazi money, tried to convince Americans that Hitler was right. Mainly composed of crackpots and presided over by petty fuehrers, these organizations held storm-troop meetings; they picketed; they published reams of abusive literature. but such blatant demagogery was offensive to the overwhelming majority of Americans; mostly the so-called lunatic fringe rallied to their banners.

"On Pearl Harbor Day most of the rabble-rousers scurried for cover, remaining there for the duration of the war. By 1947, organized anti-Semitism had reached its lowest ebb.

"The advent of the cold war brought many of these agitators back into the open. Some resumed their rabid fulminations against the Jews. Others, having learned from experience that racist appeals violated a basic American ethic, now courted public approval by exploiting the controversial issues of the day. The glibness of their arguments and the vigor of their attacks appeal especially to ultranationalist groups.

"Ultranationalist groups have been a factor in American life since the First World War. They have opposed all progressive moves to meet the needs of Government and society in these complex, industrialized, modern times. After almost a generation of collective bargaining, social-security measures, and Government welfare programs, ultranationalists still seek a return to the 19th century. Their view of States' rights would even preclude SEC regulation of security markers.

"Although three wars have proven their thesis fallacious, the ultranationalists are still vehemently isolationists. They oppose foreign aid, bitterly resent United States participation in the United Nations, and favor amending the Constitution to curtail the treatymaking power of the Federal Government. Suspicious of foreigners, they have consistently resisted immigration into this country except by persons of certain approved racial and national origins, and have fought all efforts to improve our immigration laws.

* * * * *

"Though often led and financed by reputable individuals, and spending millions of dollars to advertise their views via press, platform, radio, and other media, ultranationalists made little headway with the average American until the cold war brought about the present tense atmosphere of our national life.

"While some of the ultranationalist groups espouse retrogressive economic reforms, and others have political aims, all favor extremist techniques in combating communism—free-swinging, wild-accusation tactics which indiscriminately charge liberals with being communistic. Ultranationalists are now appealing to the American people on this basis, equating everything they oppose with communism, subversion, and a newly invented phenomenon—creeping socialism.

"During the past decade, ultranationalist organizations have increased measurably, and they now offer tempting opportunities for infiltration by anti-Semitic elements. In setting out to cultivate these groups, the professional bigot plays his hand adroitly, exploiting the particular political issues which are currently the focus of concern in ultranationalist circles.

* * * * *

"SOCIO-ECONOMIC MEASURES

"It is expected that ultranationalist groups will soon launch their strongest attack upon such long-accepted features of our national way of life as unionism, social security, Government welfare assistance, and similar social reforms of the past generation. Tied in will be appeals to 'save America from creeping socialism' and return to 'constitutionalism,' 'economic freedom,' and 'freedom of choice.' Anti-Semites add the 'Jewish angle' to these lines, alleging prominent Americans of Jewish background to be Machiavellian agents of a super-government.

"THIRD PARTY ISSUE

"The third party is not a new feature in American politics. Theodore Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party, La Follette's Progressives, and the more recent political venture of Henry Wallace, bearing the same title, come readily to mind. Adapting this idea to their own objectives, ultranationalists contend that the present Republican administration is little more than a carbon copy of the Democratic administrations which preceded it. Many anti-Semites have sedulously taken up the third party cry; in so doing, their propaganda generally charges that both major political parties are controlled by Jews.

"A notorious instance of this dovetailing occurred during the 1952 Republican primary fights when both the ultranationalists and the anti-Semites opposed the nomination of General Eisenhower. The former proclaimed what they considered his failings, and the latter blamed these shortcomings on Jewish influence. In some localities, leaflets penned by as many as 10 agitators in different parts of the country were assembled into kits and distributed on main thoroughfares. A typical piece showed a Streicher-like caricature of the Jew pointing to Eisenhower and saying, 'Ike vill keep us boys in power.' This broadside was produced by Independent Republicans for MacArthur, a front organization established by Gerald L. K. Smith—without MacArthur's approval.

* * * * *

"PARTISANSHIP OF THE M'CARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT

"The McCarran-Walter Act has been severely criticized by Christian organizations—Protestants and Catholic—as well as by Jewish and many other reputable groups. Much

ultranationalist and anti-Semitic propaganda, aimed at stirring anti-alien sentiment, has attacked critics of the act, while minimizing or ignoring the opposition of Christian church groups. Played up instead is a portrayal of the Jews as seeking the law's repeal because they wish to get millions of their coreligionists into this country. Hints of Jewish power are frequently woven into this argument.

"EXPLOITING LOCAL ISSUES

"The onslaught of ultranationalists against modern education has gravely harassed the school systems of many towns during the past several years. In some instances, so-called education groups, dominated or influenced by anti-Semites, have smeared modern educational methods as communistic and atheistic. Such features as intercultural education, especially, have come under vicious attack; leading educators have been vilified as Communists and their textbooks investigated. UNESCO teaching materials and the display of the U. N. flag have been frequently used as starting points for these attacks. The momentum produced by the earlier organizational and propaganda efforts of ultranationalists promises to keep the issue of modern educational methods alive for some time to come.

"In the grotesque effort to exploit the fears and phobias of the public, the anti-Semites have seized upon proposals in some sections of the country to fluoridate drinking water as a community health measure. Demagogic interpretations range from outright scares of mass poisoning and mass suicide to innuendoes that fluorine saps the individual's willpower—an end, it is charged, desired by the Government. Also suggested, if not openly asserted, is that a supersecret world government backs the project. Fantastic? Yet huge quantities of such propaganda were distributed in Cincinnati. They may well have influenced the negative vote which this proposition received in November 1953.

* * * * *

"CONCLUSION

"Organized anti-Semitic activity today bears little resemblance to the noisy, unruly assemblages of pre-Pearl Harbor days with their spewing of unvarnished racial hatred easily recognizable as Nazi inspired. Using as a point of reference the year 1947, when the anti-Semitic movement reached its lowest ebb, several changing trends in dynamics and tactics are discernible:

"First, more emphasis is laid on disseminating literature, rather than staging meetings, picket lines, rallies, and other demonstrations.

"Second, more subtle approaches are made to public opinion by exploiting such issues as communism, United Nations, and national economic policies.

"Third, there is a pronounced tendency among prominent ultranationalist organizations and leaders to accept—or at least tolerate—hatemongers and their propaganda products. In many cases this amenability is the result of unwariness; many would be more discerning, were it not for their own extremist viewpoints.

"And finally, professional fomenters of discord are in positions where they can cause much trouble, for they have learned how to salt public debate with hate propaganda, and have discovered the usefulness of general mailing lists, instead of relying on the private rosters of crackpot following in years gone by.

"The threat of bigotry polluting the American atmosphere can best be averted by an alert American public. Hatemongers and their machinations must be exposed. Vitally important is the responsibility of ultranationalists and ultraconservatives to recognize, and rid themselves of, the racists who seek to exploit and dominate them. Equally vital is the obligation of respectable leaders and supporters of these movements to dissociate themselves from groups which cannot dislodge the anti-Semites, and to persuade other men of goodwill to do likewise.

"There is much room in the market-place of ideas for opposing viewpoints on a multitude of issues—national and international, political, social, and economic. That is the glory of American democracy. But the public must be shown how to recognize and reject the ideological counterfeiters who would pass on as legal tender their hollow coins of bigotry."

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 19, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, July 2, 1954)

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

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

Our Father God, who hath taught us that in quietness and confidence shall be our strength, standing at the threshold of another week of test and toil, by the might of Thy spirit lift us, we pray Thee, to Thy presence that we may be still and know that Thou art God.

We thank Thee for friendships that enrich our lives, for duties that challenge our powers, for rainbows of radiant hope which are our skies. In paths beyond our human ken to discover, lead us to that concord which is the fruit of righteousness. Grant us reason and insight to apply our hearts unto wisdom and to bring every thought and effort into captivity to the high endeavor of peace on earth to men of good will. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 17, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 16, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 3539) to further amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the computation of reenlistment bonuses for members of the uniformed services.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2987. An act to provide for the transfer of hay and pasture seeds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Federal land-administering agencies;

H. R. 2617. An act for the relief of Guillermo Morales Chacon;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1940, or other acts of Congress;

H. R. 4928. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the city of Clifton, N. J.;

H. R. 6263. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Alaska to the Rotary Club of Ketchikan, Alaska;

H. R. 6642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen;

H. R. 6882. An act to amend the act of September 27, 1950, relating to construction of the Vermejo reclamation project;

H. R. 6975. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Siskiyou Joint Union High School District, Siskiyou County, Calif.;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Nicole Goldman;

H. R. 8549. An act granting the consent of Congress to The Breaks Interstate Park Compact;

H. R. 8713. An act to amend section 1 (d) of the Helium Act (50 U. S. C. sec. 161 (d)), and to repeal section 3 (13) of the act entitled "An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 701);

H. R. 9006. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate 28 paintings to the Australian War Memorial; and

H. R. 9242. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. 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:

Barrett	Ferguson	Murray
Bennett	Gillette	Saltonstall
Bowring	Gore	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hayden	Smith, Maine
Burke	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Hill	Thye
Chavez	Holland	Williams
Crippa	Johnson, Tex.	Young
Dirksen	Knowland	
Ervin	Lehman	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr.