rust, and fought forest fires. As camp educational adviser it was my task to provide educational opportunities in addition to the relief and work programs for which the CCC is more widely known. We worked in warm weather and in cold. There was plenty to do, but we were young. We liked the work; we liked the life; and especially, we liked the opportunity to be a recognized part of American life.

I believe I am the only Member of this Congress who was in the CCC. From this vantage point, I see it as a great movement to renew a spirit of adventure in youth, and to dramatize the protection and restoration of our natural resources. Our efforts up there on the shores of Lake Superior stand out as part of a job being done by thousands of young men in hundreds of CCC camps across the country.

Because of our work, millions of acres of forest land now yield crops of pulpwood and sawlogs, on millions more, fat livestock feed on good grass that we made possible, everywhere sportsmen find better places in which to fish and hunt, and families have places where they may picnic. Now, as never before, I see in the CCC, an evidence of what can be done when direction is given to the energies of youth.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1955

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast led us across the Red Seas and the wilderness of the yesteryears in a vision of a divine covenant, quicken that vision in our minds so that with renewed faith we shall be its living witness and inspire freemen toward a rebirth of freedom to face the promise and dangers of a new age.

O Thou who hast led us out of bondage with a vision of man's righteousness, Thou who hast taught us that we are faithful to Thee only when we labor for Thy children, guide us in our deliberations so that we shall find the path that leads upward, the way that builds new strength and new hope for the children of men.

Bless Thou the men who raise Thy standards in our time, the men who guard the rights of their fellow men, the men who are not neutral in time of evil, the men who do not turn away their face when the wicked would barter the birthright of freedom for the mess of pottage of petty gain, the men who have the self-discipline of the disciples of Thy sacred law as children of a just God.

Guide us and guard us and lead us forward so that through our labors in this great moment of history we shall in truth be the living witness of Thy covenant, and the time will soon come when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of a righteous God even as the waters cover the seas. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ELLENDER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. DOUGLAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, April 14, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate commencing at 4:30 p. m. today, and for the remainder of the week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

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

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet on Wednseday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, during the sessions of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LIST OF PRINCIPAL AND ALTERNATE CANDIDATES SELECTED FOR 1955 REGULAR NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

A letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a list of principal and alternate candidates selected for the 1955 Regular Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program (with an accompanying list); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXEMPTION FOR DIPLOMATIC OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FROM PAYMENT OF CERTAIN TAXES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7511 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide exemption for diplomatic officers and employees from payment of internal revenue taxes on imported articles (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ENTITLED "USE AND DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY" BY COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission entitled "Use and Disposal of Surplus Property" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, ACADIA NATIONAL PARK, MAINE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract within Acadia National Park, Maine (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, TENNESSEE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit, in Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tennessee (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF DIVISION OF COAL MINE INSPECTION, BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on synthetic liquid fuels, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the payment of claims from the correction of military or naval records, for the period July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED MINIMUM POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSIT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A law enacted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"S. 230

"An act creating the Senator McCarran memorial statue committee; stating the membership and powers and duties of the committee; providing for public meetings, the election of officers and duration of the committee; allowing the acceptance of contributions and creating a special fund; making an appropriation; and other matters properly relating thereto

"Whereas the late United States Senator Patrick A. McCarran, during his service in the United States Senate, was associated with the enactment of legislation having for its purpose the arresting at its source of the poisonous pollution of the Godless ideology of communism which was permeating the lifestream of this Nation; and

"Whereas in furtherance of the fight against the enemies of the Republic, both within and without, he authored and caused to be enacted the Internal Security Act of 1950, known as the McCarran Act, and coauthored and guided the enactment of the Immigration Code of 1952, known as the McCarran-Walter Act, these acts being the two principal security laws of the United States; and

"Whereas this most distinguished statesman and courageous patriot, during his 22 years of service in the United States Senate, brought great distinction and credit to his native State of Nevada and to the Nation at large and prior to such senatorial service he was instrumental in shaping the laws of this State as a member of the legislature, district attorney and supreme court justice; and

"Whereas Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States at Washington, D. C., was designated by the 38th session of Congress as a place for the States to honor their statesmen and leaders by the donations of statues, not to exceed two from each State; and

"Whereas the rules for admission of statues to Statuary Hall provide that the statues are to be a gift from the State, not from individuals or groups of citizens, that the statues must be in marble or bronze, and that the person commemorated must be illustrious for his historic renown or for distinguished civic or military service so that the State deems him worthy of national commemoration; and

"Whereas Nevada is 1 of the 8 States that have not as yet honored any of their respected sons by contributing such a statue; now, therefore, the people of the State of Nevada represented in senate and assembly do enact as follows:

"SECTION 1. There is hereby created the Senator McCarran Memorial Statue Committee, which shall consist of the governor of this State, the president of the senate and the speaker of the assembly of the 47th session of the legislature, and four other citizens of the State of Nevada to be named by the three officials specified.

"SEC. 2. The members of the committee shall serve until their successors are appointed or the purposes of this act are fulfilled. A vacancy in the regular membership created by death, resignation, or any other cause shall be filled by election of the majority of the entire committee remaining.

"SEC. 3. The committee shall holds its first meeting within a reasonable time after the passage and approval of this act and shall elect from its membership a chairman and a secretary-treasurer. Thereafter, the committee shall meet at such times and places as shall be specified by a call of the chairman or a majority of the committee. Four members of the committee shall constitute a quorum, and such quorum may exercise all the powers and authority conferred on the committee. All meetings of the committee shall be open to the public, and a complete record of all its proceedings shall be taken and preserved as a matter of public record.

"SEC. 4. The members of the committee shall receive no compensation but shall be entitled to the per diem expense allowance and travel expenses as provided by law for attendance at committee meetings and other necessary official committee business.

"SEC. 5. The primary purpose of the Senator McCarran memorial statue committee is to facilitate and make arrangements for the placement of a statue in Statuary Hall of the late Senator Patrick A. McCarran. To fulfill the provisions of this act, the committee shall have the following powers and duties:

"1. To investigate and determine the steps to be taken to enable this State to have placed in Statuary Hall in Washington, D. C., a marble or bronze statue of Senator Patrick A. McCarran.

"2. To select a sculptor or sculptors to create or cast the statue and to hold deliberations and determine the type, size, material and cost of such a statue.

"3. To direct the method of obtaining, furnishing and expending the funds necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"4. To contract for and employ a sculptor or sculptors to create or cast the statue, and to pay the necessary costs, such as, but not limited to, the fee of the sculptor, building and material expenses, cost of a pedestal or base, freight costs for transporting the statue to Washington, D. C., cost for temporary placement and erection of the statue in the Rotunda in the United States Capitol for unveiling ceremonies, cost for permanent placement and erection of the statue in Statuary Hall, cost of printing the announcements, invitations and programs for the unveiling ceremonies, and other incidental and necessary expenses which the committee may find it necessary to incur.

"5. To determine whether or not unveiling ceremonies are desired and, if held, to arrange such exercises and appoint a presiding officer to take full charge of the presentation. If the committee decides to hold unveiling ceremonies, it shall take the necessary steps to be granted permission by concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States and it shall consult with the congressional delegation from Nevada to introduce such a resolution.

"6. To contact and consult with the Architect of the Capitol of the United States for any procedural information desired with regard to the contribution of the statue and to confer with the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library and Statues concerning the final determination as to where the statue will permanently be located in the United States Capitol.

"7. To receive contributions from any source whatever to cover the cost of erecting the statue and to deposit such contributions with the State treasurer to the credit of the Senator McCarran statue fund hereinafter created.

"8. To report to the next ensuing session of the legislature of the State of Nevada on what action has been taken and what results have been achieved under the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 6. This act shall remain in full force and effect until the objective intended and enunciated by the preamble and context of this act have been accomplished.

"SEC. 7. To carry out the purposes and provisions of this act there is hereby created a fund in the State treasury to be known as the Senator McCarran statue fund, which fund shall consist of legislative appropriations, contributions and donations of any kind or nature whatsoever. State funds to apply to the necessary costs of procuring the statue shall be provided by direct appropriation of the legislature and there is hereby appropriated the sum of $500 out of any money in the State treasury not otherwise appropriated to the credit of the Senator McCarran statue fund and claims against this fund shall be paid out as other claims against the State are paid.

"SEC. 8. This act shall become effective upon passage and approval."

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

"House Concurrent Resolution 15

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

"Whereas Federal courts, and more particularly the United States Supreme Court, have through numerous opinions and decisions invaded the fields of the legislative and executive branches of government; and

"Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts, and more particularly the United States Supreme Court, have invaded the field of government which should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

"Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to control and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein*, That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts, so that the fields of government of the executive and legislative

branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator from Mississippi, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from Mississippi, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Adopted by the house of representatives February 15, 1955.

"WALTER SILIERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate, March 24, 1955.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 11

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to set aside the Veterans' Administration property at Fort Logan adjacent to Denver as a Veterans' Administration domiciliary

"Whereas there is no Veterans' Administration domiciliary available for Colorado and the Rocky Mountain area veterans in the area from Fort Meade, S. Dak., to Wadsworth, Kans.; and

"Whereas the domiciliaries previously mentioned are constantly crowded and having waiting lists, as are the other domiciliaries throughout the United States; and

"Whereas the need for domiciliary care is increasingly more acute for each year and month that passes; and

"Whereas there is a saving of over $15 a day per patient for all veterans who can be transferred from a general medical and surgical hospital to a domiciliary; and

"Whereas Fort Logan has adequate buildings available at a small cost in preparation for service and with ample ground for expansion in necessary Veterans' Administration activities for the future: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact a law which will provide that the Veterans' Administration property at Fort Logan, near Denver, Colo., be made a permanent Veterans' Administration domiciliary; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"STEPHEN L. R. MCNICHOLS,
"President of the Senate.

"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution relative to the storage of surplus wheat in California

"Whereas the United States Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, has on its hands a vast quantity of surplus wheat which is estimated to exceed 2 billion bushels, and which is stored in various places; and

"Whereas none of this surplus wheat is now stored in California while in the Pacific Northwest area there is now reported to be stored some 30 million bushels of surplus wheat in 140 ships, in addition to that stored in warehouses, and it is proposed to use 105 additional ships in that area for the storage of approximately 25 million additional bushels of such wheat; and

"Whereas there is available now in the State of California grain warehouse facilities for the storage of approximately 10 million bushels of such wheat, and further facilities could be made available if necessary; and

"Whereas from an overall strategic standpoint it would seem that the best interests of the United States would be served by preserving shipping facilities for their intended purpose and by dispersing the storage of its strategic assets, including such surplus wheat, as widely as possible; and

"Whereas irrespective of the ultimate disposition of this surplus wheat its storage within California would be advantageous because if it is to be exported, California has the ports and shipping; if it is to be sold, California has its livestock industry and other purchasers to buy it; and if it is to be stored indefinitely, California has facilities for such storage; and

"Whereas this surplus wheat is the property of the people of the United States as a whole and whatever economic benefits may ensue to labor, trade, and industry from the handling and keeping thereof should be equitably distributed throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas there is now no reason why plans for the storage of such surplus wheat in California may not be put under way pursuant to which such wheat may be stored in California at least as advantageously as elsewhere, thus conferring a great economic benefit to this State at no additional cost, and possibly a saving, to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to cause to be stored within the State of California such quantities of the surplus wheat under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be stored therein to the best advantage and benefit to the people of the State of California and the people of the United States; and be further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relative to payments in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government

"Whereas the Federal Government, through its many agencies, continues to acquire vast holdings of land and improvements, particularly for military, experimental, and defense purposes, and since the Federal Government is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, the property thus acquired is removed from the local tax base; and

"Whereas not only has the Federal Government acquired considerable land for war and defense projects, but in recent years it has enlarged its holdings of public lands set aside for national parks, Indian reservations, forest reserves, experimental areas and other similar purposes, which activity has been particularly noticeable in the 11 Western States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, within which States the Federal Government has greatly expanded the public domain since 1937, now owning over 55 percent of all the land in these States; and

"Whereas because general property taxation is the major source of revenue for counties, cities, school districts, and other local governmental units, the acquisition of property by the Federal Government has seriously impaired this source of revenue of local governmental units and consequently the financial stability of such local governments; and

"Whereas while the acquisitions of additional Federal property have adversely affected the source of revenue of local government, at the same time they have also enlarged the local problems and responsibilities of furnishing many necessary public services, not only directly for Federal activities, but also for the large numbers of families being attracted to the sites of Federal projects; and

"Whereas Federal property ownership has had a crushing impact on local governments, striking at the very heart of local government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for payments to local governments in lieu of taxes on federally owned lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 34

"Whereas the right of national self-determination is universally accepted as inherent in all peoples; and

"Whereas Slovakia was one of the first countries to suffer Communist aggression at the end of World War II and her peoples were denied their right of national self-determination; and

"Whereas Slovakia's strategic geographic location—on the flank of eastern Europe—is anchored in the politically, militarily, and economically vital area of the Carpathian Mountains, possessing as she does the finest area defense lines, which, if free, would add materially to the safety and security of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to pass a resolution that it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the people of Slovakia are entitled to and should no longer be denied the right of national self-determination; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States, by the secretary of state.

"Adopted by the senate April 12, 1955.

"JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Resolution 16

"Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the United States Department of Agriculture

"Whereas water and soil are the most valuable resources of Kansas; and

"Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954; and

"Whereas many cities, industries and farms are suffering from a critical shortage of water, and, at the same time, are exposed to the further hazards of floods and droughts and

"Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply; and

"Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil, and, more specifically, such matters as flood control, water supply, irrigation, pollution control and soil conservation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take what actions are necessary to assure continuance of surveys and planning and assure cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water, by the three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the senate, and was adopted by that body March 31, 1955.

"JOHN M. CUISK,
"President of the Senate.
"SIDNEY MARGARET GARDINER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide for annual regular sessions of the legislature

"Whereas section 41 of the Hawaiian Organic Act provides for biennial sessions of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, such section having been in effect since April 30, 1900; and

"Whereas subsequent to the enactment of the Hawaiian Organic Act the population of the Territory has more than tripled and it is now necessary for the legislature to meet annually for the proper and adequate consideration of governmental problems and determination of policy for the Territory; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the State of Hawaii as agreed upon by the delegates of the people of Hawaii in convention on July 22, 1950, made provision for annual regular sessions of the legislature: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii,' approved April 30, 1900, as amended, known as the Hawaiian Organic Act, as follows:

"(a) By amending section 26 to read:

"'SEC. 26. Compensation of members: That the members of the legislature shall receive for their services, in addition to mileage at the rate of 20 cents a mile each way, the sum of $2,500 for each general session, and $1,500 for each budget session, payable in 3 equal installments on or after the 1st, 30th, and 50th days of each general session and on or after the 1st, 15th, and 25th day of each budget session, such amounts to be appropriated by Congress from any moneys in the Federal Treasury not otherwise appropriated, based upon regular estimates submitted through the Secretary of the Interior: Provided, that the members shall receive from the Territory $750 as compensation for any special session held under the provisions of existing law: Provided further, that the sums herein authorized to be appropriated from the Federal Treasury for mileage and per diem of members for general or budget sessions shall constitute the only sums to be appropriated by the Congress for legislative expenses.'

"(b) By amending sections 41, 42, and 43 to read:

"'SEC. 41. Sessions of the legislature: That regular sessions of the legislature shall be held annually. The governor may convene the legislature, or the senate alone, in special session. All sessions shall be held at the capital of the Territory. In case the capital shall be unsafe, the governor may direct that any session shall be held at some other place. Regular sessions in odd-numbered years shall be known as "general sessions" and regular sessions in even-numbered years shall be known as "budget sessions."

"'At budget sessions the legislature shall be limited to the consideration and enactment of the general appropriations bill for the succeeding fiscal year and bills to authorize proposed capital expenditures, revenue bills necessary therefor, urgency measures deemed necessary in the public interest, bills calling elections, and bills to provide for the expenses of such sessions. The legislature may also consider and act upon matters relating to the removal of officers. No urgency measure shall be considered unless a statement of facts constituting such urgency is set forth in one section thereof and until such section has been first approved by each house. The approval of such section and the final passage of such measure in each house shall require a two-thirds vote of all the members to which such house is entitled, taken by ayes and noes and entered upon its journal.

"'SEC. 42. Commencement and duration of sessions: That regular sessions shall commence at 10 a. m. on the third Wednesday in February. General sessions shall be limited to a period of 60 days and budget sessions and special sessions to a period of 30 days, but the governor may extend any session for not more than 30 days. Sundays and holidays shall be excluded in computing the number of days of any session.

"'SEC. 43. Adjournment: That neither house shall adjourn during any session of the legislature for more than 3 days, or sine die, without the consent of the other.'

"(c) By amending section 53 to read:

"'SEC. 53. The budget: That within such time prior to the opening of each regular sessions as may be prescribed by law, the governor shall submit to the legislature a budget setting forth a complete plan of proposed general fund expenditures and anticipated receipts of the Territory for the ensuing fiscal period, together with such other information as the legislature may require. The budget shall be compiled in two parts, one setting forth all proposed operating expenditures for the ensuing fiscal period and the other, all capital improvements expenditures proposed to be undertaken during such period. The governor shall also, upon the opening of the session, submit bills to provide for such proposed expenditures and for any recommended additional revenues or borrowings by which the proposed expenditures are to be met. Such bills shall be introduced in the legislature upon the opening of each regular session.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 11th day of April 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, District of Columbia Branch, Washington, D. C., signed by Eugene Davidson, president, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide suffrage in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the San Diego Chapter, California Society, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring the repudiation of the Yalta agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the San Diego Chapter, California Society, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring the enactment of legislation to reveal the Potsdam Agreement and certain other agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Civic Club and the Lions Club, both of the city of Downieville, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the construction of the Trinity River development in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Chamber of Commerce of Salt Lake City, Utah, relating to the exemption from Federal regulation the activities of producers and gatherers of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Texas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a salary adjustment for Post Office employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Ferenc Horvath, of Wrightstown, N. J., relating to the national highway program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I present, for appropriate reference, three resolutions adopted by the Rhode Island General Assembly, and sent to us by Armand H. Cote, secretary of state of Rhode Island.

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

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution urging the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make every effort to obtain from the Public Housing Administration an extension of time for occupancy of Veterans' Emergency Housing Project No. RI–V–37053B, at Fort Kearney, R. I.

"Whereas in the town of Narragansett upon South Ferry Road upon a hill overlooking the bay is situated Fort Philip Kearney, which became a housing development for the University of Rhode Island in 1946 under the provisions of the Lanham Act when contract with the Public Housing Administration converted the barracks at the installation into apartments; and

"Whereas the deadline date for vacating this Veterans' Emergency Housing Project No. RI–V–37053B (Fort Kearney, R. I.) was extended to July 1, 1955; and

"Whereas a formal extension of the closing date for such housing project is now necessary since the facilities are located on land under the control of the United States Government and, therefore, subject to the requirements of section 604 of the Lanham Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the General Assembly respectfully request the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make every effort to have an extension granted for another year until July 1, 1956, by the Public Housing Administration to permit Veterans' Emergency Housing Project No. RI–V–37053B (Fort Kearney, R. I.) to continue in residence there; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State to said Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour

"Whereas the President of the United States has proposed, and Congress is now considering, legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage above the present inadequate figure of 75 cents an hour; and

"Whereas a fair and reasonable minimum wage would raise the living standards of underpaid workers, increase the national income, stimulate business activity, minimize unfair industrial competition based upon sweatshop wages and help to solve the problem of runaway shops; and

"Whereas in the State of Rhode Island many industries are getting serious and unfair competition from plants in low-wage areas because of the inadequacy of the present minimum wage, and the State may lose more of its industries unless action is taken quickly to raise the Federal minimum: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island calls upon the Congress of the United States to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour and urges our Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to support such legislation, in the interests of both of our own State and of the Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

"Resolution memorializing Congress endorsing the resolution calling for a $1,250,000 survey of the alarming mental health problem in the United States

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a resolution calling for a $1,250,000 survey of the alarming mental health problem in the United States; and

"Whereas in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which hears health matters, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, gave figures on the toll of mental illness. The press coverage is herein quoted:

" 'She spoke in support of President Eisenhower's program for dealing with the problem.

" 'She endorsed a resolution calling for a $1,250,000 survey. This was submitted by Representative J. PERCY PRIEST, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the committee.

" 'No dissenting voice was heard as Mrs. Hobby and her experts urged much greater efforts immediately in the mental health field. As much as 6 percent of the population, or about 9 million persons, are believed to have serious mental disorders, she said.

" 'Mrs. Hobby put the direct cost of mental hospitals, plus benefits to veterans with mental disorders, at more than $1 billion a year.

" 'Dr. Wilfred Overholzer, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital here, a leading mental institution, added to the tragic picture.

" '"In the first year in a mental hospital," he said, "patients have a 50–50 chance of release. In 2 years, the odds against being released alive rise to 16 to 1. By the time a patient has been hospitalized for 8 years, the odds are more than 99 to 1."

" 'Dr. Overholzer reported that a 99-year-old woman had been in the hospital since 1885.

" '"Of the more than 500,000 patients in our State mental hospitals, one-quarter have been hospitalized more than 16 years, one-half more than 8 years, three-fourths more than 2 years," he said.

" '"Schizophrenia, a baffling type of mental disease, accounts for half the cases," he added.

" 'He added that virtually no special studies had been made on improving care and treatment in mental hospitals. However, he told of a California hospital that had increased its discharge rate 2½ times by intensifying care and therapy.

" '"There are very interesting new drugs coming along," he said. "They are not a panacea, but I believe we are on the verge of a new era in drugs."

" 'Secretary Hobby explained that the President's special program would complement an appropriation increase from $14,147,500 to $17,501,000.

" 'It calls for an additional $6,750,000 in grants to States, $1,250,000 in "demonstration projects," and $1,500,000 for training workers, and $1 million for research.

" 'Both Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Robert H. Felix, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, stressed the shortage of medical personnel in the field': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island earnestly requests Congress to endorse this movement calling for a $1,250,000 survey of the alarming mental health problem in the United States; asking our Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island to work for enactment of this legislation; directing the Secretary of State to transmit to them duly certified copies of this resolution."

REGULATION OF PRODUCERS' PRICES OF NATURAL GAS—RESOLUTION AND STATEMENT

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution in favor of Federal regulation of producers' prices of natural gas, adopted by the City Commission of Grand Rapids, Mich., and a statement by Mr. Samuel H. Himelstein, city attorney for the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., to the mayor and the city commission of that city. The statement is a particularly straightforward and enlightening exposition of the compelling reasons why such Federal regulation must be kept in force.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas the Harris bill (H. R. 4560) is now pending in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Harris bill would nullify the Natural Gas Act of 1938, which gives the Federal Power Commission the right and duty to regulate a fair and reasonable price for natural gas at the wellhead; and

Whereas if the Harris bill is enacted into law it would destroy consumer protection in the price of natural gas and permit the natural-gas producers to charge the consumers any arbitrary price they chose to fix and would result in increased cost of millions of dollars to the many thousands of natural-gas users and result in great harm to the people of this city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this city commission, That we do hereby declare our opposition to the Harris bill, so-called, and urge upon the President of the United States and our representatives in the Congress that the Harris bill be defeated: Be it further

Resolved, That if the Harris bill is passed by the Congress, we urge the President of the United States to veto it; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, to Senator CHARLES POTTER, to Senator PATRICK MCNAMARA, and to Congressman GERALD R. FORD, JR., at their respective addresses in Washington, D. C.

The statement presented by Mr. MCNAMARA is as follows:

SHOULD CONGRESS VOTE A $1,700,000 YEARLY INCREASE FOR NATURAL GAS CONSUMERS OF GRAND RAPIDS?

(Statement by Samuel H. Himelstein, city attorney of Grand Rapids, Mich.)

Mayor Veldman and gentlemen of the commission, you have before you a resolution asking the Congress of the United States to defeat the Harris bill. I desire, through you, to alert the people of this city to the great danger that the Harris bill will be enacted into law by the Congress unless the people make themselves heard. It is necessary that the people become fully aware of what this Harris bill will mean to them in the very near future if it does become law.

Most people think that what happens in Congress in Washington is far away and doesn't concern them. Of course, that is not

true. And it is especially not true in this situation. If this bill passes it will cost the people of the city of Grand Rapids millions of dollars. I am not overstating the case.

To understand this situation I must give you a brief factual background. Natural gas, including that for Grand Rapids users, is produced in 3 or 4 States in South and Southwest United States. The principal producers are Texas and Oklahoma. Two or three other States contribute some natural gas. Natural gas, as it comes out of the ground, is called well-head or field gas. From the ground, the gas is piped by long pipelines to its destination, most times to other States far away, e. g., Michigan. It is sold to local distributing companies, such as the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., which bases its rates, in part, on the price paid for the natural gas at the field or well-head (as it comes from the ground).

In two decisions, the United States Supreme Court has decided that when the gas is transported across States lines neither the State where the gas comes from the ground, e. g., Oklahoma or Texas, nor the State of destination, e. g., Michigan, has the right to regulate or control the price of natural gas as it comes from the ground. This is what is known as the well-head or field price. Investigation by the Federal Trade Commission proved that the sellers of natural gas before 1938 always charged whatever they thought the traffic would bear. This resulted in price gouging and exploitation of consumers.

To correct this situation, the Congress of the United States in 1938 enacted what is known as the Natural Gas Act of 1938, whereby the Federal Power Commission was given the right and the duty to regulate the price of natural gas at the field or well-head. This regulation sets a price which would, on the one hand, guarantee a fair rate to the producer of natural gas, but, on the other hand, would not be unfair to, nor would it gouge the consumer. This Natural Gas Act of 1938 was upheld by the United States Supreme Court. But the Harris bill, if it becomes law, would nullify and kill the Natural Gas Act.

Since 1938 the natural-gas industry has grown and prospered. Much natural gas has been found, and millions of customers have been added. It has been profitable to the producer and, despite some increases because of inflation, etc., the price of natural gas has remained within reach of millions of consumers.

Now the gas and oil industry (oil companies own most of the natural gas wells) are making an intense legislative drive in Congress to sabotage and scuttle effective regulation of natural gas rates. The oil companies are spending well over a million dollars on this lobby. There have been six bills introduced to nullify the Natural Gas Act, and the principal bill is the Harris bill, against which this city commission resolution is directed.

If this Harris bill becomes law, the Federal Power Commission would no longer have the right to regulate just and reasonable prices for natural gas as it comes out of the ground. If this happens, consumer protection will be destroyed. With the Federal protection removed, and with the States constitutionally helpless to protect the consumer, then that which happened before the Natural Gas Act was passed will happen again: the producers will again charge whatever they think traffic will bear; there will be price gouging and exploitation of consumers. What this will probably mean in dollars and cents to Grand Rapids I will shortly point out.

Under the present law a tremendous network of pipelines bring natural gas to nearly all the major cities in the Nation, Grand Rapids included. The pipelines were built, for the most part, under the representation that natural gas would be available to consumers at a regulated, reasonable rate. Municipalities, cities, and consumers in cities, supported this pipeline development in reliance on these representations. In city by city, Grand Rapids included, thousands upon thousands of people changed over their equipment to heat and cook with natural gas.

Consumers, including those in Grand Rapids, are now absolutely dependent on those who sell natural gas in interstate commerce. They are as dependent upon natural gas as a public service commodity, as they are on water and electricity. Heating units, stoves, hot water systems, etc. have been converted to this fuel at a cost of millions of dollars to the consumer; and gas is the only fuel which can be utilized by and in this equipment.

Furthermore, distributors, e. g. Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., are committed by contract to buy from the pipeline which comes a long distance in interstate commerce. Unless, therefore, the Federal Power Commission has the right to control that initial price in the field, no effective control exists. The only choice open to the consumers, and there are thousands of them in Grand Rapids, would be either to pay the gouging price, or to use another fuel. Everyone within the sound of my voice will understand the cost to him of reconverting back to coal or oil.

This is no choice at all. We, who have installed costly gas equipment with which to heat and cook, know that the cost of changing back to another fuel measured in terms of inconvenience and time, and of money, is prohibitive, and yet this is exactly what faces every user of gas in the city of Grand Rapids if the Harris bill is enacted into law by the Congress.

In terms of money the effect of removing the consumer protection if the Harris bill becomes law, is illustrated in a pending rate increase in the city of Denver. There the producers asked that the field or wellhead price be substituted for regulation by the Federal Power Commission which now exists. According to the figures presented there, this change means an increase in rates to consumers in Denver of $4 million extra per year; and the company there claims that the field price is not as high as it should be.

Now Denver is a city with 415,000 population. It is an American city just like Grand Rapids is. Figuring the population of Grand Rapids at 180,000 and using simple arithmetic, if the increase to Denver is $4 million each year, then, if the Harris bill becomes law, Grand Rapids users would have to pay for natural gas in addition to the present prices, the sum of $1,720,000 extra each and every year thereafter.

Imagine $1,700,000 extra in gas rates each and every year. Here the city commission is trying to save a dollar here and a dollar there. We are trying to save a million dollars on our sewage works which is a one time capital investment. Yet if the Harris bill becomes law it will mean over $1,700,000 extra in just gas rates every year to most of you within the sound of my voice. And think of the increase in cost of articles in which gas is used to manufacture. That figure could be greater than $1,700,000.

I should state here that this implies no criticism of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. They, too, would be helpless if the Harris bill becomes law. They would simply have to pay the price of gas whatever is charged at the wellhead, and they would have to pass that price increase on to you the consumer.

So that you may know the arguments used on the other side I want to state and analyze them briefly. The claim of the proponents of the Harris bill is that there are over 4,000 natural gas producing companies and that if the Government will just let them alone, competition will set in, and with free enterprise, prices will settle down.

What are the facts? True, there are over 4,000 natural gas producers. But most of them are so small that they produce very little gas and at the most only enough to supply one little surrounding community. Of these thousands of producers 7 (not 70, not 700, but 7) mostly big oil companies, produce one-third of all the natural gas used in this country and less than 100 of these companies produce 85 percent of all the natural gas used in this entire Nation. All the remaining 3,900 or more companies produce only 15 percent of the gas.

Nor is that the whole story. For example, 4 or 5 big companies produce our automobiles. But if you don't like an automobile you can, by simple choice, buy a competing product at about the same or even a lower price. You cannot do that with gas. Gas comes through a pipeline from Oklahoma or Texas or Louisiana, and once that pipeline is laid it would cost millions to change. In other words, there is no room for maneuverability or choice in the buying of natural gas.

Thus in the light of facts, the illusion of competition in the gas industry vanishes. The fact is that the natural gas industry is a monopoly and not a competitive industry.

I have stated before that there is a well-organized lobby now driving in Congress to scuttle and sabotage the protection which you have. Congressional committee hearings are now being carried on and there is real danger that the Harris bill will be enacted into law.

But there is no lobby as powerful as the people, if they make themselves heard.

It is imperative that you communicate with your representatives in Congress at the earliest possible time. Write them letters or post cards, or wire, or telephone your Senators and your Congressman in Washington, D. C. Let these Senators and Congressmen know, in your own words, that you are opposed to the Harris bill or anything like it. And watch how these Senators and Representatives vote in this.

You should also write to the President of the United States and ask him to use the influence of his high office to prevent the enactment of the Harris bill; and you should ask the President that if the Harris bill is passed by the Congress, that he veto it.

Protect and defend yourselves from the serious menace of the Harris bill. Write and get your friends to write to your Senators and Congressmen. Do it now without delay because the bill is now being considered.

INCREASED SUGAR QUOTAS—RESOLUTION OF KENNEDY (MINN.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Kennedy, Minn., Chamber of Commerce, relating to increased sugar quotas.

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

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural life of the Red River Valley of the North; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity

per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of the valley: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the secretary of the Kennedy Chamber of Commerce is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Minnesota; and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by the Kennedy Chamber of Commerce April 13, 1955.

ROBERT PETERSBURG,
President.
WILLIS LILLIQUIST,
Secretary.

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted at the annual meeting on March 26, 1955, of the Isanti County Cooperative Association, endorsing a long-range permanent farm program of not less than 90 percent of parity, and supporting the family-sized farm.

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

ISANTI COUNTY COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Cambridge, Minn., March 31, 1955.

At the annual meeting of the Isanti County Cooperative Association, which was held March 26, 1955, the following resolution was brought in by Roman Jaloszynski, Cambridge, Route No. 1, and recommended for passing by the resolutions committee consisting of Hilmer N. Johnson, chairman, Isanti, Route No. 2; Linden Erickson, Cambridge, Route No. 2; Edwin Dobe, Dalbo; and John Spier, Bethel, Route No. 1. This was duly seconded and passed unanimously by the 300 members present. Copies of the resolution to be sent to Senator THYE, Senator HUMPHREY, and Congressman WIER.

Resolution as follows:

"Since net farm income has fallen off about 30 percent since 1948, while nonfarm income has increased about 43 percent since 1948, no amount of scrambling of figures can convince us we are better off now under flexible price supports than we were before. In view of these facts we submit the following resolution:

"Calling upon the President and the Congress to work out a long-range permanent farm program on all commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity—produced by the family-sized farm (a family farm can be described as one of which the family lives on the land, makes all the major decisions, and supplies the major part of the labor).

"We further resolve that the Government stop giving aid to the rich hobby farmers and the large cooperation farms who really produce the surpluses if there are any, and that the Government provide enough money through low-interest credit for the farm program, CCC, crop insurance, REA, SCS, etc."

ISANTI COUNTY COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
RAYMOND STOECKEL,
Secretary.

ZIMMERMAN, MINN.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN INDIAN PROPERTY TO CITY OF PIPESTONE, MINN.—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a letter I received from the Pipestone Civic and Commerce Association, and a copy of a resolution adopted by the Pipestone City Council, requesting that property belonging to the Indian school, and not needed for the proper enlargement of Shrine Park, be deeded to the city of Pipestone for the sum of $1.

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

PIPESTONE CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,
Pipestone, Minn., March 28, 1955.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the request of Lawrence Cunningham, State representative, Pipestone County, we are forwarding a copy of a resolution adopted March 17 by the Pipestone City Council.

This resolution has been heartily endorsed by the Pipestone Civic and Commerce Association and the Pipestone Community Council.

Very truly yours,

ROY E. SMITH,
Secretary.

Whereas the Pipestone Indian school building and building area and adjacent lands belonging to the Federal Government lie contiguous to the city of Pipestone; and

Whereas said Indian school buildings have been vacant for some time; and

Whereas it appears that said buildings, building site, and any other lands connected with said Indian school not deemed necessary or desired to enlarge and improve the national park adjacent thereto are no longer needed by the Federal Government and that it is possible that said property will be deeded to the State of Minnesota for the sum of $1; and

Whereas it appears that the State of Minnesota does not desire to have said property for use by said State: Be it

Resolved, That the city of Pipestone desires to have said buildings, building site, and any other real property belonging to said Indian school not necessary for the proper enlargement of Shrine Park deeded to the city of Pipestone for the sum of $1 with no restrictions involved and that the city of Pipestone will accept such transfer for which it will pay the consideration of $1.

THE CASE OF COMMISSIONER CORSI—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Congress Club of Kings County, a Republican organization in the Fourth Assembly District, County of Kings, State of New York, with headquarters at 694 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. I ask that the entire resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

Whereas the Congress Club of Kings County, regular Republican organization, since its incorporation over 50 years ago, of an area known as the Fourth Assembly District, County of Kings, State of New York, and active in Republican affairs and campaigns throughout the years of its existence, has been and still is interested in the welfare of the Republican Party and the enrolled and active members thereof; and

Whereas the Congress Club believes in party loyalty, the principles of the Republican Party, and good government by competent and forthright individuals of good character and attainments; and

Whereas the Honorable Edward Corsi has been a lifelong loyal Republican who has served the city, State and Nation with honor and distinction, and has been a proponent of good government for the benefit of all, irrespective of race, creed, religion, or ancestry; and

Whereas Commissioner Corsi has held numerous public offices, including delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1936; Commissioner of Naturalization and Immigration, under Presidents Hoover and Roosevelt; director of home relief and deputy commissioner of public welfare under Mayor La Guardia, chairman of the industrial board and industrial commissioner of New York State under Governor Dewey, and Special Assistant to the Secretary of State under President Eisenhower, without reflection upon his honesty or integrity for more than 25 years; and

Whereas Commissioner Corsi has also been the Republican candidate for such other offices as United States Senator, mayor of the city of New York, and councilman of the city of New York; and as one of the standard bearers of his party has actively participated and worked unselfishly in all campaigns in behalf of the party in the city, State, and Nation, being instrumental in establishing and building up many organizations and campaign committees throughout the years to further the cause of Republicanism and good government; and

Whereas Commissioner Corsi has been one of the outstanding progressive and liberal Republican leaders of the present generation, and has helped in furthering legislation, and taken other actions, both in his official capacity and as a member of the party, to advance the social welfare of the inhabitants of the city, State, and Nation; and

Whereas the Congress Club has learned with deep shock of the great injustice that has come to Commissioner Corsi through the recent action taken by the Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, a fellow Republican and an influential leader in the party, in dismissing him from his post as Special Assistant Secretary of State without opportunity to carry out the humanitarian task assigned to him; and

Whereas this dismissal by Secretary Dulles was without just cause and apparently motivated primarily by the actions of a Democratic Member of Congress who leveled unjustified and unsubstantiated charges against Commissioner Corsi; and who did not afford him an opportunity to be heard in his own defense of such charges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress Club of Kings County resents the action of Secretary of State Dulles as an injustice to Commissioner Corsi, a loyal, competent, and intelligent veteran of the public service and Republican of the highest caliber; and be it further

Resolved, That this dismissal be condemned and repudiated by the people of the city, State, and Nation and by the President of the United States, the New York State Republican Committee and the National Republican Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the leaders of the Republican Party take appropriate steps to correct

this deplorable action which is both detrimental to the Republican Party, the Nation, and an affront to the basic standards of human decency; and be it further

Resolved, That such action be taken as necessary to prevent any similar unfortunate future occurrence in the best interest of the country and the party.

Mr. LANGER. I wish particularly to invite the attention of Senators to the last four paragraphs of the resolution:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress Club of Kings County resents the action of Secretary of State Dulles as an injustice to Commissioner Corsi, a loyal, competent, and intelligent veteran of the public service and Republican of the highest calibre; and be it further

Resolved, That this dismissal be condemned and repudiated by the people of the city, State, and Nation, and by the President of the United States, the New York State Republican Committee and the National Republican Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the leaders of the Republican Party take appropriate steps to correct this deplorable action which is both detrimental to the Republican Party, the Nation, and an affront to the basic standards of human decency; and be it further

Resolved, That such action be taken as necessary to prevent any similar unfortunate future occurrence in the best interest of the country and the party.

I was asked to present this resolution by the Republicans of Brooklyn, N. Y. I am well acquainted with the Republican leaders in Brooklyn, although I have not seen them for some years. I submit the resolution entirely without prejudice. I promised to submit it, and I therefore send it to the desk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 26. A bill for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor (Rept. No. 140);

S. 29. A bill for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger (Rept. No. 141);

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Selma Rivlin (Rept. No. 143);

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen (Rept. No. 144);

S. 89. A bill for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers (Rept. No. 145);

S. 90. A bill for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman (Rept. No. 146);

S. 91. A bill for the relief of Luzia Cox (Rept. No. 147);

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen (Rept. No. 148);

S. 94. A bill for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius (Rept. No. 149);

S. 95. A bill for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters) (Rept. No. 150);

S. 99. A bill for the relief of Xanthi Georges Kimporozou (Rept. No. 151);

S. 100. A bill for the relief of Hermine Lorenz (Rept. No. 152);

S. 118. A bill for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer (Rept. No. 153);

S. 119. A bill for the relief of David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea (Rept. No. 154);

S. 120. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos (Rept. No. 155);

S. 121. A bill for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch (Rept. No. 156);

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek (Rept. No. 157);

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ribeiro (Rept. No. 158);

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Borys Naumenko (Rept. No. 159);

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski (Rept. No. 160);

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Olivia M. Orcuich (Rept. No. 161);

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro (Rept. No. 162);

S. 238. A bill for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto) (Rept. No. 163);

S. 283. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger (Rept. No. 164);

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen (Rept. No. 165);

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela (Rept. No. 166);

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael) (Rept. No. 167);

S. 341. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti (Rept. No. 168);

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sroka (Rept. No. 169);

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri (Rept. No. 170);

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Lucy Personius (Rept. No. 171);

S. 449. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas (Rept. No. 172);

S. 467. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura (Rept. No. 173);

S. 473. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski and his family (Rept. No. 174);

S. 570. A bill for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo (Rept. No. 175);

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov (Rept. No. 176);

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller (Rept. No. 177);

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Alick Bhark (Rept. No. 178);

S. 633. A bill for the relief of certain alien sheepherders (Rept. No. 179);

S. 644. A bill for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philp (Rept. No. 180);

S. 650. A bill for the relief of Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis (Rept. No. 181);

S. 676. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo (Rept. No. 182);

S. 707. A bill for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas (Rept. No. 183);

S. 713. A bill for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni (Rept. No. 184);

S. 714. A bill for the relief of Alfio Ferrara (Rept. No. 185);

S. 760. A bill for the relief of Pietro Meduri (Rept. No. 186);

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim (Rept. No. 187);

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Jacob Grynberg (Rept. No. 188);

S. 892. A bill for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez (Rept. No. 189);

S. 1014. A bill for the relief of Henry Duncan (Rept. No. 190);

S. 1044. A bill for the relief of Edward Naarits (Rept. No. 191);

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra (Rept. No. 192);

S. 1197. A bill for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic (Rept. No. 193);

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni and his wife and child (Rept. No. 194); and

S. 1367. A bill for the relief of Antonio Jacoe (Rept. No. 195).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 36. A bill for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez (Rept. No. 196);

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand (Rept. No. 197);

S. 236. A bill for the relief of Johanna Schmid (Rept. No. 198);

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic (Rept. No. 199);

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Priska Anne Kary (Rept. No. 200);

S. 758. A bill for the relief of Marion S. Quirk (Rept. No. 201);

S. 844. A bill for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani) (Rept. No. 202); and

S. 974. A bill for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez (Rept. No. 203).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiadis; with amendments (Rept. No. 204).

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

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to designate the first day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day (Rept. No. 139).

OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION IN OR NEAR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. REPT. NO. 142)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I report favorably an original bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, and I submit a report thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, reported by Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

FUNDS FOR EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 92), which was placed on the Calendar as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from May 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to

make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads 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.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of May 1, 1955.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii; and

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Louie W. Strum, deceased.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 1697. A bill to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life; and

S. 1698. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Takis Yuanidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1699. A bill for the relief of Albert Woolson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1700. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Silvonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1702. A bill to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

S. 1703. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947 (ch. 433, 61 Stat. 715), as amended, to increase the number of professional and scientific positions authorized for the Department of Defense; and

S. 1704. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the establishment of the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1705. A bill for the relief of George Paul Khouri; and

S. 1706. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and his wife Efrossini Saintoufis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1707. A bill for the relief of Vasil Theodosovitch Stepanchuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1708. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M. Kersh; and

S. 1709. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia S. Prims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1710. A bill providing for the designation of a highway between Echo Junction, Utah, and Ogden, Utah, as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1711. A bill to grant career appointments to certain employees in positions under temporary or indefinite appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 1712. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1713. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1714. A bill to define "wheat unfit for human consumption" for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG):

S. 1715. A bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Air Station, Houma, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1716. A bill for the relief of Cheuk Wa Leung and his wife, Camilla Ying Ling Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1717. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to union welfare funds; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1718. A bill to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 1719. A bill for the relief of Zanis Rigos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1720. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the county of Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1721. A bill for the relief of Renate Dressel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1722. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he reported the above bill, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1723. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished contribution to medicine made by Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AWARD TO DR. JONAS E. SALK, DISCOVERER OF POLIO VACCINE

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 1697) to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I have asked for the floor today to speak briefly on a matter which I feel is of importance to the people of our country.

The people of America and of the whole world have been told during the last few days of a tremendous advance in medicine. The discovery that has been made ranks in importance with such milestones in medical history as the development of the vaccine against smallpox, Lister's antiseptic procedure, the inoculation against diphtheria, insulin, the sulfa drugs, and the antibiotics.

Inasmuch as my own great State of Michigan and the University of Michigan made great contributions to this historic event, I think it fitting that I should make some remarks about it, and that I should introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill to make my remarks effective.

I am referring to the discovery and the successful tests of the Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis. It is the opinion of the medical profession that this is one of the great steps forward in man's steady march toward victory over disease and deformity. Polio is a particularly dramatic and frightening malady, for it strikes almost without warning; in many instances it kills or cripples, and its incidence is particularly high among our children.

Our own late illustrious President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was a victim of the disease. Only by indomitable courage was he able to adjust his life to its cruel damage.

Now a great scientist has found a way to prevent the disease on a nationwide scale. Soon his discovery will be available not only to the people of America, but to the people of all the world. This is far better, it seems to me, than the atomic bomb, which speaks of destruction. Here is a profound discovery that speaks only of healing and of peace. It is our gift to the world.

But I do not think the American people would wish to be accused of ingratitude to the scientist who made this great discovery. As Dr. Jonas Salk, himself said on a television program on the anniversary of Franklin D. Roosevelt's death, "You can't patent the sun." And so Dr. Salk, in the great tradition of the highest level of ethics of the medical profession, gains nothing material from his great discovery. Therefore, I propose in the bill which I am now introducing, that Dr. Jonas Salk be given an award of $10,000 a year throughout his natural life. This is not to be considered in the light of a payment for his services, but as an award from a grateful people to a great scientist, so that Dr. Salk may be removed from the anxieties and disturbances of seeking a livelihood, and may be able to continue to devote his great talents to the service of mankind in dignity and in peace.

The manufacture of the Salk vaccine appears certain to ensure earnings of many, many millions of dollars to the pharmaceutical manufacturers who produce it. It will mean the addition of important revenue to the Treasury of the United States through the corporation income tax. In good conscience, we can do no less than see that an award which will give the great discoverer financial security shall be made.

This bill to give an award to Dr. Salk, if enacted, will be something new in our history, or at least so I am told. It seems to me that our Nation can well afford to do honor in a practical way to Dr. Salk, and in so doing to honor all the selfless scientists and physicians who make great sacrifices for the well-being of all of us.

ALBERT WOOLSON

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I shall make a very brief statement in connection with the introduction of a bill for the relief of Albert Woolson.

Albert Woolson, the last surviving Union veteran of the Civil War, who celebrated on February 11 his 108th birthday, has incurred considerable personal expenses in connection with his recent hospitalization. Mr. Woolson, unfortunately, has now been compelled to return to the hospital, which will involve additional personal expenses for his care.

As soon as I learned that Mr. Woolson, a Union Army veteran, one of the oldest citizens of our Nation, was not qualified to receive outpatient care from the Veterans' Administration or any assistance from the Veterans' Administration, I proceeded to obtain all of the details concerning Mr. Woolson's problem.

Mr. Woolson is the embodiment of those elements in our national character which are responsible for the greatness of our Nation. He is the remaining participant on the Union side in one of the most important events in our Nation's history. I feel that in recognition of the unique position in which he resides at this time, the American people would wish to assist in the financial difficulties confronting Mr. Woolson as a result of his illness and hospitalization. The bill I am introducing will authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the hospital and medical-care expenses incurred by Mr. Woolson, as a result of his illness.

Mr. President, this veteran does not come under the act providing for outpatient medical care. Therefore, I am introducing this bill, for which I request appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1699) for the relief of Albert Woolson, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEFINITION OF WHEAT UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to define wheat unfit for human consuption for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared for me by Harker T. Stanton, counsel of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, pertaining to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1714) to define wheat unfit for human consumption for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The memorandum presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

This responds further to your request for legislative suggestions arising from the committee's hearings on the importation of wheat classified as unfit for human consumption.

Attached are (1) the letter of June 24, 1954, from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury to the chairman of the committee; (2) the draft bill referred to in the Acting Secretary's letter; and (3) a redraft of this bill prepared for introduction should you desire to use it.

The redraft does not differ in substance from the draft submitted by the Acting Secretary and its purpose is to clarify certain provisions, particularly with respect to the application of existing reciprocal trade agreements and the existing proclamation under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. An additional consideration in preparing the redraft has been to create the possibility that it might be referred to this committee for which it was prepared and which has shown so much interest in the problem. However, since it affects customs as well as agricultural laws, it should, under the Constitution, originate in the House.

I have spoken to Mr. Higman of the Customs Bureau about this several times within the last few days. He advised that their present regulation appears to be working satisfactorily. This legislation may therefore not be needed, but I thought you would probably like to consider it as it was prepared at the committee's request. If you should decide to introduce this, you might want to consider whether other members of the committee might be interested in joining with you.

Respectfully,

HARKER T. STANTON,
Counsel.

MARCH 31, 1955.

REVESTMENT OF CERTAIN INTERESTS IN LAND AT UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION, HOUMA, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Air Station, Houma, La. I ask unanimous consent that a joint statement, prepared by me and my colleague, regarding the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1715) to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Air Station, Houma, La., introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The joint statement presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF SENATORS ELLENDER AND LONG

We are introducing legislation to revest in certain individuals, the town of Houma, La., and the Parish of Terrebonne the mineral and royalty interests underlying lands formerly belonging to them and now comprising the United States Naval Air Station at Houma, La.

In 1943 the Navy filed condemnation proceedings to acquire 1,700 acres of land upon which to establish a lighter-than-air station near Houma. Some 640 acres of this land belonged to South Coast Corp. and the balance to those on whose behalf this bill is being introduced.

The filing of the 1943 condemnation suit constituted a taking of the title of the lands involved; the only issue left open was the fixing of just compensation, as required by the Constitution. As a matter of practice, the price to be paid could have been left to a jury or negotiated by agreement. The Government and the landowners decided to negotiate.

Southwest Louisiana is rich in natural resources; the oil and gas potential in that area is common knowledge, and was such in 1943. The question of reservation of mineral rights is, and for some time has been, the subject of specific discussion in connection with practically every land transaction in this area. This is particularly true in Terrebonne Parish. As a matter of fact, the property of one of the landowners in this instance was under oil lease prior to and up to

the time of the condemnation proceeding, and as early as 1936 some of the parties had sold royalty interests from about 400 acres of the land in question. Accordingly, during the 1943 negotiations, the landowners repeatedly told the Navy representatives that they desired to retain their mineral rights. Some of them made the request in writing. All of them were informed that the Navy insisted on the mineral rights because the Navy demanded a full and complete title. Open meetings were held and similar representations were publicly made to the landowners and others by representatives of the Navy.

It must be remembered that the war was on. Houma is only a short distance from the Gulf of Mexico, where the submarine menace was very great. As patriotic American citizens and in order to facilitate the war effort through the rapid installation of the base near Houma, these landowners did not insist on their demands that they be permitted to retain their mineral rights, believing, as they had been told by the Navy representatives, that such rights were needed and that their acquisition was required under existing Navy policy. They assumed, as they had a right to assume in view of the declared policy of the Navy, that all landowners were being treated alike with respect to their mineral rights.

Only last year, however, these landowners learned that their Government had broken faith with them. They discovered in 1954 that about a year after construction of the base began, the Government revested or returned to one landowner, the South Coast Corp., all mineral rights under 640 acres of the property of that corporation which had been taken in the very same condemnation suit, involving a total of 1,700 acres. Moreover, the South Coast Corp. received an average compensation of $120 per acre, while the other landowners, whose land was generally of equal value, received an average of $99 per acre.

Mr. Harvey W. Hillyard, who was officer in charge of construction of the base, has this to say concerning the unequal treatment of the landowners:

"I am at a loss to explain the apparent discrimination since my firm impression during my duty period in Houma was that the Navy desired a policy of fairness and equality of treatment to all of the landowners. I attempted to reflect this general attitude and policy in my personal relations with them. The failure to return mineral rights to all owners alike is, in my opinion, an inequitable situation which should be remedied if at all possible. I personally recall the full cooperation these people gave me as an individual and as a representative of the Navy, and I am embarrassed that the confidence they undoubtedly placed in my personal and official assurances of just and equitable treatment has been compromised."

Equality of treatment of citizens by the sovereign is a fundamental principle of our democratic form of government. Whatever the explanation, the bald fact is that the landowners in whose behalf the bills are introduced received an average of $99 per acre for their surface rights, and the South Coast Corp., for the surface rights of exactly similar land, received $120 per acre. These landowners, without being paid any compensation therefor, lost their mineral rights, whereas those of the South Coast Corp. were revested in that corporation. The purpose of these bills is to right this wrong.

In this connection, it should be noted that Senator LONG introduced a bill on January 26 which would prevent similar situations arising in the future. His bill, S. 748, provides that the United States shall not acquire any mineral rights or interest in land acquired for public purposes, unless (a) the acquisition of such mineral interest is necessary to serve the purpose for which the land is being acquired; (b) the national security requires that the United States own all right, title, and interest, including mineral interest, in and to the land being acquired; or (c) the use to which the United States intends to put such land renders impractical its development for mineral purposes.

Unfortunately the legislation proposed by Senator LONG could only apply to instances arising in the future, but it is entirely consistent with the circumstances which justify relief in connection with the specific private bill offered.

UNION HEALTH AND WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to modernize and strengthen our laws with respect to union health and welfare funds.

I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1717) to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to union welfare funds, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the really great advances which collective bargaining has made in recent years has been the development of health and welfare fund provisions in union-management agreements. Although these provisions are widespread, I think it is fair to say that unions and management are still experimenting with the kinds of provisions that offer the best protection for the lowest cost.

Abuses have crept into the administration of these programs. These abuses have taken the form of shady or unethical practices engaged in by a few insurance company officials, brokers, union officers, and employers. In terms of the magnitude of the health and welfare schemes, these alleged shady or unethical practices have been limited to a relatively few situations. This fact, however, must not blind us to the need for dealing with the problem in a constructive way.

The bill has as its objective the advisability of making all financial affairs and transactions of these funds public knowledge.

I introduced a similar bill in the 83d Congress. As we all know, hearings are under way in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in which the so-called health and welfare activities of union management agreements are being investigated.

We have learned through experience that disclosure is one of the most effective weapons against dishonesty and corruption. My bill, therefore, requests that the following information with regard to union health and welfare funds must be made public every year:

First. The assets and liabilities of any trust fund established as a union health and welfare fund.

Second. Payments made into such fund and the sources of such payments.

Third. Disbursements made from such fund during such year for payment of benefits or for other purposes, including salaries and other expenses of administering such fund.

Fourth. A list of any investments made by the fund.

Fifth. The amounts paid to officers, employees, or agents of the fund as commissions, fees, gratuities, or otherwise, by any insurance company doing business with the fund, or by an officer, employee, or agent of such insurance company.

My bill also would provide standards for investing moneys from union health and welfare funds on a par with standards established by State laws for insurance companies. This means that no moneys may be invested unless the laws of the State in which the principal office of the union fund is located allow insurance companies to invest in those same securities or investments.

The safeguarding of the financial integrity of union health and welfare funds, and/or employer health and welfare funds, must, of course, in the final analysis rest on the States. Nevertheless, there is an important area for the Federal Government activity in this field. It is to help the Federal Government live up to its responsibilities that I introduce this proposed legislation.

I do not pretend to be an expert in this highly complex subject, but my experience during the 82d Congress as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations leads me to suggest that the following factors be taken into account in any kind of public policy which we develop:

First. We ought to be concerned with the malpractices and not with casting a rigid mold to which all plans would have to adhere. We should allow flexibility and experimentation in collective bargaining.

Second. We ought to explore the extent to which malpractices are illegal under existing State statutes and to see that these statutes are enforced to the hilt.

Third. We ought to be certain that we do not subject collectively bargained health and welfare programs, operating on an interstate basis, to a crazy quilt of conflicting State legislation.

It is my hope, therefore, that the Congress will proceed with intelligence and calm reason based on experience to formulate legislation affecting the health and welfare funds which are established as a result of collective bargaining. There is no room for rancor and vindictiveness in considering this very complicated fiduciary relationship area. I stand ready to join with my colleagues in giving this very serious question careful study and consideration.

The Senate is indeed fortunate to have an energetic subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee now studying the overall problem of

union health and welfare funds. In the last Congress that subcommittee which was under the Chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the subcommittee is now being chaired by the learned and able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. This leadership insures a thorough and equitable study which will provide the basis for intelligent, statesmanlike legislative action.

I am delighted that both the A. F. of L. and the CIO are themselves devoting their energies so as to help the Congress arrive at a sensible solution to the problem. They are certainly working energetically to resolve the problem through self-discipline, and I commend them for that action.

I introduce the bill in the hope that it will provide a central point or a set of standards around which the subcommittee can conduct its investigations and hearings. My bill applies not only to funds which are administered by union officials, but also to funds which are administered exclusively by employers when those funds have been established in collective bargaining agreements.

MEDAL IN RECOGNITION OF DR. JONAS SALK DISCOVERER OF POLIO VACCINE

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the entire country has honored and paid homage to Dr. Jonas Salk for his antipolio vaccine. We of Michigan are particularly proud because the final phases of his great work were conducted at the University of Michigan. Therefore, in recognition of this notable achievement, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished contribution to medicine made by Dr. Jonas Salk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished contribution to medicine made by Dr. Jonas Salk, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

STUDY OF EXTENT TO WHICH OFFICERS OF ANTICRIME CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS MAY BE REQUIRED TO DIVULGE CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 91); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas there are now in active operation throughout the Nation about 25 privately financed and operated anticrime civic organizations, devoted to the gathering of information, statistics, data, and evidence relating to law enforcement; and to reporting to the public and appropriate public officials any indications of lax or inefficient law enforcement; and

Whereas these anticrime civic organizations are generally composed of responsible and reputable citizens motivated by patriotic efforts in behalf of clean government and civic decency, who voluntarily dedicate their time and money to this commendable public cause, and who usually employ capable and well-qualified directors of investigations who are often former FBI agents; and

Whereas these anticrime civic organizations are endeavoring on their own volition and resources to further the objectives outlined and recommended in the 1951 Senate Crime Investigation Committee report for citizen participation in, and public insistence for, high standards of community law enforcement; and

Whereas the national public interest and welfare critically require the continuing and active support of all respectable and law-abiding citizens throughout the Nation, if the rising menace of crime is to be suppressed and kept under control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government should encourage, and aid by all reasonable and proper means, the continued active cooperation of citizens and functioning of civic anticrime committees; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate Judiciary Committee, or an appropriate subcommittee thereof, is hereby directed to conduct an immediate study and report promptly to the Senate body as to the extent to which the officers and directors of such anticrime civic organizations should or should not be required to divulge confidential sources of information, except in cases involving treason, where such confidential information was obtained by agreement that its source would be kept confidential, but wherein the substance of such information has been duly reported to an appropriate public official.

DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRODUCTION OF MANGANESE-BEARING ORES AND CONCENTRATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, amendments, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 920) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States. The amendment would authorize the extension of our Government's manganese purchase program to the Minnesota Cuyuna Range.

There is a national self-interest in developing practical and economical processes of concentrating manganese ore from the very large low-grade deposits which can be found in the Minnesota Cuyuna Range. Nothing could be more important for the security of the United States than to develop a self-supporting process of beneficiating low-grade manganiferous ores. The evidence is clear from all the Government agencies who have studied the problem that the supply of manganese in the United States is limited, and that it is all-important to make our country as independent as possible of foreign-produced manganese and the hazards which attend such imports at times of national emergency.

Our Government has recognized this problem and in fact through its loan program helped to establish a manganese pilot plant at Ironton, Minn. This pilot plant has demonstrated the economic feasibility of beneficiating low-grade ore to usable products.

S. 920, which is now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was introduced on the assumption that our national security demands a continuation of the manganese stockpile program. Based on that assumption, it appears clear to me that a depot should be established at Ironton or Crosby, Minn., so that we may as a nation make use of the low-grade ore to be found in the Cuyuna Range in northern Minnesota. It is estimated that anywhere from 150,000 to 200,000 tons of ore per year could be made available from northern Minnesota if a purchase depot could be established in that area to encourage operators to open manganese deposits and produce the units for stockpile.

It is with that purpose in mind that my amendment is submitted.

Later, Mr. President, I shall testify before the committee concerning the amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

At the end of the bill:

"SEC. (a) Paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended by inserting before 'wood flour' the following: 'hardboard, whether or not provided for elsewhere in this act, and whether or not cut, stamped, or shaped for boxes or other articles, 33⅓ percent ad valorem.'

"(b) For the purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945, for hardboard provided for in paragraph 412 of such act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be deemed to have been 33⅓ percent ad valorem: *Provided, however*, That so long as any foreign trade agreement that shall have heretofore been entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and any amendments thereto, that is applicable "to manufactures of wood or bark, or of which wood or bark is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for" in paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that are not specifically described in said foreign trade agreement, shall remain in force and effect, the rate of duty for hardboard provided for in paragraph 412 of such act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be 16⅔ percent ad valorem, with like effect as though that rate had been included in said foreign trade agreement, excepting that said rate shall be subject to being increased or decreased hereafter by foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to amendments to said section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930,

as amended, or other statutes that shall authorize the President to proclaim modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or additional import restrictions, or the continuance for minimum periods of existing customs or excise treatment of any article. Such hardboard, when the product of any nation or area designated by the President pursuant to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, shall be subject to a duty of 33⅓ percent ad valorem.

"(c) The amendment made by this section shall be effective with respect to hardboard, whether or not provided for elsewhere in the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and whether or not cut, stamped, or shaped for boxes or other articles, entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on and after the 30th day following the date of enactment of this act."

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. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, at Indianapolis, Ind., on April 16, 1955.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him before Society of Business Magazine Editors, in Washington, D. C., on April 7, 1955.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Addresses delivered before annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association by Senators DUFF and DIRKSEN; and Representatives RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, and CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; also an address delivered by himself upon the same occasion.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

A report to the citizens of New York broadcast by him on April 17, 1955.

Address delivered by Senator MCNAMARA on the State of Israel bond drive, delivered at San Francisco, Calif., on April 2, 1955.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF JOHN T. WILLIAMS TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of John T. Williams, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee for 4-year term, vice William Ernest Smith, resigned, to file with the committee in writing on or before Monday, April 25, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN M. TASHIRO TO BE JUDGE OF THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of Benjamin M. Tashiro, of Hawaii, to be judge of the Fifth Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, for the term of 4 years, vice Philip L. Rice, elevated, to file with the committee in writing on or before Monday, April 25, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE LEGAL EFFECT OF CERTAIN TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 27, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee by Monday, April 25, 1955, so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]; the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]; and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

MARKETING QUOTA FOR DOMESTIC BEET AND MAINLAND CANE SUGAR—LETTERS FROM GOVERNOR FREEMAN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I received today from Gov. Orville L. Freeman, of Minnesota, together with a letter the Governor wrote to the President.

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

ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 1, 1955.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As Governor of Minnesota I want to commend your efforts in behalf of our domestic sugar beet producers and add my support to the appeal of our growers for an increase in marketing quotas for domestic beet and mainland cane sugar.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have today sent to President Eisenhower informing him of my concern. I want him to know that Minnesota solidly backs up the personal presentation you made to the President in behalf of our sugar beet industry.

The Minnesota State Federation of Labor and the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce are both supporting the request of our Red River Valley sugar beet producers, presenting a solid front of farmers, organized labor, and business interests of our State in behalf of our domestic sugar industry.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor.

APRIL 1, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Extension of the Sugar Act with amendments permitting domestic beet and cane growers to share in the annual increases in consumption of sugar and also a special marketing allowance for 1955 and 1956 to aid in disposing of surplus domestic sugar is urgently needed.

I know that the problems of the domestic sugar industry have been brought to your attention and are now being studied. I, therefore, will review only a few facts that have brought about the present sugar situation.

When the Sugar Act was amended in 1951 Cuba was granted temporarily a substantial share of increasing consumption, to enable her to dispose of surplus sugar resulting from overproduction following the war period. At this time it was pointed out by representatives of domestic areas that because of improvement in farming practices and increase in production per acre that the time was approaching when consideration would have to be given to increases in domestic quotas. That time has arrived.

In my State substantial increases in acreages are needed for the Red River Valley and two smaller areas. Sugar beets is one of our most needed and dependable rotation crops. I am therefore deeply concerned by the requirement to reduce acreage in 1955 and until such time as marketing quotas permit us to dispose of surplus sugar on hand.

I therefore most respectfully ask you to give all possible assistance in bringing about the prompt extension of the Sugar Act with an increase in marketing quota beginning in 1955 for domestic beet and mainland cane sugar.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor.

MILK FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for many years I have been interested in having made available to the members of our Armed Forces a maximum quantity of healthy, nutritious milk. I have prepared a statement on the subject. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement prepared by me printed in the body of the RECORD, as well as a copy of a letter from Mr. Henry A. DuFlon, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, addressed to me.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

For many years I have been interested in making available to the members of our Armed Forces a maximum amount of healthy, nutritious milk. This is a part of my overall effort to make available nature's best product for the school lunch program, the patients in our Veterans' Administration hospitals, and through every other channel where Uncle Sam can appropriately take action of making milk available.

Recently, I brought to the attention of Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson the importance of having all United States Armed Forces installations alert to the advisability of encouraging the installation of automatic vending machines to dispense milk.

Throughout our country today, wholly aside from Armed Forces installations, there are some three-quarters of a million vending machines dispensing cola and other type beverages, while there are only around 16,000

machines dispensing milk. Obviously, therefore, there is tremendous room for expansion of milk vending machines, and one area for doing so is among the Armed Forces.

I was pleased to hear from Mr. Henry A. DuFlon, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense that "as a result of (my) inquiry, we have given additional emphasis to increasing opportunities for sale of milk in Armed Forces exchanges."

Sales to members of the Armed Forces constitute, of course, but one of innumerable phases toward the end of increased dairy consumption, but it is an important phase, and I am hoping that the Department of Defense acts comprehensively on it.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is in further reply to your letter of March 10, 1955, relative to installation of automatic milk vending machines in Armed Forces cantonments.

The importance of making milk available to members of the armed services from the standpoint of both health and morale is recognized by the Defense Department. Vending machines dispensing packaged milk are authorized for use in Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps exchanges. At the present time a considerable number of dispensing machines are in operation on a contract basis.

The placing of milk vending machines on an installation is accomplished through the execution of an agreement between the exchange and the vending-machine operators. Such agreements are negotiated and awarded by the individual installation commander.

Any concern that is interested in installing vending machines dispensing packaged milk at military installations should contact the local exchange officer, as the requirement for this type of machine varies by installation.

The contents of your letter have been brought to the attention of appropriate officials in the services, and information on the availability of vending machines for the sale of milk is being sent to all installation commanders and exchange officers.

In this connection, it is desired to invite to your attention that in addition to milk being used in the commissary departments of military activities, it is sold at exchange operated cafeterias, soda fountains, snack bars, and mobile canteens.

We appreciate this opportunity to forward this information to you. As a result of your inquiry, we have given additional emphasis to increasing opportunities for sale of milk in Armed Forces exchanges.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. DUFLON,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

FORMOSA AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Washington Post and Times Herald of today carries a significant headline which reads "Chinese Reds Mass Opposite Formosa, Dulles Warns Ike," and contains the statement that Secretary Dulles has flown to inform the President of the facts. I might say, in view of those facts, that I was particularly impressed with the statement the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, made a few evenings ago, parts of which I shall now read:

I would, therefore, beseech Democrats and Republicans alike to conduct themselves with a becoming restraint in all those things that pertain to war and peace, since they pertain also to the life and death of all men. Let us guide our debates with wisdom and inform our hearts with righteousness, lest we fall into shame and so into oblivion.

He said also:

We Democrats have conducted ourselves with the highest responsibility toward the President in his direction of the country's international relations.

I repeat the statement that we should "guide our debates with wisdom and inform our hearts with righteousness" in this troublesome hour, lest worse things come upon us.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF BENEFIT TO ALL MANKIND

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, with all the disquieting news of the day, including the threat of shooting in the Far East, we can all rejoice over the dramatic announcement, last week, of the apparent effectiveness of the antipolio vaccine, discovered by Dr. Salk and his collaborators. And also there are rumblings of real advances in the field of atomic energy for the peaceful benefit of all mankind.

It is a great regret to me that on the occasion of the well-deserved dinner last Saturday in honor of Speaker RAYBURN, whom we all love and admire, some of our Democratic brothers should have used the opportunity to threaten in the eyes of the world the unity of America by purely political attacks on our President. What a chance they had to rejoice with us over these great human achievements that mean so much to a suffering and apprehensive world.

Along the line of the antipolio vaccine discovery, I have had recent contacts with dedicated men and women who are working here, and especially abroad, in the field of new health discoveries. We are really contributing to the elimination of such scourges as malaria, the devastating destructiveness of human life and happiness by "yaws," and the inevitable diseases that accompany famine conditions.

I desire to pay a special tribute to a friend of mine, Dr. R. Townley Paton, of New York, an eye specialist. In spite of the overwhelming demand of his private practice, he is giving of his time and energy to help build and support the eye institutions in Iran and other Middle East points which promise to save the children from the dreaded trachoma and other eye-destroying diseases. I wonder whether we realize the possible benefits to the world and to America's place in the world, if such ambassadors of goodwill could be given support reasonably commensurate with our military programs and defense mechanisms, important as they are.

And now there comes to our attention another great work carried on by people of good will throughout the world. I refer to the Children's Fund, originally inspired by former President Hoover's work for the children of the world, and now carried on at the U. N. under the brilliant and inspired lealership of Mr. Maurice Pate, one of Mr. Hoover's early converts.

Mr. President, the April 29 issue of Collier's magazine, released April 14th, contains an article entitled "Asia's Best Friend." It describes the great work of Spurgeon M. Keeny, known as Sam Keeny, one of the chief bulwarks of the work of the United Nations Children's Fund. He is the director of the Asia Regional Office for the Fund. At one time Mr. Keeny worked under former President Hoover in the American Relief Administration in Russia. He symbolizes the spirit of the ambassadors of goodwill about whom I am talking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the informative and inspiring article prepared by Mr. Howard Lewis, for Collier's, be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

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

ASIA'S BEST FRIEND

(By Howard Lewis)

Check the guest list of any glittering international function; ask the doormen outside the world's major embassies; eavesdrop in the cocktail salons of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington or Claridge's in London. From none of these usually alert sources of cosmopolitan information will you glean any recognition of the name of Spurgeon M. Keeny—yet a great many people who should know rate this man as one of the most successful diplomats of our day and, among Westerners, the best friend Asia ever had. These people will also tell you, sometimes with dismay, that Keeny has achieved his remarkable success by violating most of the rules of his subtle trade—that he is monumentally indifferent to protocol, and that his tongue is often too sharp for his own good.

Other Keeny fans contend he cannot properly be called a diplomat—although he has frequently conducted intricate separate negotiations with three governments in 1 week. Rather, they say, he typifies a totally new breed of international operator, a breed on whose shoulders may well rest the future of the Western World.

Sam Keeny—only his family insists on calling him Spurgeon—is director of the Asia Regional Office for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). In that role he is almost miraculously changing the lives of uncounted millions of people in the non-Communist Far East. Under his supervision, 2,000,000 children in South Korea receive a pint and a half of milk every school day to supplement their almost nonexistent diet, and the youngsters of 15 other Asian nations also get milk in some form. Through 5,000 maternal and child-health centers in his area, Keeny acts as a kind of honorary midwife at nearly a million births a year. By the end of 1955, projects spurred by his intense drive will have brought protection against malaria to 150 million people, against TB to 100 million children, against yaws to 47 million persons formerly menaced by that loathsome skin disease.

These staggering statistics boil down to this: Keeny and the handful of men with whom he works are influencing to an incredible degree just how many children of Asia will survive to reach adulthood.

Keeny's attack on yaws is an example of how he operates. In the files of his headquarters at Bangkok, Thailand, are a pair of photographs marked No. 1077 and No. 1078. The first takes some strength to look at. It is a picture of an Indonesian mother holding her child. The mother's face is not so frightening; although blotched by constellations of suppurating sores, the face still shows. The baby's face is frightening; running sores hide its very outlines. Only two pain-filled eyes, a twisted mouth, and an ear are visible.

Then, as if the miracle accomplished had taken merely the time required to flip a photograph, there is picture No. 1078, showing the same faces a fortnight later. On the mother's face are still faint color blemishes where the sores had eroded the skin. But the baby's face is smooth and healthy. The look of pain is gone.

The difference: two shots of penicillin.

Here is how Sam Keeny fits into the story of the two pictures. When UNICEF first offered its help in Indonesia's yaws-eradication program, the Indonesian Government agreed to pay one-third the cost of the pencillin required; UNICEF paid the rest. After a year, the Government's expenditure for the drug became a part of its regular budget.

But as Keeny went from one Indonesian village to another—by puddle-jumper airplane, by mule, and often by pulling himself bodily up the steep slopes of mountains—the sight of thousands of disfigured children preyed increasingly on him. The penicillin had proved itself; why not expand the program until the entire nation had been freed from this terrible canker?

He flew back to Government headquarters in Jakarta to argue his point. The minister of health smiled wanly. Like most Asians, he did not have to be told of the existence of misery, but he also knew that his new government could grant him no more money.

"Would you approve expansion," Keeny asked, "if it didn't cost you a single rupiah?"

"Of course!"

"All right. UNICEF will pay for all the penicillin if you will spend your share in hiring more nurses to visit the villages."

ENOUGH PENICILLIN FOR YAW VICTIMS

Keeny was playing a hunch, and it worked. During the 2 years it took Indonesia to hire and train 400 additional nurses, mass-production methods brought down the price of penicillin. It dropped so low that UNICEF was able to furnish all the drug needed without spending an extra cent. Yaws cures shot up from 33,700 in 1950 to more than 1 million in 1954.

Keeny was taking one of the chances for which he is celebrated. UNICEF headquarters would not have been too happy had he exceeded his budget; overall it averages a mere $5 million a year—less than Portland, Maine, spends on all its municipal affairs annually. But, says Keeny, "We are dealing with big problems. People who tackle them must take big risks."

The basic job of the United Nations Children's Fund—which is financed mostly by voluntary contributions from U. N. members—is to work with the World Health Organization (WHO) and other U. N. agencies to provide healthier living conditions for children in underdeveloped areas, mostly in Asia and South America. UNICEF provides the supplies; WHO, the expert medical advisers.

One of the U. N.'s standing rules is that countries receiving help must make an even greater contribution of their own in money, material or labor. To Sam Keeny this arrangement means that with a budget of about 2 cents per child per year, he must offer so much hope to the impoverished countries in his orbit that they will almost bankrupt themselves to take part in a program only the wildest dreamer could believe in.

Luckily Keeny is that kind of dreamer. He has brought to Asia an unorthodox notion and a staggering ambition. The notion: that Asia is not only sick because it is poor, but also—much more important—that it is poor because it is sick. The ambition: to raise the standard of living 50 percent or more by stemming the tide of disease that has flowed through Asia since time out of mind. How? By adding to the enormous energy of the awakening East the essentially American idea of mass production.

Keeny puts it this way: "In fighting the big killers like TB and malaria, there is no point in treating a handful of patients with individual doctors. We'll use mass assault, cheap drugs, and presto chango! the disease is gone—if you have the nerve to go after it big."

Keeny is going after it big. Under his inspiration, hundreds of local spraying teams, armed with tanks full of DDT, are marching like an avenging army to wipe out the malarial mosquito. Their wages are paid by their own countries, the DDT is supplied sometimes by UNICEF, sometimes by the country, and now in large measure by our own Foreign Operations Administration in Washington. Tuberculosis gets a cavalry attack: jeep-mounted squads of four are now spreading out through India armed with hypodermic needles and a vaccine called BCG. Although not a complete preventive, it will give a child 75 to 80 percent immunity.

With a couple of new miracle drugs in his arsenal, Keeny is preparing fresh attacks. He plans a double-barreled aureomycin-terramycin assault on trachoma, a miserable eye infection which now threatens 50 million Asians with blindness. Almost 75 percent of Formosan children suffer from trachoma or conjunctivitis. And he will use recently developed sulfone drugs to treat the 2 million lepers in his area; the drugs hold out the promise of a complete cure in 2 years. (The Philippine Government now spends almost $1 million a year just to care for its lepers. With the sulfone drugs, they may all be cured for less than $100,000.)

Sam Keeny is a chunky, bespectacled man with a lantern jaw obviously designed for a 16-hour grip on a pipe. Should the visitor to his Bangkok office have the rare opportunity of finding him seated, he will see what looks like a pile of old clothes on which someone has dumped an ashtray. But atop it he will see the face of a man who, at 61, looks vitally alive, for Keeny is intensely aware that within his hands he holds the power to do good works unparalleled in modern times.

Keeny carries with him another unspoken but vital responsibility. As a U. N. employee, he is technically an international civil servant. But wherever he goes throughout Asia—more than 100,000 miles a year by plane, jeep, and oxcart—he knows that he bears the indelible stamp of an American, and that as such he is being watched with particular care by the east.

Keeny is an interesting man to watch. A good place to start would be right in Bangkok, where he holds forth the 4 months of the year he isn't out in the field. Let's follow Sam as he takes the long way to work in the morning. He has fed the two families of sparrows that nest in the chandelier over his dining table. Now he is ambling along the Chao-Phya River, inspecting the bird market. It is a familiar route with him.

"From the bird market," he once revealed, "I draw philosophic sustenance for the day's work. First of all, there are the toddlers who rise with the dawn and busy themselves with the mysterious occupations of childhood. They are the daily reminders of the 250 million children in the 21 countries or territories we serve.

"Then the birds, ranging all the way from chickens to scarlet-crested cockatoos, recall the variety of the task, the humdrum, but useful, I trust, nature of most of it and the color in the crises.

"These sights encourage contemplation rather than action. The antidote is to watch my favorite gibbon do his daily dozen on a clothesline stretched from a boat in the river to a convenient tree on the bank. Thus, vicariously, I take my morning exercises and, somewhere about 8, arrive at the desk positively eager to write the letters that, hopefully, will slowly improve the lot of my small friends along the canal."

PROJECTS ARE MANY AND WILDLY VARIED

Keeny's gentle self-portrait is deceptive. Out of his office comes a veritable blizzard of activity. Besides the major campaigns, he is also responsible for more than a hundred wildly varied projects such as supplying bicycles to midwives, new X-ray equipment to Pakistan, soap to Afghanistan, blankets to typhoon victims in Japan, and fish-oil capsules to malnourished tykes in Hong Kong.

Many of his letters go to his mission chiefs, scattered all over Asia and adjacent islands. So hard does he drive them with the lash of his own example that one of them once complained, "I'm always glad when Sam goes off on an inspection tour. That way there's only 1 chance in 7 of his dropping in on me. When he's at that Bangkok office, it's every darned day."

If his subordinates feel the whip, they suffer no more than Keeny's superiors. Keeny is a man with a mission. When he feels he is being held back by the people who pay his salary, he sees no reason why he should spare them any more than anyone else.

Sometimes, however, even he is abashed at his own truculence. But not for long—as this quote from one of his confidential messages would indicate: "If we seem impatient at times, will those who suffer from it please think of the sick babies and mothers in the waiting line of any typical dispensary and be tolerant or, better still, get busy."

Son of a Pennsylvania Dutch farmer, Keeny has an instinctive fondness for the truth and courts it with a fine passion. His straight-from-the-shoulder approach stamps him as a maverick among his breed. When he was head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in Italy after World War II and had to settle some involved negotiations with that country, he asked Premier Alcide de Gasperi for an appointment.

SOUND ADVICE FOR ITALY'S PREMIER

At the interview, Keeny came to the point at once. "Mr. de Gasperi," he pointed out, "in the previous UNRRA program Italy lost $15 million by taking its time about an agreement while other nations were acting fast. The present offer is 10 times as large. I don't want to see Italy lose $150 million; do you think we could agree on principles, say, within a week—and settle the details afterward?" They agreed on principles in 5 days.

Keeny's ideas about his relationship with the rest of the world are simple. "Back on the farm in Shrewsbury, Pa.," he says, "you had to be a good neighbor. That was the way we put barns up. There were barn raisings all the time, one neighbor helping another.

"And then there was the way we felt about the land. The idea there was you'd get a good crop from the soil and then you'd put something back for the next year. Why, if a farmer didn't do something to make his land a little better, he was looked down on as a lower type in our part of the world.

"Since I left the farm, I've moved around a lot. I've seen enough sickness and death. I know people don't like it and I don't like it. If we can change all that with a little effort, it would not only be absurd not to do it, it would be criminal."

His private good-neighbor policy is sometimes put to the acid test. Once, in Indochina, an insurgent's hand grenade exploded less than 50 feet from Keeny's cot. When a friend asked him if the incident had unnerved him, he replied, "Why, no. The man wasn't throwing it at me." (As a matter of fact, most local rebellions in Asia go on a standby basis when UNICEF crews come through.)

The majority of problems Keeny encounters in the East are of a less violent, but more crippling nature. There is the extreme poverty, almost inconceivable to the

Western mind. In South Korean school districts, officials tried to assess families 10 cents a month to provide for school kitchens; they found that many families literally couldn't afford it. UNICEF child-care centers in Thailand had to advertise for empty bottles because many of the mothers had nothing in which to carry free milk home. In Cambodia there are only four fully qualified doctors for 4 million people.

Among other obstacles are the eastern superstitions which tell mothers it is bad luck to bathe a baby before it is 2 weeks old, and then only in a broth of onion rings; that the severed umbilical cord should be covered with a poultice of ground betel nut; that emaciation can be cured by making the child a bracelet of wheat kernels.

Keeny must also contend with local mores. Once, in Karachi, he arrived at a half-finished maternal and child-health center being constructed under UNICEF guidance to find that a Moslem crisis was in the making. The contractor, who had already received one polite warning, was still dawdling on the project although several young ladies from the veiled seclusion of purdah were due to arrive at the center within a few weeks to work as student assistants. Moslem tradition demanded that all male workmen be off the premises by the time the young ladies arrived.

Keeny averted the crisis by combining firmness with recognition of Asian customs. The much-abused contract in his hand, he called on the builder. The following conversation took place:

"KEENY. You don't seem to have got very far with the building.

"CONTRACTOR. Oh, yes, sir. We are working like Superman.

"KEENY. But the building isn't nearly finished. As a matter of fact, there doesn't seem to be much improvement since last time.

"CONTRACTOR. We have been working very hard, sir. If it weren't for the evil forces——

"KEENY. What evil forces?

"CONTRACTOR. The evil forces, sir, that keep us from finishing the construction. They are working against us.

"KEENY. Ah, yes. Well, I would suggest March 31 as a good day for getting rid of the last evil force. Agreed?"

The contractor hastily agreed, possibly because his fear of losing money on the job was greater than his concern over the evil forces. The contract which Keeny was idly waving as a fan contained a penalty clause which began on April 1.

Last month, Keeny returned to the United States for the semiannual meeting of the UNICEF executive board. It was an emotional homecoming. He was reunited with his wife, who accompanied him throughout the world until she was stricken with arthritis. (The former Amelia Smith, of Atlanta, Ga., she traveled to England in 1921 to marry Keeny, then associated with the American Relief Administration. They spent their honeymoon in a Polish delousing center.) There was also a grandson to see, born in December to Keeny's son and daughter-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Spurgeon Keeny, Jr. And there was Keeny's mother, who still lives in Shrewsbury.

Coming back to the States is always something of a shock to Keeny, who has lived so long in the East he now finds it miraculous that this country is able to produce so much food without a single water buffalo in sight.

But it also gives him time for reflection. One night as he sat in an office high over New York, he said to a friend: "At a time when half the world is anticipating extinction by a hydrogen bomb, it's good to know that modern science is also making it possible for us to wipe out diseases that make life a misery for millions. There may be greater satisfactions, but I haven't discovered them."

FREE ASIA TAKES THE INITIATIVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, several weeks ago on the floor of the Senate, I delivered a speech proposing a new partnership program for strengthening freedom in Asia. In that statement I said:

We must proceed on the basis of a genuine partnership with the free Asians in helping and encouraging them to express and achieve their deepest yearnings for freedom, independence, and economic development. Let them take the initiative. And let us keep within the framework of their social structure as we assist them.

In my statement, I went on to suggest that the Far Eastern Columbo plan powers should be encouraged to take the initiative in holding an economic conference for the purpose of working out their various problems of trade and development. I pointed out that in order to solve the problems facing these Asian countries, Asian initiative and concerted action on a regional basis would be required.

On April 14, Mr. President, it was reported by the Associated Press that India had called for a preliminary 11-nation conference on possible regional uses of new American economic aid. The conference will meet in Simla, India, for a week, starting May 9. The nations invited are Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Indonesia, Nepal, Malaya, South Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia.

This demonstration of Asian initiative and cooperation is good news, especially in the light of the Bandung Asian-African conference. It is my sincere hope that this news marks only the beginning of a new period of Asian initiative and responsibility, and of mutual cooperation and partnership between East Asia and the West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a news article on this subject, appearing on April 14 on the first page of the New York Times.

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

[From the New York Times of April 14, 1955]

INDIA CALLS 11-NATION TALK ON NEW UNITED STATES ASIAN AID PLAN

NEW DELHI, India, April 13.—Authoritative sources said today that India had called an 11-country conference on the regional use of new United States economic aid. The new aid is expected to total $200 million.

The conference has been summoned to meet in Simla, starting May 9 or May 16. It was learned from qualified quarters that the so-called Stassen plan would be the main topic of the meeting.

Director Harold E. Stassen, of the Foreign Operations Administration, has proposed that United States aid to Asia be placed on a regional basis, possibly with Western Europe contributing.

It is understood here that the United States Government intends to continue its current bilateral economic aid to Asian countries at the present levels but that President Eisenhower plans to ask Congress for an additional $200 million to start a regional program.

Washington officials have made it clear that Asian nations must display a willingness to help themselves before the United States can be expected to appropriate this additional amount.

The summoning of the Simla conference is obviously intended to show that Asia is ready to take this initiative—and today's disclosure comes only a few days before President Eisenhower is scheduled to make known his new aid plans.

The countries reported invited to the Simla conference, besides India, are Ceylon, Pakistan, Indonesia, Nepal, Malaya, Burma, South Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos.

RED CRITICISM ASSAILED

NEW DELHI, April 13.—The influential morning newspaper, the Hindu, lashed out today at Communist Chinese criticism of United States intentions in Asia.

The Indian newspaper particularly attacked an article in the Peiping's daily which said United States aid to Asia was intended for "military aggression, economic exploitation, and colonialist expansion."

The Hindus said the Communist organ was entitled to hold that Washington was "lukewarm" toward the forthcoming African-Asian conference in Indonesia. But it described as a "travesty of fact" the Communist charge of American imperialism in Asia.

UNITED STATES READY TO HELP

WASHINGTON, April 13.—The United States said today it was ready to share responsibility for improving the lot of African and Asian peoples.

The United States position was carried in a statement issued by the State Department just 5 days before opening of the African-Asian conference in Indonesia. The United States was not invited.

Henry Suydam, State Department spokesman, said he was making the statement in response to inquiries about the American attitude toward the forthcoming conference. He said it hardly seemed necessary to restate the United States "deep and sympathetic interest" in all efforts of Asian and African people to achieve material and spiritual well-being and other "blessings of liberty."

TRANSPORTATION OF LIVE SCORPIONS IN THE MAILS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last week the Senate, in its wisdom, passed Senate bill 35, a bill which I introduced on January 6, for the purpose of permitting the transportation in the mails of live scorpions. It was impossible for me to be present in the Senate at that session. I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the remarks which I had prepared for that occasion, together with an article entitled "Arizona's Scorpion Man" written by Keith Monroe and published in Coronet magazine for March 1955.

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

STATEMENT ON S. 35 BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

On January 6, 1955, I introduced S. 35 for the purpose of permitting the transportation in the mails of live scorpions. It was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which reported it on March 22 without amendment.

Venomous reptiles and insects are improperly considered a major threat to persons living in and visiting in the southwestern part of the United States, which includes the State of Arizona. Although many tales have been told about these creatures stalking and viciously leaping out at every human being they see, I can assure my colleagues that these are merely another chapter of

unfounded superstitions which have grown up with a section of our Nation.

Of hundreds of interesting, harmless and beneficial reptiles and insects in the Southwest, only a few are capable of inflicting damage by biting or stinging. Ants, wasps, and bees are among the less venomous of these. However, the only dangerous members of these species to be found in the Southwest are the rattlesnake, the Gila monster, the black widow spider and the scorpion. The bites of the mildly poisonous centipede and still less poisonous tarantula are of relatively little consequence. Without exception, all of these venomous creatures tend to be timid and nonaggressive and want to get away from humans and be left alone. Their poisonous devices, basically intended for use in procuring food, are only used against humans when they are startled or molested.

S. 35 deals specifically with a tiny arachnid, which has been called the real public enemy No. 1 of the poisonous animals of Arizona—the scorpion. There are at least 40 species of scorpions found in three-fourths of the United States, in Canada and Mexico, but there are only two known lethal species and both of them are found mostly in the lower areas of Arizona and neighboring States.

The two scorpions, the Centruroides sculpturatus and the Centruroides gertschi, are in the minority among the scorpion population, but their sting can be very serious and even deadly to children or adults in poor health unless prompt treatment is administered. During the 20-year period from 1928–48 these two species of scorpions were responsible for more than twice as many fatalities as all other venomous animals in Arizona put together including rattlesnakes, Gila monsters, black widow spiders and venomous insects, according to the Arizona Department of Health. Nearly 3,000 persons in Arizona are stung by scorpions each year, but, fortunately, only a small percentage of the bites are by the dangerous type of scorpion.

The sting of the nonlethal scorpion causes primarily a local reaction such as swelling, painful burning feeling and discoloration at the site of the sting and even some distance from the sting. However, under ordinary circumstances there is no danger from this venom even to a child. A sting from the lethal species, on the other hand, produces primarily a systemic reaction, but does not produce a swelling or discoloration at the site of the sting. It is a convulsant neurotoxin affecting the nervous system and causing convulsions. The first symptom at the site of the sting is a prickly-pin sharpness which may become quite painful. That spot becomes hypersensitive at once so that bumping it causes additional tingling sensations. A sort of prickly-pin sensation and numbness travels from the sting site causing a woody feeling. Some people have experienced severe tingling and electric sensations throughout their entire body, but the feeling produced by the sting of a ground scorpion and that of a centruroides species is very different.

The simple ice water or equivalent cold treatment applied promptly will offset even the serious effects from the sting of the sculpturatus and gertschi, in most cases. However, in the few advanced cases where first aid is not applied promptly enough or for some reason does not take care of the situation, a serum has been developed which has invariably brought immediate and satisfactory results. The serum was developed after extensive scientific research with venoms in Arizona for nearly a quarter of a century by Dr. Herbert L. Stahnke, head of the department of biological sciences and director of the poisonous animals research laboratory at Arizona State College at Tempe. His work is more completely described in two articles which I shall insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of this statement.

However, the "Arizona venom man," who came to my State in 1928 from Chicago, developed this scorpion serum, which involves the collecting of many scorpions, milking them of their venom, freezing the venom and removing its moisture, accurately weighing it and rediluting it with distilled water. Then it is periodically injected in nonlethal doses into the blood stream of a laboratory animal, generally cats, until an immunity is built up. When this occurs, a small sample of blood is drawn from the immunized animal, put through an intricate sterile processing, again frozen and dehydrated, weighed and bottled for distribution. It might be added here that these cats live a very soft life in temperature-controlled sanitary quarters with a balanced diet and little to do except receive doses of venom, which cause them little or no discomfort, and donate blood which is no more bothersome than giving a pint of blood to the Red Cross is for a human.

However, the problem still existed as to how to provide general relief all over Arizona and the lethal scorpion area. To make sure that ample serum was available in all this area, many, many live, lethal scorpions are needed. In fact, Dr. Stahnke requested and got 10,000 to start with—through public cooperation.

Even with this wholehearted public cooperation of Arizonians and residents of neighboring States, there was still no satisfactory way of sending live scorpions to the laboratory. Despite the fast, efficient mail service, postal regulations forbid using the mails for the transporting of live scorpions. Other methods of shipment were too costly or too slow or the packages often were in the hot sun so long that the scorpions were either in very bad condition or dead when they arrived at Dr. Stahnke's laboratory.

Another obstacle was the lack of a suitable container for transporting the scorpions. However, the ingenious Dr. Stahnke designed a simple lightweight cylindrical mailing tube with a plastic inner bag which is completely airtight and escapeproof even if damaged or crushed. Since a scorpion could easily spend a week in such a sealed container and suffer no ill effects, it is the ideal answer for scorpion mailing.

The final step is the legislation embodied in S. 35 which will allow the mailing of live scorpions with regulations as to their packaging to protect postal personnel and facilitate handling by the research workers in the laboratory.

This bill not only has the recommendation of the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, but it also has the backing of the Arizona State Association of the National Association of Letter Carriers, the Arizona Federation of Post Office Clerks, the Arizona chapter of the National Association of Postmasters, and the State Legislature of Arizona.

Mr. Summerfield, in stating that his Department has made a careful study of this matter, gives full approval to the legislation, says it will not result in any additional cost to the Department, and fills a "worthy purpose."

[From Coronet of March 1955]

ARIZONA'S SCORPION MAN

(By Keith Monroe)

"I need 10,000 deadly scorpions—alive," Dr. Herbert L. Stahnke appealed to Arizona parents back in 1951. "Will you catch some for me?"

This request was no crazy whim. It was a grim plea from one of the world's leading authorities on venomous creatures.

After almost a quarter-century of dangerous research, Dr. Stahnke had at last found a way to win Arizona's age-old war against scorpions—if people would help him. They would have to hunt the vicious little animal whose two lethal species are more dangerous than all other poisonous creatures in the Southwest. And when they found one, they would have to get it safely to the sinister-looking laboratory at Arizona State College where Dr. Stahnke works, surrounded by hundreds of live creatures—many of them lethal.

Now he wanted 10,000 live specimens of the two deadly types of scorpions: The sculpturatus and the gertschi. But Arizonans respect Stahnke so deeply that they promptly went after them. If he said that catching live scorpions would wipe out a widespread danger in Arizona, it must be so.

Some 3,000 people are stung by scorpions in Arizona each year. Most of the victims are children poking into places where these little menaces lie hidden: Under rocks and logs, behind the loose bark of trees, in trash piles and lumber stacks, in cellars or attics.

It isn't unusual for the little scorpions to scuttle into a house through a door crack or crevice. When inside, they are not easy to see because they are straw colored and avoid the light, and hide in dark corners.

At night they crawl out and explore the floors, where any bare foot may step on them. When daylight returns they again seek a dark hiding place—which may be a shoe or the folds of blankets.

At least 40 different species of scorpions (some growing to lengths of 8 inches) are scattered across three-fourths of North America. But only two species are known to be deadly, and both of these are found mostly in and around Arizona. Even these usually fail to kill an adult in good health—but without prompt treatment, their sting can be fatal to a child, or an adult in poor health.

There seemed to be no sure treatment until Dr. Stahnke developed a serum at the end of a 23-year fight against the scorpions.

The doctor had arrived from Chicago in 1928, married a year later, and eventually became head of the Department of Biological Sciences at Arizona State College in Tempe.

By the time his first child was a few years old, Stahnke was as troubled as are all Arizona parents by the recurring news items about children killed by scorpions. Instead of just fretting, he went to work to wipe out the hazard.

Because no college funds were available for such research, Stahnke had to make his own laboratory equipment by hand, and perform experiments at night, on weekends, and in his spare time.

He learned how to milk live scorpions of the venom in their tails, how to freeze it, then dehydrate it, redilute it with distilled water, and inject it little by little into a cat's bloodstream until the animal built up immunity. Then he drew blood from the cat and put this through other complex treatments to make a serum. The serum worked. All he needed now was enough scorpions and money.

In the spring of 1951, he began explaining these needs to the public. The Tucson Daily Citizen joined his efforts and launched a campaign to persuade people to catch scorpions. It also appealed for funds to buy equipment with which Stahnke could manufacture serum.

Thousands of Arizonians put on gloves and boots, and began prying into dark places where scorpions might lurk. Everyone knew the first-aid method Stahnke had developed for treating snakebite or scorpion sting: Wrapping a string tightly around the injured part, then keeping it in ice water for several hours.

Boxes and bottles of scorpions poured in to the Poisonous Animals Research Laboratory that Stahnke directed at Arizona State College. On June 26, 1951, the Daily Citizen

invited Stahnke to Tucson to receive a check for $4,500. Two days later the State legislature appropriated $1,500 more.

In appreciation of the Tucson donations, he took with him the only two vials of his precious serum and presented them to the Tucson Health Center. Three days later a 4-year-old girl was stung, and the serum saved her life.

Today there are vials of Stahnke's antitoxin in hospital refrigerators all over the State. The menace of the scorpion has been conquered and Stahnke cherishes a stack of letters from parents whose children are alive today because of his serum.

TRIBUTES TO SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, those of us who serve in this Congress are privileged to be associated with one of the truly great figures of American history, Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN.

SAM RAYBURN has served his country in the House of Representatives for more than four decades. He has been Speaker of the House longer than any other man—including even the immortal Henry Clay. He has presided with a dignity and fairness which have won him the respect and the admiration of all Members, regardless of party or philosophy.

I believe that even the minority leadership of the House would join with me in saying that no other man in Congress is held in more affection and trust.

As for myself personally, my respect and affection are motivated by much more than ordinary ties. All my life, I have known SAM RAYBURN as a close personal friend, as my father before me was his close personal friend.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN last Saturday night at a testimonial dinner in his honor.

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

SPEECH OF SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN AT RAYBURN TESTIMONIAL DINNER, NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and fellow Democrats, I want to thank, from the bottom of a grateful heart, everyone who has had anything to do with bringing about this occasion. I especially want to thank the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Paul Butler, and the treasurer, Mr. Matt McCloskey, for the great part they have played in this affair. I would also like to express my appreciation to the chairman of the dinner committee, Mr. W. John Kenney, and the cochairmen, Mr. George C. McGhee and Mrs. Oscar L. Chapman.

I want you to know that I shall never cease to hold in grateful memory this evidence of your partial friendship, and above all, to feel that I have your respect.

I accept this gracious gesture with the deepest feeling of inadequacy and humility. You honor me far beyond what I believe to be my desserts.

I belong to a party that has been, is, and will be, the party of responsibility. We have demonstrated this time and time again, it matters not whether the administration in power be Democratic or Republican.

It is the party that has the vision of Thomas Jefferson and the dauntless courage of Andrew Jackson.

I came to Washington as a freshman Congressman in the first administration of Woodrow Wilson. He didn't know that I was in town but I was well aware that he was in the White House. Since then some forty years have passed. Yet if today our Federal laws reflect a strong sense of social responsibility toward the people, much is owed to Woodrow Wilson. Anger rose in his soul at the sight of injustice done the helpless. Then he became as stern as a Hebrew prophet.

In his inaugural address Wilson made one thing clear, and years later another Democratic President—Franklin D. Roosevelt—would make the same thing clear in another inaugural address. They put the Nation on notice that their election as Democratic Presidents was not merely a meaningless shift from one political group to another. It meant something of profound significance to the Nation; something that would alter its course and touch the lives of all men. It was that there had been a true change of government.

Woodrow Wilson told his countrymen that the Nation had made great industrial strides. But he said that we had paid a high cost for it in terms of the men, women, and children upon whom crushing burdens had been laid. The Government we loved, he added, had been made use of for private, selfish purposes by those who forgot the people. Thundering against these evils in his mighty Presbyterian wrath, he pointed out that it was the duty of government to shield ordinary people from the consequences of great industrial and social processes that they could not singly alter, control, or cope with.

The First World War stopped the march of Wilson's new freedom. But nothing stops, or can stop, or ought to stop, the rightful aspirations of all our people for a better life than they ever had before. And nothing can stop the Democratic Party in its efforts to help them attain that life. This was the conviction of the first Democratic President under whom I served. It was equally the conviction of the last Democratic President under whom I served. Thank God he is with us tonight.

This is what President Truman said in his very first message to Congress:

"Let me assure the forward-looking people of America that there will be no relaxation in our efforts to improve the lot of the common people."

Thus Mr. Truman expressed his humane heart. And so doing he expressed also the humane hearts of Jefferson, Jackson, Bryan, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt. He stated the doctrine that is with us at our rising up and at our lying down. He reiterated the unchanging basic principle of the Democratic Party. For, I ask you, what is the use of being a rich, populous country if large numbers of our citizens are too poor to lead good, abundant lives?

Yet, within our memory, great numbers of Americans endured in poverty. Their plight was not wholly economic. Potentially there was enough for everybody and to spare. What was the trouble? It was clear that if the often desperate inequalities among our people did not flow from purely economic causes, economic change alone would not be enough. What was needed was moral change, a change of heart. Then and then only could economic change help all Americans.

Therefore the great Democratic Party reforms of the recent past were not merely changes of economics. They were primarily moral changes. They proclaimed at the crossroads and at the doors of every house in this land that people come first; that if you destroy a man's self-respect you destroy the man; that he who tramples on the Bill of Rights tramples on us all.

But between the brief, bright day of Woodrow Wilson and the warming sun of Franklin Roosevelt, there came a long Republican eclipse. In its murk and gloom this Nation almost lost its way.

The profound changes wrought in American life by recent Democratic administrations rooted this Nation so strongly in freedom's soil that no storm of alien doctrine can uproot it.

The tempests of communism blow but not a leaf of our tree is disturbed.

And bear this in mind. We did not move to improve the condition of all of people because we feared communism. We moved for the best of all reasons and motives—because it was right to move; because we could not bear it that some stuffed themselves with cake while others, equally worthy in God's sight, went without bread.

Today this Nation is one in its devotion to freedom.

Today the American people are so deeply devoted to the Democratic reforms of this generation that no Republican administration would dare tamper with them; certainly not in open daylight.

We wrought in the spirit of the great men who gave the Democratic Party life and light.

Even now the name Andrew Jackson rings sharp on American ears. It means a leader who would fight for the ordinary man. It means a man who could not be deterred by the devil himself when he was fighting for the people's interest. It means a patriot. And it still means a patriot even if some spiritually dead Republican leaders call Jackson's political party the party of treason. We've seen lies and libel before, wholesale and retail. But this is the first time that lies and libel have been used on an atom bomb scale to besmirch millions of people with the black charge of treason to their country.

Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt, Truman—these were quite different men. But they were alike in these things. They cared about people. They had courage. Their hearts were big. They burned with the humanitarian spirit that has always animated the Democratic Party.

Hence the people took the Democratic Party to their heart and made it the one enduring institution of our national life.

This is a great achievement. But endurance alone is not enough. Age may bring dry rot as well as wisdom. Yet, somehow our party has found the fountain of youth. It has a continuing vitality. It responds to changing times. It is receptive to new ideas. It welcomes experiments. Therefore, while you may find a few amiable idiots among us, you won't find any old fogies or those who are worse than old fogies—young fogies.

The Democratic Party, therefore, has constantly produced great national leaders; men who performed a twofold task. They sought, first, to redeem the Nation from its follies and its crimes of indifference toward a large part of the population; and, second, they sought to bring the Nation to rededicate itself to the life of democracy. Their achievements have made this the greatest of all nations.

During the past 40 years—the term of my own service in the Congress—we Democrats have scarcely a day to walk beside still waters. For our long period of service was one of almost endless struggle here and abroad.

It was our somber privilege and responsibility to lead the Nation victoriously through the two greatest wars of all time.

It also was our privilege to lead the Nation out of the greatest depression it has ever known into the greatest prosperity that it has ever known.

Time after time we had to make decisions affecting the lives of millions of soldiers and the survival of this Nation and of our allies.

Time after time during the great depression we had to move to redeem the great promises of American life.

In so doing we had almost to recast the Nation's economy, without affecting the constitutional structure upon which that economy rested.

Moreover, it was during our period of service that this great Nation, once strongly isolationist, became the leader of the free world and is today the hope of all men everywhere who are free, and of those who aspire to freedom.

In the name of freedom we mobilized our resources and, together with our allies, hurled them against the enemy and crushed him.

Here at home, 20 years ago, we mobilized the material and spiritual resources of the Nation and broke the depression that was destroying us.

I think, then, that the Democrats have learned something about the nature of responsibility, and because we have learned something about it, I know that I speak for all Democrats when I say this. Our hearts go out to President Eisenhower as, in the terrible loneliness that surrounds Presidents, he wrestles with the problems of life and death that confront the Nation. We Democrats, I am happy to say, have conducted ourselves with the highest responsibility toward the President in his direction of the country's international relations. And, as duty dictates, we have maintained a loyal opposition. It has remained for prominent members of the President's own political party to confront him with a disloyal opposition.

Sobered by long responsibility, tempered by trial, matured by experience, mellowed by time, the Democratic Party now stands at the heights of its powers to serve the Nation. And as a life-long Democrat, I have never seen our party so united in spirit, resolution, and purpose, as it is today.

But this is not all. In the fullness of time and service to the Nation, the Democratic Party, I believe, has come to be more than a political party. It has become an idea; an essential part of the American idea. Political parties have their victories and defeats but great ideas go on forever. Hence we Democrats may look with equal serenity to 1956 or to 1976.

I hope now you will permit me a personal word. It has been given me to see much in the long years that the good Lord has allotted me.

But now we have come upon times whose like is not in the annals of mankind. For today it is possible to enshroud all men in a seamless, cloudborne garment of poison, and make our plant as lifeless as the moon. I would, therefore, beseech Democrats and Republicans alike to conduct themselves with a becoming restraint in all those things that pertain to war and peace, since they pertain also to the life and death of all men.

Let us guide our debates with wisdom and inform our hearts with righteousness, lest we fall into shame and so into oblivion.

Nearly two centuries ago there began upon this continent the noblest experiment in Government that men have ever undertaken. It has greatly succeeded. Whenever this country, faced with a grave foreign or domestic crisis, conducted itself greatly, it prevailed and moved on toward the heights.

Today darkness broods over the face of the earth. Evil stalks the hills. No man knows what devouring monsters tomorrow may bring. May I say, then, to my countrymen—let us in this desperate hour nobly conceive and nobly act in the greatness that is our heritage and our light and our life. So doing, within the eye of God, we shall triumph over evil as did the founders of this great Republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, prior to the dinner held in Washington last Friday evening to honor Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the Texas House of Representatives adopted unanimously a resolution paying tribute to this great American.

Our beloved Speaker was a member of the Texas House in his young manhood and served as speaker of that body. His career has been a lasting inspiration to those who have followed him as members of the Texas House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution adopted by the Texas House of Representatives be printed in the RECORD.

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

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, OF TEXAS

Mr. Turman offered the following resolution:

"House Concurrent Resolution 82

"Whereas the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in the National Armory at Washington, D. C., on April 16, 1955, will pay tribute and do honor to a great Democrat and lifelong stalwart of the Democratic Party, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN; and

"Whereas Mr. Sam, a Democrat in the best tradition of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy, will be acclaimed by having April 16, 1955, known as Sam Rayburn Day; and

"Whereas the Honorable SAM RAYBURN has served as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States longer than any other man, always abiding by the motto: 'Be reasonable, be fair,' fulfilling a boyhood ambition and thus being assured of a prominent niche in American history; and

"Whereas SAMUEL TALIAFERRO RAYBURN was born January 6, 1882, in the Clinch Valley of Tennessee, the son of William Marion Rayburn and Martha (Waller) Rayburn. And at the age of 5 Sam and his family moved to Texas near Bonham in Fannin County; and

"Whereas SAM RAYBURN, in that grand old American way, is a self-made man. He worked his way through college and law school and at the age of 24 earned his political spurs by being elected to the Texas House of Representatives, a place he held during the 30th legislature in 1907, the 31st legislature in 1909, and the 32d legislature in 1911, and being the third youngest speaker of the house in his last term; and

"Whereas in 1912 SAM RAYBURN was elected to the House of Representatives of the United States and arrived in Washington early in 1913, to serve in the first administration of Woodrow Wilson, thus beginning in the 63d Congress in 1913 continuous service and association with seven President, three Democrats and four Republicans; and

"Whereas the Honorable SAM RAYBURN was majority leader of the House in the 75th and 76th Congresses in 1937 and 1939, and was elected Speaker of the House on September 16, 1940, and has been Speaker of the House in the following Congresses: the 76th in 1939, 77th in 1941, 78th in 1943, 79th in 1945, 81st in 1949, 82d in 1951, and 84th in 1955; and

"Whereas SAM RAYBURN came to full flower and national eminence during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He helped write many of the keystone acts of the New Deal, among them were the Wheeler-Rayburn Utilities Act, the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, the Rural Electrification Administration Act; he was influential in establishing the Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, Tariff Board, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Communication Commission, and the Federal Reserve Board; and

"Whereas the Nation will be forever grateful to SAM RAYBURN for preventing the Army from being disbanded 4 months before Pearl Harbor when on August 12, 1941, the House voted 203 to 202 to extend the Selective Service Act and before anyone could switch his vote he gaveled down all moves for reconsideration and announced the total vote; and

"Whereas SAM RAYBURN has been a tower of strength in the legislative branch of the Government to Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, a valuable colleague to Members of Congress, and an exceptional leader; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the 54th Legislature of Texas to honor and pay tribute to a former colleague who has now become the famed Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas, and to commend the Democratic Party for naming the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day assembly the Sam Rayburn Day: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives of the 54th legislature (the senate concurring)*, That the brilliant career of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN will forever burn bright over the Lone Star State and that we do honor and commemorate this distinguished statesman; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon the pages of the journal of both houses and that copies be forwarded to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, and to the National Chairman of the Democratic Party.

"HUGHES.
"TURMAN.
"HARDEMAN.
"BENTON.
"HUTCHINS.
"MORGAN.
"HOGUE."

(Signed by Lindsey, speaker; Allen, Allison, Anderson, Andis, Armor, Atwell, Baker, Banks, Bates, Bell, Bergman, Berlin, Berry, Bishop, Blaine, Bradshaw, Brashear, Briscoe, Bristow, Bryan, Burkett, Carmichall, Carpenter, Carr, Chambers, Chapman, Cheatham, Clements, Cloud, Cobb, Cole, Cooper, Cory, Cowen, Cox of Montgomery, Cox of Bell, Crim, Crosthwait, de la Garza, Dewey, Miss Duff, Dugas, Elliott, Ellis, Fenoglio, Ferrell, Ford of Nueces, Ford of Red River, Garrett, Gillham, Glass, Glusing, Hale, Hazlett, Heatly, Heideke, Heitman, Holstein, Hosey, Houston, Huffman, Hunt, Miss Isaacks, Jackson of Cass, Jackson of Navarro, Jamison, Johnson, Jones, Joseph, Kelly, Kennard, Kennedy, King, Kirkham, Kirklin, Koliba, Lane, Latimer, Lee, Lehman, Lieck, McDaniel, McDonald, McGregor of McLennan, McGregor of El Paso, McIlhany, McNeil, Martin, Maverick, Moore of Harris, Moore of Tarrant, Mullen, Murphy, Murray, Niemann, Osborn, Parish, Patten, Patterson, Pipkin, Pool, Puckett, Pyle, Reeves, Ross, Sadler, Sandahl, Sanders, Saul, Sayers, Schram, Schwartz of Galveston, Schwartz of Washington, Seeligson, Shannon, Sheridan, Slack, Smith of Hays, Smith of Tarrant, Smith of Jefferson, Spilman, Spring, Stewart, Stilwell, Stone, Storey, Strickland, Stroman, Talasek, Thurmond, Walling, Ward, Welch, Wheeler, White, Wilson, Winfree, Wohlford, Wood, Yancy, Yezak, and Zbranek.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader regarding the outstanding public service of the Democratic leader in the other body.

For 14 years it was my privilege to serve with and under Speaker RAYBURN in the House of Representatives. No

young man ever had a finer friend. No country ever had a more devoted public servant. Patriotism never flowed more genuinely in the veins of any man than in those of SAM RAYBURN. In him also there is a large measure of compassion, human understanding, and wisdom; and a full measure of courage.

DEATH OF DR. ALBERT EINSTEIN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is with great sorrow that I announce to my colleagues the death this morning in Princeton, N. J., of the eminent scientist, Albert Einstein. Mr. Einstein was a personal friend of mine. He had been a resident of New Jersey for a number of years. He was well known for his great scientific achievements, and especially for his contribution toward the discovery of atomic energy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief biographical sketch relating to Dr. Einstein's remarkable career.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

It is with deep regret that I have just learned of the death, in my home town of Princeton, N. J., of America's most distinguished scientist, Albert Einstein.

To the day of his death, Dr. Einstein never gave up his search for knowledge and in particular his search for a unified, mathematical concept of the laws governing the universe.

No one in the world in our time has had as great an influence on the advances of science as did Dr. Einstein. Discoverer of the theory of relativity at 26, great contributor to the enormous discoveries in electronics, television, and atomic energy, and recipient in 1921 of the Nobel Prize in Physics, Dr. Einstein came to Princeton in 1933 as a voluntary exile from his native Germany. A familiar and colorful figure in Princeton, Dr. Einstein was always friendly and always humble. He was never overly impressed with his great fame.

As with so many scientists who shared the responsibility for developing weapons which may be used in peace or war, Dr. Einstein fought continually to assure that these advances in science would be used for the benefit and not for the destruction of mankind.

As a person and as a neighbor Dr. Einstein will be greatly missed in Princeton.

As a man of science, searcher for truth, and great contributor to humanity's progress, Albert Einstein will never be forgotten.

Men everywhere are indebted to this great scientist. And today, all mankind will join together in tribute to one of civilization's greatest figures.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the death of Albert Einstein is more than a loss to the world of science. This great pioneer in the realm of physics was also a warmhearted, deeply thoughtful human being. He recognized the impact of modern scientific discoveries upon our daily lives, and never forgot that the laboratory of science is often the doorway to the households of mankind.

Those of us who live in the free world must thank God for the providential events which led Albert Einstein from the Old World to our shores. It was his intervention which induced our Government to move rapidly and boldly into the all-out struggle for atomic power. Without that timely and fortunate event, the history of our time might have been far different.

Every free American owes a debt of gratitude to this humble, earnest scholar. He has joined the immortal list of those scientists whose brilliant minds have charted new paths for the world to follow.

THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter written by Mr. Frank Ahlgren, publisher of the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, and addressed to Mr. DeWitt Wallace, publisher of the Reader's Digest. In this letter, Mr. Ahlgren effectively answers the article published in the current Reader's Digest, which speaks for itself.

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

MARCH 18, 1955.

Mr. DEWITT WALLACE,
Publisher, Reader's Digest,
Pleasantville, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: The mail brings us a proof from your April issue of William Hard's account of the Dixon-Yates deal. Your memorandum calls it an "informative over-all story" and a "complete picture."

It is nothing of the kind.

It is complete only in its presentation of the power trust lobby version of this situation. It ignores questions of sound public policy as asked by the numerous objectors during months of controversy.

Leaving to one side the unquestionable fact that fears for the future of the Tennessee Valley Authority have bearing on the views of the objectors, and the fact that the Democratic Party is using the question for political advantage, this is a purchase contract for payment of more than $500 million in tax money for electricity ($20 million for 25 years—and then the plant goes to the company). The very size of the purchase demands close examination on its own merits and demerits. For your account to lump this examination as "hot air" is a disservice to the public interest.

Your account tells of an earlier Dixon offer to sell power to TVA, without saying what his price was, or how very much higher it was than cost of other power to TVA, or how high this price was in comparison with prices offered by Mr. Dixon a few months later, or the price now mentioned after the spotlight was turned on.

Your account says the Dixon-Yates deal obtained approval of all present members of the AEC. The record shows only 2 members of a 5-member board approved and that 1 of them has since attacked it, saying he only approved in the hope of getting AEC back to the atom business and away from the power-brokerage business. (There was one neutral member, one unconfirmed appointment, and one vacancy at the time of the vote.) You say the Federal Power Commission approved without mentioning that this action was taken over the strong opposition of the head of FPC's Bureau of Accounts, Finances and Rates—the very men most likely to understand what the contract says. You say the General Accounting Office approved. You do not record that the head of GAO appeared before the Joint Committee on Atomic energy in violent protest which resulted in partial modifications.

You put negotiation for power at Paducah and Portsmouth, when the war situation demanded more atomic plant production at any cost, on the same basis as negotiation for West Memphis power, after the war situation had calmed.

You explore timidly the "guaranteed profit" angle of Dixon-Yates, without mentioning the fact that two former high officials of Mr. Dixon's companies have said for publication that the company is guaranteed against loss. There is nothing in your "complete picture" to indicate that one interpretation of a clause in this contract requires the AEC to pay the full price of power even though the plant produces none. Neither is there any hint of the contract clauses which give the Dixon company the chance to take power it is selling to the Government at 3.99 mills for its own use at 1.863 mills, under terms which could mean as much as $12 million a year profit to the Dixon companies. The figures have been published, without challenge, by Walter Von Tresckow, who is biased to be sure (because he wanted to bid but was brushed off), but an experienced man in electricity and finance nonetheless.

Your "informative story" mentions the tax clause, without saying that the Dixon-Yates proposal was so far out of line with precedent in years of Government purchase contracts that the United States Senate adopted special legislation to bring it back into line. You do not mention the many "adjustments" made in favor of the Government after objectors such as the New York Times, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Milwaukee Journal, and the Commercial-Appeal brought the deal before the public.

We further object to this "complete account" leaving out the announcement of Memphis city officials that Memphis will answer its own power needs by financing its own generating plant, if necessary. This one fact removes the whole objective of the Dixon-Yates deal. It has a place in any fair summary of this situation.

And if you use some of your space to tell of the protective attitude of this region toward TVA, you surely should let your readers know that Middle South is the present-day heir of the very company which Memphis voted out when TVA was voted in.

We are close to this situation. We have worked through its details at great length and we are thoroughly convinced that it is against the public interest. You have only to ask: Why was there no opportunity to bid on this job? To realize it was rigged from the start. We are surprised that Mr. Hard, ostensibly a reporter, would approach the story with so little regard for objectivity—that he, and you, would violate the primary rule of journalism that requires examination of both sides of a controversy.

Your truly,

FRANK AHLGREN.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make to the Senate. I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. After the roll is called, and a quorum is developed, the Senate will receive a visit from a very distinguished former Member of this body.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have in the Chamber today a former colleague who has come back to pay us a visit.

Many honors have come to him since he left our ranks more than a decade ago. One of those honors was the highest office in our land, the Presidency of the United States.

He led our Nation through some of the most serious crises in its history. He traveled abroad, and in the name of all our people, dealt with foreign potentates on an equal footing. At all times he displayed courage and fortitude and patriotism that gained him the respect even of his enemies.

However, Mr. President, I should like to welcome him back today as a man who is returning for a visit to a dearly beloved home, peopled by very beloved friends.

His life is an important chapter in Senate history. He is already a part of our traditions and a part of our lore. This is a better Senate because he was a part of it.

On behalf of my colleagues, I say: "Welcome back Mr. Truman. The latchstring is always out whenever you pass this way."

Mr. President, I believe it would be very appropriate if we might have the pleasure of hearing from our distinguished former colleague, and with that purpose in view, I ask unanimous consent that he be given the privilege at this time to submit whatever remarks he may care to make.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the request made by the distinguished majority leader, and to join in welcoming to the Senate a distinguished former Member of this body, one of two living ex-Presidents of the United States. He will always find here a most cordial bipartisan welcome.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks of Mr. Truman, the Senate take a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, to enable Senators to greet our former colleague.

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

The Chair recognizes the former President of the United States, and our former colleague. [Applause.]

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, thank you very, very much.

When I was a Member of the Senate the rules prohibited applause in the Senate. Has that rule been repealed? [Laughter.]

I cannot tell the Members of the Senate how very much I appreciate the privilege and the honor which has been accorded me. The happiest days of my 30 years of political life were spent at the desk where I now stand. I do not know of anything I could say that could impress you with the full meaning of the statement that my heart has always been in this Chamber. I wanted to remain here, but circumstances prevented it.

I met with an experience this morning which I never expected to have. I appeared before the distinguished Foreign Relations Committee of this body, on the wrong side of the table. I wish to say that never in my entire life have I been more courteously treated than I was at that meeting of the committee. I trust the statement which I made will be a contribution to the information of that great committee.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will always continue to be, as it has been in the past, the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world. It is an honor for any man to serve in this great body, and I consider the 10 years spent here by me the greatest 10 years of my entire life.

I consider this visit a very great privilege, Mr. President, and I appreciate the honor which has been extended to me.

[Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the light of the uncertainty of how the Senate will proceed, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there be no further morning business, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 500.

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

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that the bill now before the Senate is the Colorado River storage project bill, and that it is now in order to proceed with the consideration of any amendments thereto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill is now before the Senate, and the consideration of the committee amendments is now in order. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after the word "use", it is proposed to strike out "making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize" and insert in lieu thereof "commencing a program for utilization in the States of the upper basin."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, if he intends to propose to have all the committee amendments agreed to, and then to proceed to discuss the bill. I ask the question, in part, because I understand the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] intends to offer an amendment, and I was wondering what the procedure would be.

Mr. ANDERSON. My thought was, if I may respond to the distinguished Senator from California, to have the Senate proceed to agree to the committee amendments, recognizing the fact that the Senator from Oregon subsequently will offer an amendment dealing with Echo Park Dam. I should certainly wish to protect his parliamentary right to offer that amendment. I feel sure that it would be in order at a subsequent time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments from the floor will be in order after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Senator from California get a sufficient answer to his question? The procedure being followed is merely the usual procedure, having the committee amendments acted on first. After the committee amendments have been acted on, then it will be in order for any Senator to offer an amendment to the perfected bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to be certain of my understanding with respect to an additional point. As I recall, 1 or 2 proposed amendments of which I was the author were offered in committee, but I do not believe they were accepted by the committee. Language somewhat different was adopted. If the amendments of the committee shall be adopted, is my understanding correct that I may, at a subsequent time, if I so desire, move to strike any of the committee amendments, or to substitute other language therefor?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to have the Chair rule on that question, but certainly it is my understanding that the Senator from California could subsequently offer an amendment to strike out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that committee amendments are subject to amendment, and if any Senator has any amendment to offer to one of the committee amendments, it should be offered at the time the committee amendment is pending

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I not have the right to ask that my suggestions be adopted? In other words, do I not have a right to ask that subsequently any Member of the Senate shall have the opportunity to move that a committee amendment be stricken or changed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Most certainly, if the Senator asks unanimous consent, and it is granted, that may be done. The Senator is asking that certain amendments he desires to offer to the committee amendments be deferred until all the committee amendments are adopted, and that he be permitted to offer them at that time.

Mr. KUCHEL. No. Let me phrase it differently, and see if the Senator from New Mexico will agree with the request.

I ask unanimous consent that at any time prior to the vote on the final passage of S. 500, any Member of the Senate may have the right to offer an amendment by which a committee amendment previously adopted may be stricken or changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the Senator from California, his unanimous-consent request is that at any time prior to the final passage of S. 500 any Member of the Senate may offer amendments to the committee amendments which previously have been adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from California would modify his request so as to make it apply only to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think his original request was too broad. There is no disposition on our part to foreclose any amendments. If the unanimous-consent request were so limited, I would have no objection to it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I adopt the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico as my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request now is that prior to the final passage of S. 500, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] may be permitted to offer amendments to the committee amendments which have been adopted before that time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the second committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 16, after the word "works", it is proposed to strike out "Cross Mountain."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 17, after the word "Canyon", to insert "Juniper."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 23, after the word "level", to insert "and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board,"; in line 24, after the word "thereof", to insert "and of the Juniper unit."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in view of the agreement we have had with the Senator from California, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the remaining committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The remaining committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "such" and insert "each;" in line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "such" and insert "each;" in line 15, after the word "Navajo", to insert "Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette;" in line 20, after the word "That", to strike out "(a);" on page 4, line 14, after the word "law", to strike out: "Section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall, except as hereinafter provided for the San Juan Chama and the Navaho participating project, not be applicable to such supplemental reports; and, (b) that no appropriation for or construction of the San Juan Chama project or the Navajo participating project shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States, including (but without limiting the generality of the foregoing) the State of Texas, pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and said projects shall have been approved and authorized by the Congress."

At the top of page 5, in line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to insert: "Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: *Provided further*, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navajo Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navajo participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by act of Congress:"; on page 6, beginning in line 4, to strike out:

"SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive development as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado River system the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of further units of the Colorado River storage project, of additional phases of participating projects authorized in this act, and of new participating projects as additional information becomes available and additional needs are indicated. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to authorize as participating projects only projects (including units or phases thereof)—

"(1) for the use, in one or more of the States designated in article III of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, of waters of the upper Colorado River system the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those States by that article; and

"(2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine their probable engineering and economic justification and feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any participating project authorized in the future shall be amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this act and Federal reclamation law; and insert:

"SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated."

On page 7, line 24, after "(a)", to strike out "irrigation repayment"; on page 8, line 2, after the word "the", to insert "irrigation"; on page 9, line 12, after the word "Treasury", to insert "and such funds shall be available for expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this act."; on page 10, line 12, after the word "act", to insert "After repayments to the United States of all moneys required to be repaid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress."

On page 12, line 24, after the word "year", to strike out "1955" and insert "1956"; on page 13, line 7, after the word "powerplants", to insert "and transmission lines"; on page 14, line 8, after the word "provided", to insert "for"; in line 22, after the word "the", to strike out "Cross Mountain,"; in line 23, after the word "Canyon," to insert "Juniper"; on page 15, line 19, after the numerals "12", to insert "(a)" in line 24, after the word "Compact", to insert "the upper Colorado River Basin compact,"; on page 16, line 6, after the word "States", to insert "either on its own behalf or as parens patriae,"; in line 16, after the word "River", to strike out "and its tributaries" and insert "System"; in line 17, after the word "purposes", to strike out "within any of the States of the upper Colorado River Basin"; and after line 18, to insert:

"(b) In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River system and in programing the storage and release of such waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time to time with an advisory committee consisting of 1 representative appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin States, 1 representative of the Colorado River Board of California, 1 representative of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and 1 representative of the United States Section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional authority to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce among the States and with the Indian tribes, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States, and for the purposes, among others,

of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, commencing a program for utilization in the States of the upper basin, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the apportionments made to and among them in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods and for the improvement of navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, hereby authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, and Navaho: *Provided,* That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than 940,000 acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at 7,520 feet above mean sea level and approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and that construction thereof, and of the Juniper unit, shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of each unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of each unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette: *Provided,* That construction of the participating projects set forth in this clause (2) shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has reexamined the economic justification of such project and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress, through the President, that, in his judgment, the benefits of such project will exceed its costs, and that the financial reimbursability requirements set forth in section 4 of this act can be met. The Secretary's supplemental report for each such project shall include, among other things, (i) a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of the project made by the Secretary after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture; (ii) a reevaluation of the nondirect benefits of the project; and (iii) allocations of the total cost of construction of each participating project or separable features thereof, excluding any expenditures authorized by section 7 of this act, to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control or navigation, or any other purpose authorized under reclamation law. Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: *Provided further,* That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navaho participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by act of Congress: *Provided further,* That with reference to the San Juan-Chama project, it shall be limited to a single off stream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River to be used solely for the control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River, that no power facilities shall be established, installed, or operated along the diversion or on the reservoir or dam, and such dam and reservoir shall at all times be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided,* That (a) contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the irrigation obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than 50 years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an "organization" as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under, or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin fund (hereinafter referred to as the basin fund), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this act other than section 7.

(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, other than section 7, shall be credited to the basin fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury, and such funds shall be available for expenditures within the limitations of the provisions of this act.

(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the basin fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts, (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section, (3) payment of the reimbursable construction costs of the Paonia project which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay within the period prescribed in the act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181), said payment to be made within 50 years after completion of that portion of the project which has not been constructed as of the date of this act, and (4) payment in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277): *Provided,* That revenues credited to the basin fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this act. After repayments to the United States of all money required to be repaid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

(d) Revenues in the basin fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 5 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 5 of this act, within a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

(4) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 5 of this act within a period not exceeding 50 years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable features thereof, or, in the cases of the Paonia project and of Indian lands, within a period consistent with other provisions of law applicable thereto.

(e) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during

the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

(f) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

SEC. 5. Upon completion of each unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by sec. 7 of this act) of constructing said unit, project, or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation, and maintenance costs to authorize nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this act. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1956, upon the status of the revenues from and the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

SEC. 6. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but no exercise of the authority hereby granted shall affect or interfere with the operation of any provision of the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, or the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

SEC. 7. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of and improve conditions for the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided for, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

SEC. 9. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, Navaho, and Echo Park initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 11. The appropriate agencies of the United States are authorized to convey to the city and county of Denver, Colo., for use as a part of its municipally owned water system, such interests in lands and water rights used or acquired by the United States solely for the generation of power and other property of the United States as shall be required in connection with the development or use of its Blue River project, upon payment by Denver for any such interest of the value thereof at the time of its acquisition by Denver, and provided that any such transfer shall be so limited as not to preclude the use of the property other than water rights for the necessary functions of the United States Government.

SEC. 12. (a) In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States, either on its own behalf or as parens patriae, to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits. No right to impound or use water for the generation of power or energy, created or established by the building, operation or use of any of the powerplants authorized by this act, shall be deemed to have priority over or otherwise operate to preclude or impair any use, regardless of the date of origin of such use, of the waters of the Colorado River system for domestic or agricultural purposes.

(b) In the operation of works under his jurisdiction for the storage and release of waters of the Colorado River system and in programing the storage and release of such waters, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult from time to time with an advisory committee consisting of one representative appointed by each of the Colorado River Basin States, one representative of the Colorado River Board of California, one representative of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and one representative of the United States section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

SEC. 13. As used in this act—

The terms "Colorado River Basin," "Colorado River compact," "Colorado River system," "Lee Ferry," "States of the upper division," "upper basin," and "domestic use" shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the upper Colorado River Basin compact;

The term "States of the upper Colorado River Basin" shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

The term "upper Colorado River Basin" shall have the same meaning as the term "upper basin";

The term "Upper Colorado River Basin compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948, by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

The term "Rio Grande compact" shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785); and

The term "treaty with the United Mexican States" shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, so that I may be correctly advised by the Chair, I should like to inquire whether amendments will be in order prior to the vote on the final passage of S. 500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that is the unanimous-consent agreement which applies to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When the Chair was engaging in a colloquy with the junior Senator from California, I did not hear all that was said. Am I to understand that an amendment to S. 500 will be in order up until the time of the final vote on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments to S. 500 are in order now. The unanimous-consent agreement obtained by the Senator from California for himself and the Senator from Oregon was that amendments to the committee amendments would be received from those two Senators up to the vote on the final passage of the bill. Amendments to the bill which have nothing to do with committee amendments are in order now.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for my better information, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sentor from Vermont will state it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Senate bill 500 is before the Senate, and the committee amendments to the bill have been adopted en bloc. Therefore, we now have before us the bill as reported by the committee, and all the committee amendments have been adopted. Do I correctly understand that the parts of the bill represented by the committee amendments are now sacred and are not now subject to amendment, except as amendments may be proposed by the two Senators who, by unanimous consent, were given the privilege of submitting amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the parts of the bill which have been amended by committee amendment can be altered

now only by the submission of amendments by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] or the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], or under a motion to reconsider a committee amendment heretofore adopted which some Senator may desire to have changed.

Mr. FLANDERS. So amendments to the committee amendments can be made now only through the process of reconsideration. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, within 2 days.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me state there is no desire on the part of those who are sponsoring the bill to shut off the offering of amendments.

The original request by the Senator from California, if granted, would have resulted in our going over and over the same ground. If the Senator from Vermont wishes to submit an amendment, I can assure him that he will not have to resort to any unusual practice in order to obtain consideration of his amendment. Nothing of that sort is in the heart of any Member of the Senate, I am sure; and I assure him that the bill is open to amendment by him or by any other Senator. The only desire is to prevent our going over and over the same matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I was as much interested in the general principle involved as I was in this particular instance. I have been here only 8 years, and I keep learning things I did not know.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my only concern in raising the point at all was in the interest of orderly procedure. I was acquainted with the fact that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] intended to offer an amendment. I wished to protect my own rights in opposing any of the committee amendments. However, it seemed to me that orderly procedure would require that the bill be first discussed generally, pro and con. Thereafter, Members of the Senate would be a little better informed as to what they might wish to do with respect to amendments.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not the understanding that the action which has been taken by the Senate to expedite orderly procedure on the bill would permit amendments in the first degree, even with respect to those parts of the bill which were amended by committee amendments? Was that not the intent of the author of the unanimous-consent request, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], when he proceeded to clarify the situation? Was it not the intent to have before us for consideration a single piece of legislation?

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator addresses that question to me, I think the Chair had ruled that, by the simple process of moving to reconsider any amendment which has been adopted by the Senate on the recommendation of the committee, any Member of the Senate may exercise his rights.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I understood the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, amendments in the second degree would also be permitted. I ask the Chair whether or not amendments in the second degree are also permissible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that committee amendments are amendments in the first degree, and that any amendments to committee amendments are amendments in the second degree. No further amendments could be offered, under the rules, to the same committee amendment, after one amendment to the committee amendment had been agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have the honor today to present to the Senate for its consideration S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River storage project, as reported favorably with amendments from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with only one dissenting voice. Twelve Senators signed the report, No. 128; one presented separate views with respect to one feature of the bill; a thirteenth Senator filed minority views, and 2 members of the committee abstained from taking a position on the report.

To the minds of most western people concerned with the conservation for use of the precious water resources of the arid and semiarid areas, S. 500 is perhaps the most vital legislation of this character before the Congress since the reclamation law of 1902, which was sponsored by President Theodore Roosevelt. In the 53 years that have elapsed since that memorable and far-reaching law was enacted, most of the West has moved forward.

Irrigation, which is essential to the stabilization of agriculture west of the 100th meridian, has expanded under reclamation and private initiative. Multiple-purpose dams financed by congressional appropriations store water for irrigation, flood control, river regulation, recreation, and the production of hydropower for industries, rural and urban use. Power revenues assist in repaying irrigation costs beyond the ability of water users to repay. In 50 years, Congress has appropriated approximately $2.5 billion for reclamation construction. The areas in the West created or supported by reclamation developments since 1916 have paid more than that amount into the Federal Treasury in income and other Federal taxes.

I have many times pointed out, with respect to the Salt River project in the State of Arizona, that not only is the Federal Government receiving back the entire cost of the project, but the farmers under that project, because of the water which is supplied to their farms, have paid to the Federal Treasury, in income taxes alone, three times the entire cost of the Salt River project.

California, from Oregon to the Mexican border, has shared in this expansion stimulated by Federal appropriations. The Pacific Northwest has likewise set a pace for industrial growth, and the Missouri River Basin project, authorized by the Congress in 1944, is under way to protect seven more States from the ravages of drought, wind, and floods. Current estimates of the costs to complete the Missouri Basin project approach $5 billion, including the programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

Only the upper Colorado River Basin awaits recognition by the Congress of the United States as an area that needs and deserves conservation of its water resources for irrigation to stabilize its agriculture and hydropower to stimulate its industrial and rural development and aid in returning the costs to the Federal Treasury. Incidental recreational and flood-control benefits round out the multiple-purpose features of the project to be authorized by S. 500.

The States of the upper basin are Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

S. 500 has four principal purposes, which are outlined more in detail in the report, and which will be discussed more fully by other Senators.

First, it would authorize 6 holdover storage reservoirs, 5 of which have hydropower plants, transmission lines, and incidental works. These reservoirs are vital to the control of the Colorado River and to insure that the upper basin can fulfill the commitments in the Colorado River compact of 1922 not to deplete the flow of the stream below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years. The power installations will assure double or triple use of the waters of the Colorado without affecting the obligations of the upper basin. Power revenues will repay to the Federal Treasury not only the returnable costs of the reservoirs, facilities, et cetera, but will contribute materially to returning irrigation costs beyond the ability of the water users to repay. The ultimate installed power capacity to be authorized is 1,200,000 kilowatts.

Second, S. 500 would authorize 12 participating irrigation projects. In these projects are 132,360 acres of land to be brought under irrigation, and 234,000 acres to receive supplemental irrigation water to firm up their present supplies. Before construction can begin, the Secretary of the Interior must reexamine the projects and report to Congress.

Third, the bill recognizes by conditional authorization 21 additional projects or units in various stages of planning, and requires approval and authorization by the Congress before construction. In the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navaho projects in New Mexico, reports must be submitted to the State of Texas. In the 21 additional projects are 832,000 acres of land to be newly irrigated or receive supplemental water.

Finally, the bill recognizes that the works authorized constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive development of the water resources apportioned to the upper basin, and that the specific authorizations in this bill are not intended to limit or preclude the consideration and authorization by Congress of other projects for the use of waters apportioned under the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

The repayment provisions of the bill, following very closely recommendations

made by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Interior, are designed to achieve, so far as practicable, the concurrent return of expenditures for power and irrigation and municipal and industrial water supply purposes, insofar as expenditures therefor are made concurrently. The power and municipal and industrial water supply expenditures are returned with interest. All reimbursable costs are returnable within 50-year periods, and this is specifically required by section 4 of the bill as amended.

The Senate, of course, is aware that there is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States litigation between Arizona and California et al. The committee considered the propriety or advisability of authorization of the works set forth in S. 500. It was the conclusion of an overwhelming majority of the committee that nothing in the pending litigation warrants delay in authorization of the works proposed in the bill, and that such is the case even if Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming should be impleaded.

The works included in the bill as recommended by the Upper Colorado River Commission for the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming are fully justified because they are designed only to make effective part of the perpetual apportionment of 7,500,000 acre-feet annually made to the upper basin in the Colorado River compact, and partake of the character of works heretofore authorized under the Federal reclamation program. Therefore the committee concludes that the authorization of this plan of development, being plainly within the upper basin apportionment, cannot and should not be construed as detrimental in any respect to the rightful interests of Arizona, California, or Nevada, as lower basin States, whether as litigants or otherwise. However, the committee calls attention to section 12 of the bill which makes it possible for any Colorado River Basin State to institute litigation promptly in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the event questions arise regarding the legality of the operation of any works herein authorized or of any other works on the river.

Possible frustration of efforts effectively to litigate such questions is avoided by waiver of the immunity of the United States from such a suit. Thus, all States of the Colorado River Basin are fully protected against the operation of any works on the Colorado River system in contravention of the Colorado River compact of 1922, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the Mexican treaty. Furthermore, the provision contained in the bill—section 12 (b)—for consultation with an advisory committee in connection with the operation of works on the river will tend, as a practical matter, to obviate misunderstanding and to reduce occasions for litigation.

We feel that it was satisfactorily established by the evidence that the aggregate of the consumptive use of water that will be made, if all of the works hereby proposed to be authorized are eventually constructed after meeting the various conditions imposed, when added to consumptive use already being made in the upper division States, will amount to less than two-thirds of the apportionment being made to the upper basin under the compact. When all storage units and participating projects named in this bill are constructed, the aggregate of all consumptive uses in the upper basin would not exceed 4.8 million acre-feet of water per annum. This would leave an unused apportionment of 2.7 million acre-feet of the 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned to the upper basin to meet any contingencies arising out of litigation over varying interpretations of the compact. In the circumstances, the continuity of the water supply for the lower basin would be assured.

Before outlining the estimated overall construction costs, I should mention the Eden irrigation project in Wyoming, previously authorized and now nearing completion. This project, as well as the Paonia irrigation project in Colorado, also previously authorized and partly constructed, will be aided financially by the Colorado River storage project power revenues.

The estimated construction costs of the Colorado River storage projects authorized by Senate bill 500 are: 6 storage units, $782,883,000; 12 participating irrigation projects, $310,116,800; total cost of authorized units, $1,092,999,800.

The estimated construction costs of the units requiring further approval and authorization by the Congress are: 21 participating projects, $558,173,300.

Including the Eden and Paonia projects previously authorized, the estimated construction costs of all projects mentioned in Senate bill 500 total $1,658 million, or $1.6 billion.

Mr. President, many Senators from the western States, who have been particularly interested in this subject and who have been very faithful in furthering the development, will undoubtedly speak at some length on the proposed legislation. Therefore, I do not believe it would be fair for me to inflict on them, before they have had an opportunity to speak, a discussion by me which runs to 30 or 40 pages, in which I try to point out that the establishment of the project involved in the bill will not in any way cause difficulty in the agricultural picture throughout the United States.

I hope the able and distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who is known as one of the financial geniuses of Congress, will discuss the financial implications of the proposed project. For myself, I feel that I have had some background in agriculture and have had an opportunity to study agriculture, and on the basis of that knowledge I wish to state for the RECORD my testimony that the project can be started and completed without in any way jeopardizing the agricultural prospects of any agricultural State of the Union.

However, I do not feel it would be right for me to make my further remarks before other Senators have had an opportunity to speak on the pending bill.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy to yield to the very distinguished Senator from Utah, who has worked on the bill unceasingly and effectively. I congratulate him for what he has done.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I should like to ask him whether he will be available to answer some questions with respect to the statement to which he has referred.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sure there will be a number of questions I shall wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico, and I believe other Members of the Senate will also wish to propound some questions to him.

Mr. ANDERSON. When I speak on the agricultural question, I hope any Senator who is interested in American agriculture and who feels he has a problem in connection with it, and desires to ask me a question on that subject, will feel free to do so.

I shall deal with present population trends and with a subject on which a study was started almost immediately after I became Secretary of Agriculture, namely, the question of how best to utilize the land mass of the Nation and how best to apply it and use it in order to provide all the food needs of the United States.

Anyone who can look at the agricultural picture and not conclude that we shall have some difficulty with our food supplies within the next 25 years, and probably even within the next 10 years, has not read the story of this country correctly. I shall want to discuss that subject as frankly as I can, and I hope some enlightenment may be afforded.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Finally, I should like to say that in our labors on the bill we have enjoyed very pleasant working relationship with the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who finds himself in opposition to the bill. I wish that the good people of his State could have kept their opposition to the bill on the high level on which the distinguished junior Senator from California has kept his.

A few days ago I received in the mail the pamphlet I hold in my hand, which refers to a "new $4 billion tax burden" threatening us. It sets forth the amount of the tax burden which will fall on the various States. I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has read this pamphlet. I find that my State will be assessed $15 million of the cost. Arizona will be assessed $20 million of the cost. California will have to bear $372 million worth of the burden.

I mentioned a moment ago that anyone who will take the time to check the experience of the Reclamation Bureau throughout the West, will realize, as does the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] that these vast projects and other prospective projects which are coming along will also be revenue-producing projects. I mention that because in one of these writings it is mentioned that the Arkansas-Fryingpan project will be helped on its way by the passage of this proposed legislation.

While the Senator from Colorado is on the floor I wish to say that I hope to have a final markup of his bill, in which he is so greatly interested, the Arkansas-Fryingpan project, next Wednesday. We expect to have the bill before the full committee on the following Tuesday. Here, again, is an example of the Federal Government stepping in to do what an individual State cannot do, and making it possible for the people of Colorado to enjoy benefits and to anticipate the population growth which is now ahead of them.

I do not wish to discuss the bill which is coming before the committee. It will be amply discussed on the floor. But one of the purposes of the bill about which the people of California are a little worried is that of supplying water to municipalities in Colorado. One of those municipalities, the city of Colorado Springs, is enjoying an unusual building boom, and the Federal Government, through the utilization of the water, will be able to develop that fine community.

Therefore, Mr. President, I welcome the bill which has been introduced and on which hearings have been held. I predict that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works will report favorably on the bill. I believe all these measures, such as the upper Colorado River bill, the Arkansas-Fryingpan bill, and proposed legislation dealing with districts in California which involve the conservation of water resources, are extremely important and that the attention of the Congress needs to be called to them as we plan the food needs for future years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the business of the Senate today is Calendar No. 131, Senate bill 500, dealing with the upper Colorado storage project.

On the 16th of March I was given the opportunity to testify before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when it was holding its hearing upon this bill.

I have before me the text of my testimony. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in an appropriate place in the body of the RECORD after the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] shall have opened the debate.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY AT HEARING HELD BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, MARCH 16, 1955

I notice that you have before the committee a map of the upper Colorado River Basin. I would like to distribute to each member of the committee a miniature copy of this map so that you will have them before you while I talk.

I want to speak about a flowing river, but if I were to give a title to the talk I wish to make, I would call it "They Want To Throw Us to the Dinosaurs."

OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS CONTRAVENE COMPACT

The arguments which have been made against this upper Colorado River storage project, in my opinion, are completely contrary to the policy of the Government, since the Colorado River compact was signed by the authority of the Congress and approved by the Congress.

The attack rises from two sources: First, those in the lower basin, who fear that if the upper basin is permitted to use the water which was allocated to it, the lower basin will somehow be deprived of some of its rights; second, those who seem to believe that somehow or another the building of Echo Park Dam will create a precedent for raids upon national parks and national monuments all over the United States.

The answer to the first, Mr. Chairman, is that in drawing the bill which is before the Senate, S. 500, an attempt was made to provide that what is to be done in the upper Colorado Basin would be done solely in compliance with the Colorado River compact and the various acts which have been passed since that time.

BUILDING OF DAM CANNOT PRESAGE INVASION OF PARKS

The answer to the second is that the law and the facts prove that the building of this dam cannot be a precedent. I undertake to show you today, if I do not trespass upon your time, that is not true, and that, quite to the contrary, the expansion of the Dinosaur National Park—or national monument, I should call it, because it is not a park and never was a park—the expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument by Executive order in 1938 was an invasion of a policy already laid down by Government agencies to devote the area where the Echo Park Dam is to be built to the development of power.

Now let us take a look at this map.

The history of the Colorado River and its tributaries will never be told. The National Park Service has attempted to tell part of it in a little booklet which is entitled "Dinosaur National Monument: Past and Present," published by the Government Printing Office in 1949.

Here on the first page I will read a few lines:

"The chain of events that produced the area comprising Dinosaur National Monument began in what is known as the Jurassic period of earth history.

"This period, according to the best calculations of geologists, occupied an interval of time from 127 to 152 million years ago."

At another point in this document (the paragraph escapes my eye at the moment), the statement is made that in that ancient period this area was inhabited by the dinosaur and his relatives, who, in time, gave way to more intelligent beings—oh, here is the sentence from page 18:

"There did, however, come a day when the last dinosaur drew his final breath, leaving the world to new, different, and more intelligent creatures."

In the belief that man is to be classified among these more intelligent creatures, I appear before you today to beg of you to use the intelligence of the Congress to maintain the policy which was initiated after this history of over a million years of destruction. Congress was intelligent enough, and the States of the Colorado River Basin under their governments were intelligent enough, to do something about the control of the stream which had wrought so much damage through millions of years, and to use it for a constructive purpose.

As you will see from glancing at the map, the story of the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin begins in the State of Wyoming, where the Green River has its rise—the Green River and its tributaries. It flows south past the towns of Green River and of Rock Springs, through the Flaming Gorge site, into the State of Utah, and then over into the State of Colorado.

Under the compact which was written by the Colorado River Compact Commission, of which former President Hoover was the head, and approved by the Congress of the United States, it was agreed to divide the waters of this stream, the main flow of this stream, the waters of this system, between the upper basin and the lower basin, and the delivery of the waters which the upper basin owed to the lower basin was ordered to be made at this point on the map—at Lee's Ferry.

COMPACT DIVIDED WATER BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER BASINS

The agreement in that compact was that each basin would be entitled to use for consumptive purposes just about half of the stream flow of that system.

The work first began in the lower basin. Of course, before the Colorado River compact was approved there was private irrigation both in the lower and the upper basin, and efforts were made to irrigate and reclaim certain amounts of land. But, according to the testimony of Mr. Northcutt Ely, a representative of California in the sense that he is one of the lawyers representing the California claims, the State of California today is using about 5 million acre-feet plus of water from this system. The lower basin, all of the lower basin, is using about 6½ million acre-feet. The upper basin, Mr. Northcutt Ely acknowledges, presently is using between 2 million and 2½ million acre-feet. We place that use at 2 million, but for the purposes of this argument I accept Mr. Ely's figures.

In his testimony before the Senate committee, he also acknowledged that all of the projects in the upper basin, which have heretofore been authorized but which have not yet been constructed, might add from 400,000 to 500,000 acre-feet to the future uses of the upper basin.

RATIO IS ALMOST 6 TO 4 IN FAVOR OF LOWER BASIN

Let us take the maximum figures mentioned by Mr. Ely, 2½ million acre-feet, his maximum estimate of present use, and 500,000 if authorized projects not yet built were constructed. Thus, according to the estimates of the California expert, we would have 3 million acre-feet. If all the participating projects included in the Senate bill (S. 500) and the Governor Johnson amendments which have been proposed were built, the upper basin use would not exceed 4½ million acre-feet.

The lower basin, on the other hand, has 6½ million acre-feet. Thus, considering present uses, heretofore authorized but unbuilt projects, and projects proposed by this bill, there is a ratio of almost 6 to 4 against the upper basin on the testimony of Mr. Ely, so far as California is concerned. But it is important to remember that Mr. Ely estimates the present uses in the upper basin at a half million acre-feet more than does the Bureau of Reclamation.

We have reason to believe that the lower basin may use even more than acknowledged by Mr. Ely, but the juxtaposition of these figures seems to me must convince every fair mind that nothing should be done or be permitted to be done to prevent the utilization in the upper basin States of the water allocated to it by the Colorado River compact, namely, 7½ million acre-feet annually.

UPPER STATES WANT ONLY THEIR DUE

The upper basin States are willing to be bound by the compact. The bill before you acknowledges that. Every attempt is made to avoid injuring any right, either existing or potential, under the Colorado River compact. We want only to have the opportunity of using the water as it flows through our States, while we deliver at Lee's Ferry, according to the obligation laid upon us in the Colorado River compact, 7½ million acre-feet, which is 3 million more than is now being used and proposed in the whole upper basin annually.

Now this is the simple picture, but a great effort has been made to convince those who listen to the arguments against the

upper basin that this water system is almost a static business. We are asked to overlook the fact that the water moves and that it has been moving down that valley for millions of years. During all of those eons it has wrought only destruction. Man had not captured it, nor harnessed it, nor done anything to make it useful, except in a very small way, until by the authority of Congress the States in the Colorado River Basin were authorized to make a compact to bring these eternally flowing waters under control and to make this system an instrument of construction.

Fortunately for the lower basin, the lower basin States secured Federal legislation to store and divert water long before the upper basin States ever reached an agreement. Finally a percentage was allotted to each of these upper-basin States, and now we are here asking authorization to begin the construction of projects which, in the bill, must be supported by the certification, not only of the Secretary of the Interior, but of the President of the United States, that the projects are feasible.

UPPER STATES HAVE POURED MONEY INTO RECLAMATION FUND

Yet you are asked to believe that this is a project which will place upon the backs of the taxpayers of the United States an intolerable burden.

My colleague, Senator BARRETT, has just shown to you how the State of Wyoming alone, under the Federal Leasing Act, a law passed by the Congress, has been contributing millions of dollars ever since 1920 for the reclamation fund to build reclamation projects most of which, until 20 years ago, were built in other States.

And yet, gentlemen, propagandists have the—well, I should say, effrontery—to scatter broadcast through the Congress of the United States a little pamphlet with a red back and a red front, attempting to tell the people of the country that the upper basin States are not contributing to the cost of this project.

We build power; we have returns from the projects. Of course, it would be impossible to require the farmers on the newly irrigated farms in this area to pay the entire cost. Everybody knew that when the Colorado River compact was drawn and when it was approved. That was known when the Hoover Dam was built and made a power project to develop power and earn revenue.

I wish it were possible to display to you on a screen the pictures of the Colorado River and the lower basin before the Hoover Dam was built and after it was built. I have some photographs here showing the site after completion of the dam. But it is only necessary to refer to the irrigation of the Imperial Valley in California; it is only necessary to refer to the great expansion of the city of Los Angeles; it is only necessary to refer to the development of California industry as a result of the water and the power which was stored in these dams, to prove conclusively that it was a wise and salutary act of Congress to authorize the harnessing of this stream. Surely what was good enough for the lower basin ought to be good enough for the upper basin, too.

ECHO PARK DAM BILL LEAVES DINOSAUR UNDISTURBED

Now, it is said that the Echo Park Reservoir should not be permitted to be built. It is said that Congress ought to preserve the deep canyons which were worn in the terrain of the upper basin by the Green and the Yampa Rivers during all these centuries past, preserve them as a monument to the dinosaurs, and the public is sought to be convinced that those of us who advocate the construction of this reservoir are flooding out the Dinosaur Monument. It is not so.

In this same monograph of the National Park Service, written by William Lee Stokes, of the United States Geological Survey and the University of Utah in 1949, there is a map of Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado, and this map contains a little diagram showing the original Dinosaur National Monument. I would like the members of the committee to see that.

Congressman THOMSON, the original Dinosaur Monument is this almost infinitesimal spot at the extreme western end of the Dinosaur National Monument, as expanded [indicating].

RECLAMATION HAS PRIOR RIGHTS IN AREA

Long before the Dinosaur National Monument was created by the Executive order of President Woodrow Wilson under the authority of the Antiquities Act, long before that, there was a reclamation withdrawal in this area because it was recognized that reclamation was one of the constructive purposes to which water could be put. Here was a stream that had been rushing torrents of wasted water down through an area larger than the whole New England States and part of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. Here was this great area through which this river had been tearing and foaming and pouring torrential floods, carrying all sorts of silt and, maybe, mineral resources in its flood, but always digging in and digging in. Here was this river.

Then an attempt was made to store water, store it in the Hoover Dam, with great success. But they tell us, if we store water in the Glen Canyon Dam, that will deprive the lower basin, or at least California, of some of its uses. The words are written into the bill to prevent that.

But the point that I want to make to this committee with respect to these dams is that the only way by which the upper basin States can get the water which was allocated by the authority of the Congress of the United States to the upper basin is to build these dams.

It is said that the minute the Glen Canyon dam is built Hoover Dam or Lake Mead will be deprived of its supply. That assumes that to build a dam in the upper reaches of a stream it is necessary to stop the flow of the stream entirely. That is not the way the engineers build dams.

The members of this committee can look at pictures, some of them on the walls of the committee room outside, pictures from the Bureau of Reclamation, which show how the tunnels are dug so that the stream can continue to flow. You cannot build a dam with a flooding lake behind it; you have to make the stream flow around the construction work. Otherwise men could not live there very long; they would soon join the dinosaurs of 150 million years ago.

OBJECTIVE IS TO UTILIZE WASTE WATER

The dams at Glen Canyon and at Echo Park are structures that are designed to balance the flow. What the engineers have planned to do is to store the water that goes to waste, the water that is not claimed by the lower basin, the water that the lower basin could not get under the Colorado River Compact, the water that we can use if we have the intelligence to build structures that will save it. And all the time that those dams are being built the upper basin is still under the obligation of the Colorado River Act and of the compact to deliver at Lee's Ferry an average of 7½ million feet annually, or 75 million acre-feet for a 10-year period for the use of the lower basin.

The testimony before the Senate, as I said at the beginning, is, according to Mr. Ely's figures, that the maximum present use of water in the lower basin, including the use by Arizona, is about 6½ million acre-feet. So we have not reached their full allocation, and we intend only to take the water that is not necessary to meet what they need.

WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT ALWAYS HAD PRIORITY IN MONUMENT AREA

Now then, just a word about the creation of the monument. I wrote to the director of the National Park Service asking him for some pictures of the Dinosaur Monument, where the bones are found. His letter to me reads as follows, being dated December 23, 1954:

"DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In answer to your letter of December 16 requesting photographs of the original 80 acres of Dinosaur National Monument, I am enclosing three 5 by 7 prints of photographs taken in the quarry section, and two copies of a sales pamphlet on the dinosaur fossils which contain illustrations of several scenes in that area.

"We do not have on hand prints of the pictures in the pamphlet, but we can have them made for you if you will let us know which ones you would like and the size print desired.

"Although we cannot furnish the sales pamphlet in quantity, we can furnish you a few extra copies if you need them.

"Sincerely yours."

I wish to pass these photographs around because they prove conclusively that the 80-acre Dinosaur Monument set aside by Executive order of President Woodrow Wilson to preserve the bones of the dinosaurs is not a thing of beauty. It is like any quarry, a bleak and unattractive area.

Now, I want to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 20, 1954, from a statement made by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, in which he set forth in orderly progress the history of the movement by which the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded.

"Official actions since 1902 which established the priority of water and power development in the Green and the Yampa Rivers follow:

"1. October 17, 1904, reclamation withdrawal;

"2. June 8, 1906, act authorizing the creation of national monuments."

I pause here to say parenthetically that that act, the Antiquities Act, authorized the President to set aside by Executive order, areas of historical or scientific value, but it contained a specific proviso that the area should be the smallest possible area to protect the historic site or the scientific area. The Dinosaur Monument was created by Executive order and it embraced only 80 acres.

As long after that as 32 years, the same forces which are now attacking the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin as some sort of a raid upon conservation succeeded in persuading President Roosevelt to issue an Executive order expanding that 80-acre monument of Wilson's by some 209,664 acres.

Where were those acres, Mr. Chairman? They were the acres embracing the confluence of the Yampa and the Green Rivers. There are no dinosaur bones there; there is nothing of scientific value there except the scientific value of flowing water which ought to be used.

So I say without any hesitation or equivocation that the creation of the expanded Dinosaur National Monument in 1938 on the 14th of July had nothing to do with the preservation of any historical site or the preservation of any scientific area. On the contrary, it was an attempt to use for scientific purposes, for development purposes, water that had previously been recognized as one of the best sources of waterpower in the United States.

I return now to Senator WATKINS' statement:

"October 4, 1915, proclamation establishing the Dinosaur National Monument of 80 acres.

"June 10, 1920, Federal Power Act passed; section 4 giving authority to issue licenses for the erection of dams both within and without a national monument.

"March 3, 1921, the Federal Power Act was amended to prevent the licensing of dams,

powerplants, or other works in national parks and monuments without specific authority of Congress."

That is now cited, I say parenthetically, by some of the witnesses against this bill as a congressional disapproval of this act; whereas, upon its face, all that that act does is to say that the Federal Power Commission cannot by executive action alone issue licenses within parks or monuments, but must have the approval of Congress. It was an act which retains for this committee and this Congress the authority to pass the bill which is before you, and the bill which we have before the Senate.

Now I return to Senator WATKINS' statement again:

"This amendment was limited to 'existing' national parks and monuments 'as now constituted'."

So that it was, you see, a limitation bounded by the date of the passage of that act, which was March 3, 1921.

Let me skip now a little bit to August 9, 1934:

"The National Park Service asked the Federal Power Commission to restore its withdrawal for power purposes in the acres in Green and Yampa River Canyons so that a national monument could be established, and stated: 'Such an area would be established by Presidential proclamation which would exempt all existing rights and a power withdrawal is an existing right.'

"On December 19, 1934, the Federal Power Commission replied, referring to withdrawals for the Echo Park and Blue Mountain power developments, saying, after noting that the Park Service had acknowledged the withdrawal and stated that such rights would be exempted, the Federal Power Commission continues"—this I want to emphasize—I am quoting from the Federal Power Commission—" '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.'

"Those were the words of the Federal Power Commission on December 13, 1934, when the National Park Service was endeavoring to expand the 80-acre monument by 209,664 acres in order to include the power sites. Who is rating whom?

"Then the Power Commission goes on: '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 a monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.'

"Clearly, the story of the expansion of this monument is the story of the attempt of the Federal Power Commission to protect the water resources and the power resources of this area. And then what happened?"

ASSURANCE WAS GIVEN THAT DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT SUFFER

I will skip so that I may not take up too much of your time:

"July 14, 1938," says Senator WATKINS, "after many local meetings were held, at which the people of the area were assured that the proposed expansion would not prevent the development of the water and the power resources, the President of the United States issued a proclamation enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument from 80 to 209,744 acres.

"The proclamation provides that this expansion"—this is in the proclamation by President Roosevelt—"this expansion shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended."

Then Senator WATKINS says:

"This proclamation, including the specific reservation, 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, nor establish a precedent that would be applied to other monuments."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this recitation by Senator WATKINS, briefly pointing out each step of the way, is conclusive proof that the passage of this act will create no precedent to injure any national park or national monument, and no power site can be granted thereafter, I think, without the consent of Congress.

MONUMENT TO DESTRUCTION, OR MONUMENT TO GROWTH?

So, Mr. Chairman, the issue before us in the Congress this year is simply whether or not we shall take the intelligent course of allowing the people in the upper Colorado River Basin to have the benefits which were allocated to them by a compact among the basin States and approved by Congress, whether they shall have the right to have the Federal Government do for them what it has already done for the lower basin, by building reservoirs to store the flowing water which otherwise would go to no use at all.

Now in closing—I have talked too long—I merely want to say that the area of the State of Wyoming, which is in this upper basin, is at the very top of the Colorado River system. The waters have been flowing down there through the Green River for ages. The land there needs the water. It can be placed upon the land. It can be placed upon the land by this plan, this comprehensive plan, by engineers who have not yet built any dam anywhere in the United States that has collapsed. The record of the Bureau of Reclamation is perfect upon that point.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say, please, please forget these emotional appeals without basis, and instead of making the upper Colorado River Basin a monument to the destruction of the ages that have gone, let us make it a monument to the growth and expansion and the development of intelligent action, using the discoveries of science and the learning of the colleges and schools we have built by public resources all over the United States, in order to make it easier and of a better standard for people to live.

If we were to follow the course of policy outlined by Gen. U. S. Grant, who testified before us, by Sierra witnesses, by the Wilderness witnesses, we would be turning our back on all that science has developed, and we would be saying, "The people of America may enjoy these great achievements of the century, except in the upper Colorado River Basin." And not there, because of fears entertained, without justification, because of the language in the bill, and because of sentimental and thoughtless appeals by people who do not know that when the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded the power resources of the area were protected in the President's executive order.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with relation to the upper Colorado River project.

I should also like to ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, following my statement on the project, a resolution presented by Mr. Les Woerpel on behalf of the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs and adopted at the 19th Annual Convention of the National Wild Life Federation. This resolution is representative of the many expressions that I have received on this specific issue.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

With respect to the legislation now pending before the Senate, S. 500, I may say it is a source of regret to me that this bill was brought so rapidly to the Senate floor, that, in my judgment, there has not been sufficient opportunity for all of the groups which are deeply interested in it adequately to appraise the committee report.

I do not, of course, question the desire of the leadership to have the Senate proceed expeditiously on its important agenda, although I do say that, in this instance, it is somewhat unfortunate that more time is not available for the most careful evaluation.

I shall not attempt at the present time to make a detailed evaluation of S. 500 on the Senate floor.

I shall only say that I share the deep concern which has been voiced by numerous conservation groups and authorities in our Nation on S. 500, particularly in regard to those provisions which would authorize the construction of the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument.

I have heard from conservationists in my own State who have questioned the advisability from the standpoint of possible danger to the Nation's outdoor heritage. I note, for example, that among the groups which are officially on record in opposition to it are such outstanding organizations as the Izaac Walton League; the National Parks Association; the Wilderness Society; the Wildlife Management Institute; the National Wild Life Federation, and others.

From another standpoint, I should like to observe that numerous members of the engineering profession are opposed to the bill, including the Engineers Joint Council; the American Society of Civil Engineers; the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers; the American Society of Mechanical Engineers; the American Institute of Electrical Engineers; the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers; the American Society for Engineering Education, and the American Institute for Chemical Engineers.

I have always believed that the expert judgment of groups affected by pending legislation should be carefully considered.

I do not believe in weighing, of course, the total number of groups opposed to a given bill, as against the total number of groups which may be in favor of a bill. Of course, it is not mere numbers which should be weighed, but the merits of their arguments. Nevertheless, I point out the above facts as indications of the significant sentiment of two important segments of American society—censervation and engineering—in connection with opposition to the pending bill.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., 19TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, MONTREAL, MARCH 11–13, 1955

OPPOSING ECHO PARK DAM

Whereas the National Park System, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being supported and enjoyed by millions of people; and

Whereas progressive losses of recreational facilities in the various States apparently cannot be stopped, and recreational lands increased for the use of all of the people; and

Whereas such continuing loss in the light of increased use of outdoor recreational opportunities makes this condition alarming; and

Whereas any legislation that would authorize the construction of the proposed

Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah would open the way for further destruction of other recreational areas in our monuments and parks; and

Whereas the alternatives that have been offered have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proven inferior; and

Whereas the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been fully demonstrated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That National Wildlife Federation, in line with its policy of fighting for increased recreational opportunities for all of the people, take every action possible to oppose the construction of Echo Park Dam and to preserve the Dinosaur National Monument as it is now constituted, and to do everything possible to see that our National Park System is not needlessly invaded or despoiled.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). On behalf of the Vice President, and at his request, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Vice President, and at his request, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, speaking in support of S. 500, a bill authorizing initial units of a plan for the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, it may be profitable to state the situation existing between the seven States which contain the drainage basin of the Colorado River.

In 1922, after several years of preparatory research and studies of the physical and legal factors, the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming, through Commissioners, agreed upon a compact to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of this drainage basin. This compact was to become effective when ratified by the legislatures of the States and approved by the Congress, as required by law. The compact divided the basin into "upper" and "lower" subbasins containing approximately 110,000 and 130,000 square miles, respectively, in the United States. The area of the upper basin is that which drains to the stream above a point 1 mile below the mouth of the Paria River. This point is in northern Arizona not far from the Arizona-Utah boundary line, and is called Lee Ferry.

The compact requires that the upper basin States, being Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, together with a portion of Arizona, shall be given the perpetual apportionment of 7½ million acre-feet annually for beneficial consumptive use; that the lower basin States, Arizona, California, and Nevada, be given a like apportionment. However, the upper basin agreed not to deplete the runoff at Lee Ferry, by their combined consumptive use, to a degree which would leave less than 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series. The compact contains other provisions which are not material to this legislation, except that which permitted the States of each of the two basins to agree by compact between them upon divisions of use of the apportionment made in the compact.

The upper basin States, including Arizona, did agree in 1948 upon such apportionments, based upon beneficial consumptive use, and Congress has approved that compact. S. 500 notes these two compacts, the Water Treaty with Mexico, the laws enacted by Congress with respect to them, and clearly requires conformity with each and all of them in the development and operation of reclamation works in the upper basin.

The effect of the Colorado River compact of 1922 is simply to eliminate as between the States of the upper basin and those of the lower basin, the doctrine of priority of water rights. The States of the upper basin since 1922 thus have enjoyed security in their rights to use their apportionments when and where it is to their best interests to do so. It was on such a premise that the upper basin States favored authorization of the construction of Hoover Dam, the All-American Canal to Imperial Valley, the Gila irrigation project, and the Parker and Davis Dams, all in the lower basin.

I am one of the 10 Senators sponsoring S. 500. We represent, in this body, the five States having perpetual water rights to the flows of the Colorado River and its tributaries in the upper basin. We are joined under the terms of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact which was ratified by these States, and approved by the Congress, for the specific purpose of securing the development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

The bill under consideration is to initiate the fulfillment of that purpose. It is, in fact, a measure proposed by the Upper Colorado River Commission which was created by the compact. The Federal Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, is to be authorized as the construction agency.

Under the provisions of the bill, water rights will vest in the lands to be irrigated and in the municipalities to be supplied with domestic and industrial water supply, all in conformity with the laws of the States and the Federal reclamation laws.

While the works will be financed and constructed by the Federal Government, the people directly benefited will pay for them. The expenditures for power and municipal water supplies will be returned with interest, including interest during construction.

As amended by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and approved by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, S. 500 would authorize the construction of five "holdover storage" reservoirs. These reservoirs will make possible releases of water to the Lower Colorado River Basin so that upstream uses of water can be made during periods of low flows, while the upper basin States, at the same time, fulfill their compact commitments to the lower basin. Hydroelectric power will be generated from the release of stored water. The need of power is marked throughout the seven Colorado River Basin States.

The function of these storage units is of vital importance to all 7 of the Colorado River Basin States and of particular importance to the upper basin States. From the functional point of view, they are of significance to each of the upper basin States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming because, without them, in the light of historical flows of the Colorado River, those States cannot hope eventually to make the uses of water that are apportioned to them as a group by the Colorado River compact of 1922 and among them by the upper Colorado River Basin compact. They are also of financial significance to each of the upper division States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, because the revenues from the power they produce will help to pay the costs of irrigation works that can be undertaken in each of those States. These storage units are extremely important to the States of the lower basin because they retain sediments which otherwise will finally impair the functions of existing storage at Hoover Dam.

In approximately 50 years from the date of their construction, these storage units will have returned their total cost. In addition to that, they will have returned 2½ percent interest per annum on that part of their costs which is allocated to power, together with interest during construction.

One of these holdover storage units is located in the Dinosaur National Monument. The Senate has received much information on this subject during the past year. Suffice it to say that when the Dinosaur National Monument was enlarged to take in the Echo Park area, the people of the States of Colorado and Utah, living in the vicinity, were assured that such enlargement would not prohibit use of the area for water storage purposes.

Good faith requires us not to bar the use of the area for those purposes. Every effort has been made to find an equally good reservoir site outside the area of the monument. None has been found. None can be found which combines all of the attributes of Echo Park.

Echo Park Dam can be authorized without, in any sense, setting a precedent that might endanger other national monuments or national parks. The reason is that the circumstances surrounding the enlargement of the Dinosaur

National Monument are unique in that there was a reservation for power and storage development.

The question whether the Echo Park Dam should be authorized has become, in large part, a matter of emotion rather than reason.

The experts testified before our committee with clarity and precision that no equivalent for Echo Park can be found. Others testified that they were opposed to Echo Park, not so much because of their love for the Dinosaur National Monument—many of them had never been there—but because of their love of nature and their desire to preserve it for posterity. I am certain many of my colleagues in the Senate have received numerous letters from these good people. Many of those letters were obviously written by persons who had been asked to write, and who were glad to do so; but they have no real knowledge or sympathetic understanding of the needs of our arid country for economical storage sites.

S. 500 authorizes a number of participating irrigation projects, and it is contemplated that others will be authorized in the future. These irrigation projects are called participating projects because they will participate in power revenues to aid in meeting their construction costs.

These projects authorized in the bill total 383,000 acres. To take this amount of acreage and to charge against it the entire cost allocated to irrigation, including holdover storage costs so allocated, when it is contemplated that other projects will be authorized containing an amount of acreage which cannot be accurately stated at this time, is obviously a grossly inaccurate and misleading method of estimating the irrigation costs on an acreage basis.

Even though the few participating projects contained in S. 500 constitute only a beginning on irrigation development in the upper basin, the bill contains a number of safeguards that are designed to prevent initiation of construction of works which require further economic analysis. Notwithstanding the many years of investigation which have preceded the bill, our committee concluded that it would follow, in the main, the recommendations made by the present administration in connection with such safeguards. Thus, under the terms of the bill, as amended, construction of participating projects may not be initiated until there has been a reevaluation of the relation of their anticipated benefits to their estimated costs, and consultation thereon with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Furthermore, the participating projects could not be started prior to the completion of soil surveys and land classifications in accordance with the requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954. No participating project can be commenced until the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied that its costs will be paid out in 50 years.

One of the unique aspects of the bill, as amended in our subcommittee, consists in its financial provisions. The total reimbursable costs of the holdover storage reservoirs will be returned within 50 years from the commencement of their operation. Costs of participating projects are returnable within 50 years from the date of their completion; and this includes both those costs that are returnable by the water users as well as the costs returnable from power revenues.

The bill is so drawn as to require the separate treatment of interest returned on the power and municipal water supply investments, and to assure that such interest revenues will not be credited as payments on account of principal. These financial provisions, which were recommended to us by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior, are more strict than the requirements of existing reclamation law.

In effect, these provisions of S. 500 constitute a financial arrangement between the Federal Government and the five upper basin States for the return of all costs of the project except those costs that are directly related to national benefits. Only 3 percent of the total cost of the project is nonreimbursable.

Under the very strict provisions of S. 500, as I have already pointed out, the interest returned on power and municipal water supply cannot be credited as payment on account of principal. Under S. 500, the rate of interest is determined by following detailed and specific provisions for computing the average rate prevailing for long-term Treasury obligations.

The rate of interest is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the formula provided in the bill. S. 500, as the committee has amended it, provides for 50-year repayment contracts, in which the irrigation water users are to repay their share of the costs. They may, where particular circumstances warrant, have a development period not exceeding 10 years.

One of the outstanding provisions of S. 500 is the requirement that, in every case where such a course is practicable, the organization entering into the repayment contract—to repay to the United States the irrigation costs of participating projects—shall be of the "conservancy" district type.

Conservancy districts normally include within their territorial limits not only the agricultural area receiving the irrigation water supply but also the contiguous urban areas. Conservancy districts have the power to levy ad valorem taxes. Thus, the burden of repayment is spread, as it should be, among all local beneficiaries of the project as well as among the irrigation farmers.

Since the participating projects authorized by S. 500 constitute only a beginning on the irrigation development that must eventually take place in the upper Colorado River basin, the bill lays down policies designed to encourage continued investigations, the preparation of additional reports, feasibility studies, and the possible authorization of new participating projects from time to time.

Our committee had before it the question whether pending litigation between Arizona and California, which raises a number of questions of interpretation of compacts, treaties, and laws affecting the Colorado River, is of such a character as to require delay in the authorization of the Colorado River storage project. We concluded that it is not of such a character and that the authorization of these works should not be delayed. However, we have afforded the fullest measure of protection to the lower basin States by providing barriers against the operation of any of such works in a manner contrary to the applicable compacts, treaties, and laws.

We have accomplished this in two principal ways. First, by specific direction that the Secretary of the Interior shall operate such works in accordance with such compacts, treaties, and laws; and, secondly, by waiver of the immunity of the United States from suit, so that any State which considers that such works are being or may be operated in a manner contrary to such compacts, treaties, and laws, may have redress in the Supreme Court without delay.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that the upper Colorado River Basin States have been waiting for more than a quarter of a century for the works which will be authorized if S. 500 becomes law. The investigations furnishing the solid foundation of knowledge upon which these States, working with the Federal Government, have been able to build a plan, on which we are now asked to act, have proceeded for more than 25 years. These investigations have been carried out by experts in the field. All possible reservoir sites have been looked into. Many sites have been drilled; so it is known what conditions the builders will run into. Irrigation needs have been examined. Domestic water needs for the long pull have been computed. Power markets have been thoroughly surveyed. The result of all these investigations is a plan, a part of which would be authorized by S. 500.

The total cost of the project, assuming the construction of everything which is authorized, will be $1,093,000,000. This seems like a large figure. However, it should be remembered that this amount will be divided among 5 States over a 25-year construction period. Looked at in that way, the project involves an average expenditure of only $9 million per annum for each State. We should remember that almost all of it will be paid back, much of it with interest, and that, after such repayment has been accomplished, the taxpayers will realize an income up to $20 million a year from power revenue alone, for many, many years to come.

I wish that those of my colleagues who have not done so would view some of the irrigated areas in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Here are farm upon farm where once the desert reigned. Here are homes where once there was no shelter. Here are prosperous communities, schools, and churches. It is a matter of simple arithmetic to know that those projects which have been built in the West pay for themselves many times over in income taxes alone.

The bill authorizes construction of 6 reservoirs, of which 5 provide hold-over storage capacity. These reservoirs, to-

gether, will regulate the runoff for better river control in the whole Colorado River Basin. Lake Mead will require a lesser reservation for flood control, thereby having a greater active holdover capacity. The average annual silt inflow to Lake Mead is about 105,000 acre-feet. Of this quantity nearly 80,000 acre-feet, or 75 percent, will be captured in Glen Canyon Reservoir. The benefits of the storage project to the lower basin States will, therefore, be of considerable magnitude.

In the Colorado River storage project, for which we now seek authorization, there will be installed 1,200,000 kilowatts for power generation, and the energy produced will be 6 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

This is what now is proposed by Federal projects in the lower Colorado River Basin. Authorized Federal hydroelectric plants in the Missouri Basin on the main river in Montana and the Dakotas will generate 10 billion kilowatt-hours annually. Constructed Federal plants in the Columbia Basin produce more than 36 billion kilowatt-hours annually, and authorized plants will produce an additional 26 billion kilowatts annually. At present, there is but one Federal hydropower plant in the upper Colorado Basin, and that is at Green Mountain Dam in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

The information submitted to us shows: That the average annual evaporation losses in the reservoirs authorized by the bill will be 754,000 acre-feet; that consumptive uses on the participating irrigation projects will average 413,000 acre-feet annually; that consumptive uses of existing and uncompleted projects will average 2,500,000. The total consumptive use and stream flow depletion will be the sum of these values, or 3,667,000 acre-feet annually. This is less than one-half of the waters allocated to the States in the upper basin.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair.) Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I noted that the Senator from Colorado, in speaking about the repayments, stated that we should remember that almost all the money expended will be paid back, much of it with interest. As a matter of fact, all of the items, except that part of the cost which will be allocated to irrigation, will be paid back with interest. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. Interest is not paid on irrigation costs. It has been the law for 50 years that it should not be.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator refers to the basic reclamation law which was enacted in 1902, does he not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The law deals also with flood control, and the program was adopted by the Congress many years ago. The law does not require any of the individuals, corporations, or others who are benefited to pay back any interest.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Either interest or principal.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator. I think he has made a very able presentation of the outline of a great project.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, since World War I and the preparations of the United States and our Allies in that conflict, World War II, and the conflict in Korea, this Nation has made heavy drafts upon its natural resources and productive energies. This has been measured in a sense by the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars.

Obviously, our wealth-producing resources and energies spent in war, and in preparation for it, should be replaced or we will have indeed weakened ourselves in many tragic ways, which will reflect themselves most harmfully in our economy for a long time to come.

When we consider the expenditures contemplated by the project now under consideration, figured on a yearly and State-by-State basis, which in the end will pay for themselves and provide a constant replenishment of lost wealth in other directions, we can see that the expenditures here suggested are liberating and wealth-producing factors and are clearly in the interest of the national welfare.

We are simply preparing the seed beds and planting the seeds for a renewal and extension of activities which will help in overcoming the losses to which I have referred, by helping to restore the strength of our productive economy. This is consistent with good policies and in furtherance of good husbandry in the management of our national affairs.

Those of us who live under water conservation projects which irrigate arid lands and which develop power, can see every day the direct and indirect benefits of incalculable size resulting from those projects.

If I may mention my own State, I can say that wherever we have operating water projects, we have prosperity among individuals in the communities affected.

If it were not for its water projects which help to produce a more rounded economy, the State of Colorado would be a State of scattered grazing activities, and it would be sending to the Treasury of the United States only a small fraction of the income taxes and other revenues which now amount to about ¾ billion dollars annually.

The proposed reservoirs for water conservation, river regulation, power production, and the participating areas for watering arid lands, will be wealth-producing assets which will go far beyond the immediate benefits to those in position to share them.

Communities will be founded and expanded under the operation of those projects. They will help in the production of local and national tax revenues. There will be cumulative and expanding cycles of productive wealth and prosperity for the benefit of the United States and of the States involved.

When we divide the total cost of these projects by the States benefiting and the period of time necessary to complete the work to be done, remembering again the greater part of the expenditures will be repaid, I suggest that we are paying a very small price for the creation of assets which will replenish many of the productive assets which were lost in the wars and emergencies during the past 40 years.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, it is with very real regret that I feel compelled to oppose the passage of the pending proposed legislation, S. 500. It is a bill, Madam President, which, in my judgment, is wrong. It violates, and it seriously violates, the precedents of the Congress. Beyond that, it places in very real jeopardy the rights to water of the State of California.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate mine has been a record, I hope I may say, Madam President, of cooperation. I dislike obstruction and obstructionists.

As a United States Senator from the State of California, I am interested in progress for all sections of the United States, mine included. I wish to see the economy and the development of the people and the area of the United States dynamic, and I wish to see the Federal Government do what should be done in playing its part in the development of the Nation.

Nevertheless, Madam President, I feel constrained to oppose the pending bill. I shall endeavor to demonstrate for the RECORD why I oppose the bill and the reasons which have prompted me to bring my opposition to the attention of both the Senate and the country. That will require the devotion of a few moments to the history of the Colorado River.

Madam President, over three-quarters of a century ago—in the 1870's—people in the lower areas of California began to utilize the waters of the Colorado River, by way of irrigating their lands. As the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent continued to develop, and as her population increased, more and more water from the Colorado River was utilized. Under the laws of my State, people and public districts began to acquire rights to that water. I think it is generally conceded that the history of the Colorado River is one of being an erratic stream; at times there have been floods, and at other times there has been virtually no water at all in the river.

As the population of California began to develop with great rapidity, the people of my State believed that it would be in the public interest to have dams constructed for the storage of the water, not alone to regulate the flow of the river, but also to provide for necessary hydroelectric power and orderly development and beneficial use of the waters of the stream.

It was in 1922 that the United States Supreme Court had an important question before it. The State of Wyoming had sued the State of Colorado with respect to the rights in the Colorado River, running through both States. The United States Supreme Court held that "first in time was first in right," and that whoever appropriated first—whether it be in the upper stretches of the stream or in the lower stretches—was protected to

the extent that the appropriation could ripen into a legal right. That give rise to considerable apprehension on the part of the good people in the States of the upper basin of the Colorado River. Here was a State—California—whose population was growing by leaps and bounds, and was operating under a Supreme Court decision which said, "If you use it first, you have a right to it."

So, Madam President, when California, as represented on the floor of the Senate by those who then had been elected from my State, including the late and illustrious Hiram W. Johnson, urged Congress to pass measures providing for the erection of a multiple purpose dam and reservoir in the lower basin, in complete good faith the Senators who represented the States of the upper basin of the Colorado River raised some questions.

One of them was based on their desire to have a compact, agreement, or understanding among all the States of the Colorado River Basin, so that the rule laid down by the Supreme Court would not operate to the detriment of the upper basin States. The representatives of those States said, "Let us enter into an agreement with respect to the waters of the Colorado River. Let us substitute some other rule than 'first in time, first in right'; let us agree how to apportion the waters; and then we shall talk with you about Federal assistance in the development of dams and reservoirs."

There, Madam President, is the genesis of what is now the Colorado River compact. In any discussion of the water rights on that river—and, indeed, in any discussion as to what Congress and the Federal Government should do regarding the Colorado River Basin—it is necessary to refer to the Colorado River compact. That I propose now very briefly to do.

Madam President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Colorado River compact set forth in the RECORD.

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

NO. 6225—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

To All To Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

I certify that the document annexed is a true copy of the "Colorado River compact," signed 24th November 1922, at the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., the original of which is on file in this Department.

In testimony whereof I, Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Chief Clerk of the said Department, at the city of Washington, this 22nd day of December 1922.

CHARLES E. HUGHES,
Secretary of State.
By BEN B. DAVIS,
Chief Clerk,

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

The States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, having resolved to enter into a compact under the act of the Congress of the United States of America approved August 19, 1921 (42 Statutes at Large, p. 171), and the acts of the legislatures of the said States, have through their governors appointed as their commissioners: W. S. Norviel for the State of Arizona, W. F. McClure for the State of California, Delph E. Carpenter for the State of Colorado, J. G. Scrugham for the State of Nevada, Stephen B. Davis, Jr., for the State of New Mexico, R. E. Caldwell for the State of Utah, Frank C. Emerson for the State of Wyoming, who, after negotiations participated in by Herbert Hoover appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles:

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies, and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two basins, and an apportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River system is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made.

ARTICLE II

As used in this compact—

(a) The term "Colorado River system" means that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America.

(b) The term "Colorado River Basin" means all of the drainage area of the Colorado River system and all other territory within the United States of America to which the waters of the Colorado River system shall be beneficially applied.

(c) The term "States of the upper division" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

(d) The term "States of the lower division" means a point in the main stream of the Colorado River 1 mile below the mouth of the Paria River.

(f) The term "upper basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system above Lee Ferry.

(g) The term "lower basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system below Lee Ferry.

(h) The term "domestic use" shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

ARTICLE III

(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a), the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1 million acre-feet per annum.

(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River System, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of the upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the 1st day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact.

(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

(f) Further equitable apportionment of the beneficial uses of the waters of the Colorado River system unappportioned by paragraphs (a), (b), and (c), may be made in the manner provided in paragraph (g) at any time after October 1, 1963, if and when either basin shall have reached its total beneficial consumptive use as set out in paragraphs (a) and (b).

(g) In the event of a desire for a further apportionment as provided in paragraph (f) any two signatory States, acting through their governors, may give joint notice of such desire to the governors of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States of America, and it shall be the duty of the governors of the signatory States and of the President of the United States of America forthwith to appoint representatives, whose duty it shall be to divide and apportion equitably between the upper basin and lower basin the beneficial use of the unapportioned water of the Colorado River system as mentioned in paragraph (f), subject to the legislative ratification of the signatory States and the Congress of the United States of America.

ARTICLE IV

(a) Inasmuch as the Colorado River has ceased to be navigable for commerce and the reservation of its waters for navigation would seriously limit the development of its basin, the use of its waters for purposes of navigation shall be subservient to the uses of such water for domestic, agricultural, and power purposes. If the Congress shall not consent to this paragraph, the other provisions of this compact shall nevertheless remain binding.

(b) Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

(c) The provisions of this article shall not apply to or interfere with the regulation and control by any State within its boundaries of the appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

ARTICLE V

The chief official of each signatory State charged with the administration of water rights, together with the Director of the United States Reclamation Service and the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall cooperate, ex officio:

(a) To promote the systematic determination and coordination of the facts as to flow, appropriation, consumption, and use of water in the Colorado River Basin, and the interchange of available information in such matters.

(b) To secure the ascertainment and publication of the annual flow of the Colorado River at Lee Ferry.

(c) To perform such other duties as may be assigned by mutual consent of the signatories from time to time.

ARTICLE VI

Should any claim or controversy arise between any two or more of the signatory States:

(a) with respect to the waters of the Colorado River system not covered by the terms of this compact;

(b) over the meaning or performance of any of the terms of this compact;

(c) as to the allocation of the burdens incident to the performance of any article of this compact or the delivery of waters as herein provided;

(d) as to the construction or operation of works within the Colorado River Basin to be situated in two or more States, or to be constructed in one State for the benefit of another State; or

(e) as to the diversion of water in one State for the benefit of another State; the governors of the States affected, upon the request of one of them, shall forthwith appoint commissioners with power to consider and adjust such claim or controversy, subject to ratification by the legislatures of the States so affected.

Nothing herein contained shall prevent the adjustment of any such claim or controversy by any present method or by direct future legislative action of the interested States.

ARTICLE VII

Nothing in this compact shall be construed as affecting the obligations of the United States of America to Indian tribes.

ARTICLE VIII

Present perfected rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system are unimpaired by this compact. Whenever storage capacity of 5 million acre-feet shall have been provided on the main Colorado River within or for the benefit of the lower basin, then claims of such rights, if any, by appropriators or users of water in the lower basin against appropriators or users of water in the upper basin shall attach to and be satisfied from water that may be stored not in conflict with article III.

All other rights to beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system shall be satisfied solely from the water apportioned to that basin in which they are situate.

ARTICLE IX

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent any State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

ARTICLE X

This compact may be terminated at any time by the unanimous agreement of the signatory States. In the event of such termination all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

ARTICLE XI

This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been approved by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and by the Congress of the United States. Notice of approval by the legislatures shall be given by the governor of each signatory State to the governors of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States, and the President of the United States is requested to give notice to the governors of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States.

In witness whereof, the Commissioners have signed this compact in a single original, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the governor of each of the signatory States.

Done at the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., this 24th day of November A. D. 1922.

W. S. NORVIEL.
W. F. MCCLURE.
DELPH E. CARPENTER.
J. G. SCRUGHAM.
STEPHEN B. DAVIS, Jr.
R. E. CALDWELL.
FRANK C. EMERSON.

Approved:

HERBERT HOOVER.

APPENDIX 231—THE COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

(Text of the upper Colorado River Basin compact entered into by the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., October 11, 1948)

The State of Arizona, the State of Colorado, the State of New Mexico, the State of Utah, and the State of Wyoming, acting through their commissioners, Charles A. Carson for the State of Arizona, Clifford H. Stone for the State of Colorado, Fred E. Wilson for the State of New Mexico, Edward H. Watson for the State of Utah, and L. C. Bishop for the State of Wyoming, after negotiations participated in by Harry W. Bashore, appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed, subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, to determine the rights and obligations of each signatory State respecting the uses and deliveries of the water of the upper basin of the Colorado River, as follows:

ARTICLE I

(a) The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system, the use of which was apportioned in perpetuity to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact; to establish the obligations of each State of the upper division with respect to the deliveries of water required to be made at Lee Ferry by the Colorado River compact; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controveries; to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the upper basin, the storage of water, and to protect life and property from floods.

(b) It is recognized that the Colorado River compact is in full force and effect and all of the provisions hereof are subject thereto.

ARTICLE II

As used in this compact:

(a) The term "Colorado River system" means that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America.

(b) The term "Colorado River Basin" means all of the drainage area of the Colorado River system and all other territory within the United States of America to which the waters of the Colorado River system shall be beneficially applied.

(c) The term "States of the upper division" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

(d) The term "States of the lower division" means the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada.

(e) The term "Lee Ferry" means a point in the main stream of the Colorado River one mile below the mouth of the Paria River.

(f) The term "upper basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry.

(g) The term "lower basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system below Lee Ferry.

(h) The term "Colorado River compact" means the agreement concerning the apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system dated November 24, 1922, executed by commissioners for the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, approved by Herbert Hoover, representative of the United States of America, and proclaimed effective by the President of the United States of America, June 25, 1929.

(i) The term "upper Colorado River system" means that portion of the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry.

(j) the term "Commission" means the administrative agency created by article VIII of this compact.

(k) The term "water year" means that period of 12 months ending September 30 of each year.

(l) The term "acre-foot" means the quantity of water required to cover an acre to the depth of 1 foot and is equivalent to 43,560 cubic feet.

(m) The term "domestic use" shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

(n) The term "virgin flow" means the flow of any stream undepleted by the activities of man.

ARTICLE III

(a) Subject to the provisions and limitations contained in the Colorado River compact and in this compact, there is hereby apportioned from the Upper Colorado River system in perpetuity to the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, respectively, the consumptive use of water as follows:

1. To the State of Arizona the consumptive use of 50,000 acre-feet of water per annum.

2. To the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, respectively, the consumptive use per annum of the quantities resulting from the application of the following percentages to the total quantity of consumptive use per annum apportioned in perpetuity to and available for use each year by upper basin [sic] under the Colorado River compact and remaining after the deduction of the use, not to exceed 50,000 acre-feet per annum, made in the State of Arizona.

State of Colorado, 51.75 percent.
State of New Mexico, 11.25 percent.
State of Utah, 23 percent.
State of Wyoming, 14 percent.

(b) The apportionment made to the respective States by paragraph (a) of this article is based upon, and shall be applied in conformity with, the following principles and each of them.

1. The apportionment is of any and all man-made depletions;

2. Beneficial use is the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right to use;

3. No State shall exceed its apportioned use in any water year when the effect of such excess use, as determined by the Commission, is to deprive another signatory State of its apportioned use during that water year: *Provided*, That this subparagraph (b) (3) shall not be construed as—

(i) Altering the apportionment of use, or obligations to make deliveries as provided in articles XI, XII, XIII, or XIV of this conpact;

(ii) Purporting to apportion among the signatory States such uses of water as the

upper basin may be entitled to under paragraphs (f) and (g) of article III of the Colorado River compact; or

(iii) Countenancing average uses by any signatory State in excess of its apportionment.

4. The apportionment to each State includes all water necessary for the supply of any rights which now exist.

(c) No apportionment is hereby made, or intended to be made, of such uses of water as the upper basin may be entitled to under paragraphs (f) and (g) of article III of the Colorado River compact.

(d) The apportionment made by this article shall not be taken as any basis for the allocation among the signatory States of any benefits resulting from the generation of power.

ARTICLE IV

In the event curtailment of use of water by the States of the upper division at any time shall become necessary in order that the flow at Lee Ferry shall not be depleted below that required by article III of the Colorado River compact, the extent of curtailment by each State of the consumptive use of water apportioned to it by article III of this compact shall be in such quantities and at such times as shall be determined by the Commission upon the application of the following principles:

(a) The extent and times of curtailment shall be such as to assure full compliance with article III of the Colorado River compact;

(b) If any State or States of the upper division, in the 10 years immediately preceding the water year in which curtailment is necessary, shall have consumptively used more water than it was or they were, as the case may be, entitled to use under the apportionment made by article III of this compact, such State or States shall be required to supply at Lee Ferry a quantity of water equal to its, or the aggregate of their, overdraft or the proportionate part of such overdraft, as may be necessary to assure compliance with article III of the Colorado River compact, before demand is made on any other State of the upper division;

(c) Except as provided in subparagraph (b) of this article, the extent of curtailment by each State of the upper division of the consumptive use of water apportioned to it by article III of this compact shall be such as to result in the delivery at Lee Ferry of a quantity of water which bears the same relation to the total required curtailment of use by the States of the upper division as the consumptive use of the upper Colorado River system water which was made by each State during the water year immediately preceding the year in which the curtailment becomes necessary bears to the total consumptive use of such water in the States of the upper division during the same water year; provided, that in determining such relation the uses of water under rights perfected prior to November 24, 1922, shall be excluded.

ARTICLE V

(a) All losses of water occurring from or as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed prior to the signing of this compact shall be charged to the State in which such reservoir or reservoirs are located. Water stored in reservoirs covered by this paragraph (a) shall be for the exclusive use of and shall be charged to the State in which the reservoir or reservoirs are located.

(b) All losses of water occurring from or as the result of the storage of water in reservoirs constructed after the signing of this compact shall be charged as follows:

1. If the Commission finds that the reservoir is used, in whole or in part, to assist the States of the upper division in meeting their obligations to deliver water at Lee Ferry imposed by article III of the Colorado River compact, the Commission shall make findings, which in no event shall be contrary to the laws of the United States of America under which any reservoir is constructed, as to the reservoir capacity allocated for that purpose. The whole or that proportion, as the case may be, of reservoir losses as found by the Commission to be reasonably and properly chargeable to the reservoir or reservoir capacity utilized to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry shall be charged to the States of the upper division in the proportion which the consumptive use of water in each State of the upper division during the water year in which the charge is made bears to the total consumptive use of water in all States of the upper division during the same water year. Water stored in reservoirs or in reservoir capacity covered by this subparagraph (b) (1) shall be for the common benefit of all of the States of the upper division.

2. If the Commission finds that the reservoir is used, in whole or in part, to supply water for use in a State of the upper division, the Commission shall make findings which in no event shall be contrary to the laws of the United States of America under which any reservoir is constructed, as to the reservoir or reservoir capacity utilized to supply water for use and the State in which such water will be used. The whole or that proportion, as the case may be, of reservoir losses as found by the Commission to be reasonably and properly chargeable to the State in which such water will be used shall be borne by that State. As determined by the Commission, water stored in reservoirs covered by this subparagraph (b) (2) shall be earmarked for and charged to the State in which the water will be used.

(c) In the event the Commission finds that a reservoir site is available both to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry and to store water for consumptive use in a State of the upper division, the storage of water for consumptive use shall be given preference. Any reservoir or reservoir capacity hereafter used to assure deliveries at Lee Ferry shall by order of the Commission be used to store water for consumptive use in a State, provided the Commission finds that such storage is reasonably necessary to permit such State to make the use of the water apportioned to it by this compact.

ARTICLE VI

The Commission shall determine the quantity of the consumptive use of water, which use is apportioned by article III hereof, for the upper basin and for each State of the upper basin by the inflow-outflow method in terms of manmade depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry, unless the Commission, by unanimous action, shall adopt a different method of determination.

ARTICLE VII

The consumptive use of water by the United States of America or any of its agencies, instrumentalities, or wards shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That such consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in another shall be charged to such latter State.

ARTICLE VIII

(a) There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be known as the Upper Colorado River Commission. The Commission shall be composed of one Commissioner representing each of the States of the upper division, namely, the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, designated or appointed in accordance with the laws of each such State, and if designated by the President, one Commissioner representing the United States of America. The President is hereby requested to designate a Commissioner. If so designated the Commissioner representing the United States of America shall be the presiding officer of the Commission and shall be entitled to the same powers and rights as the Commissioner of any State. Any four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(b) The salaries and personal expenses of each Commissioner shall be paid by the Government which he represents. All other expenses which are incurred by the Commission incident to the administration of this compact, and which are not paid by the United States of America, shall be borne by the four States according to the percentage of consumptive use apportioned to each. On or before December 1 of each year, the Commission shall adopt and transmit to the governors of the four States and to the President a budget covering an estimate of its expenses for the following year, and of the amount payable by each State. Each State shall pay the amount due by it to the Commission on or before April 1 of the year following. The payment of the expenses of the Commission and of its employees shall not be subject to the audit and accounting procedures of any of the four States; however, all receipts and disbursement of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited yearly by a qualified independent public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall not be a member of the Commission, or an employee of any signatory State or of the United States of America while so acting. He shall serve for such terms and receive such salary and perform such duties as the Commission may direct. The Commission may employ such engineering, legal, clerical, and other personnel as, in its judgment, may be necessary for the performance of its functions under this compact. In the hiring of employees, the Commission shall not be bound by the civil service laws of any State.

(d) The Commission, so far as consistent with this compact, shall have the power to:

1. Adopt rules and regulations.

2. Locate, establish, construct, abandon, operate and maintain water gaging stations.

3. Make estimates to forecast water runoff on the Colorado River and any of its tributaries.

4. Engage in cooperative studies of water supplies of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

5. Collect, analyze, correlate, preserve, and report on data as to the stream flows, storage, diversions and use of the waters of the Colorado River, and any of its tributaries.

6. Make findings as to the quantity of water of the upper Colorado River system used each year in the upper Colorado River Basin and in each State thereof.

7. Make findings as to the quantity of water deliveries at Lee Ferry during each water year.

8. Make findings as to the necessity for and the extent of the curtailment of use, required, if any, pursuant to reservoir losses and as to the share thereof chargeable under article V hereof to each of the States.

10. Make findings of fact in the event of the occurrence of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system in the upper basin, whereby deliveries by the upper basin of water which it may be required to deliver in order to aid in fulfilling obligations of the United States of America to the United Mexican States arising under the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, dated February 3, 1944 (treaty series 994) become difficult, and report such findings to the governors of the upper basin States, the President of the United States of America, the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, and such other Federal officials and agencies as it may deem appropriate to the end that the water allotted to Mexico under division III of such treaty may be reduced in accordance with the terms of such treaty.

11. Acquire and hold such personal and real property as may be necessary for the performance of its duties hereunder and to dispose of the same when no longer required.

12. Perform all functions required of it by this compact and do all things necessary, proper, or convenient in the performance of its duties hereunder, either independently or in cooperation with any State or Federal agency.

13. Make and transmit annually to the governors of the signatory States and the President of the United States of America, with the estimated budget, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding water year.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in this compact the concurrence of four members of the Commission shall be required in any action taken by it.

(f) The Commission and its secretary shall make available to the governor of each of the signatory States any information within its possession at any time, and shall always provide free access to its records by the governors of each of the States, or their representatives, or authorized representatives of the United States of America.

(g) Findings of fact made by the Commission shall not be conclusive in any court, or before any agency or tribunal, but shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found.

(h) The organization meeting of the Commission shall be held within 4 months from the effective date of this compact.

ARTICLE IX

(a) No State shall deny the right of the United States of America and, subject to the conditions hereinafter contained, no State shall deny the right of another signatory State, any person, or entity of any signatory State to acquire rights to the use of water, or to construct or participate in the construction and use of diversion works and storage reservoirs with appurtenant works, canals, and conduits in one State for the purpose of diverting, conveying, storing, regulation, and releasing water to satisfy the provisions of the Colorado River compact relating to the obligation of the States of the upper division to make deliveries of water at Lee Ferry, or for the purpose of diverting, conveying, storing, or regulating water in an upper signatory State for consumptive use in a lower signatory State, when such use is within the apportionment to such lower State made by this compact. Such rights shall be subject to the rights of water users, in a State in which such reservoir or works are located, to receive and use water, the use of which is within the apportionment to such State by this compact.

(b) Any signatory State, any person or any entity of any signatory State shall have the right to acquire such property rights as are necessary to the use of water in conformity with this compact in any other signatory State by donation, purchase, or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain. Any signatory State, upon the written request of the governor of any other signatory State, for the benefit of whose water users property is to be acquired in the State to which such written request is made, shall proceed expeditiously to acquire the desired property either by purchase at a price satisfactory to the requesting State, or, if such purchase cannot be made, then through the exercise of its power of eminent domain and shall convey such property to the requesting State or such entity as may be designated by the requesting State: *Provided*, That all costs of acquisition and expense of every kind and nature whatsoever incurred in obtaining the requested property shall be paid by the requesting State at the time and in the manner prescribed by the State requested to acquire the property.

(c) Should any facility be constructed in a signatory State by and for the benefit of another signatory State or States or the water users thereof, as above provided, the construction, repair, replacement, maintenance, and operation of such facility shall be subject to the laws of the State in which the facility is located, except that, in the case of a reservoir constructed in one State for the benefit of another State or States, the water administration officials of the State in which the facility is located shall permit the storage and release of any water which, as determined by findings of the Commission, falls within the apportionment of the State or States for whose benefit the facility is constructed. In the case of a regulating reservoir for the joint benefit of all States in making Lee Ferry deliveries, the water administration officials of the State in which the facility is located, in permitting the storage and release of water, shall comply with the findings and orders of the Commission.

(d) In the event property is acquired by a signatory State in another signatory State for the use and benefit of the former, the users of water made available by such facilities, as a condition precedent to the use thereof, shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights are enjoyed for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes levied and assessed against the land and improvements thereon during the 10 years preceding the acquisition of such land. Said payments shall be in full reimbursement for the loss of taxes in such political subdivisions of the State, and in lieu of any and all taxes on said property, improvements and rights. The signatory States recommend to the President and the Congress that, in the event the United States of America shall acquire property in one of the signatory States for the benefit of another signatory State, or its water users, provision be made for like payment in reimbursement of loss of taxes.

ARTICLE X

(a) The signatory States recognize La Plata River compact [sic] entered into between the States of Colorado and New Mexico, dated November 27, 1922, approved by the Congress on January 29, 1925 (43 Stat. 796), and this compact shall not affect the apportionment therein made.

(b) All consumptive use of water of La Plata River and its tributaries shall be charged under apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XI

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the water of the Little Snake River and its tributaries is hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and Wyoming in such quantities as shall result from the application of the following principles and procedures:

(a) Water used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

(1) Water diverted from any tributary of the Little Snake River or from the main stem of the Little Snake River above a point 100 feet below the confluence of Savery Creek and the Little Snake River shall be administered without regard to rights covering the diversion of water from any downstream points.

(2) Water diverted from the main stem of the Little Snake River below a point 100 feet below the confluence of Savery Creek and the Little Snake River shall be administered on the basis of an interstate priority schedule prepared by the Commission in conformity with priority dates established by the laws of the respective States.

(b) Water used under rights initiated subsequent to the signing of this compact.

(1) Direct flow diversions shall be so administered that, in time of shortage, the curtailment of use on each acre of land irrigated thereunder shall be as nearly equal as may be possible in both the States.

(2) The storage of water by projects located in either State, whether of supplemental supply or of water used to irrigate land not irrigated at the date of the signing of this compact, shall be so administered that in time of water shortage the curtailment of storage of water available for each acre of land irrigated thereunder shall be as nearly equal as may be possible in both States.

(c) Water uses the apportionment made by this article shall be in accordance with the principle that beneficial use shall be the basis, measure, and limit of the right to use.

(d) The States of Colorado and Wyoming each assent to diversions and storage of water in one State for use in the other State, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact.

(e) In the event of the importation of water to the Little Snake River Basin from any other river basin, the State making the importation shall have the exclusive use of such imported water unless by written agreement, made by the representatives of the States of Colorado and Wyoming on the Commission, it is otherwise provided.

(f) Water use projects initiated after the signing of this compact, to the greatest extent possible, shall permit the full use within the basin in the most feasible manner of the waters of the Little Snake River and its tributaries, without regard to the State line, and, so far as is practicable, shall result in an equal division between the States of the use of water not used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

(g) All consumptive use of the waters of the Little Snake River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XII

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the waters of Henry's Fork, a tributary of Green River originating in the State of Utah and flowing into the State of Wyoming and thence into the Green River in the State of Utah; Beaver Creek, originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; Burnt Fork, a tributary of Henry's Fork originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming; Birch Creek, a tributary of Henry's Fork originating in the State of Utah and flowing into Henry's Fork in the State of Wyoming, and Sheep Creek, a tributary of Green River in the State of Utah, and their tributaries, are hereby apportioned between the States of Utah and Wyoming in such quantities as will result from the application of the following principles and procedures:

(a) Waters used under rights existing prior to the signing of this compact.

Waters diverted from Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, and their tributaries, shall be administered without regard to the State line on the basis of an interstate priority schedule to be prepared by the States affected and approved by the Commission in conformity with the actual priority of right of use, the water requirements of the land irrigated and the acreage irrigated in connection therewith.

(b) Waters used under rights from Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, and their tributaries, initiated after the signing of this compact, shall be divided 50 percent to the State of Wyoming and 50 percent

to the State of Utah and each State may use said waters as and where it deems advisable.

(c) The State of Wyoming assents to the exclusive use by the State of Utah of the water of Sheep Creek, except that the lands, if any, presently irrigated in the State of Wyoming from the water of Sheep Creek shall be supplied with water from Sheep Creek in order of priority and in such quantities as are in conformity with the laws of the State of Utah.

(d) In the event of the importation of water to Henry's Fork, or any of its tributaries, from any other river basin, the State making the importation shall have the exclusive use of such imported water unless by written agreement made by the representatives of the States of Utah and Wyoming on the Commission it is otherwise provided.

(e) All consumptive use of waters of Henry's Fork, Beaver Creek, Burnt Fork, Birch Creek, Sheep Creek, and their tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided,* That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

(f) The States of Utah and Wyoming each assent to the diversion and storage of water in one State for use in the other State, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact. It shall be the duty of water administrative officials of the State where the water is stored to release said stored water to the other State upon demand. If either the State of Utah or the State of Wyoming shall consruct a reservoir in the other State for use in its own State, the water users of the State in which said facilities are constructed may purchase at cost a portion of the capacity of said reservoir sufficient for the irrigation of their lands thereunder.

(g) In order to measure the flow of water diverted, each State shall cause suitable measuring devices to be constructed, maintained, and operated at or near the point of diversion into each ditch.

(h) The State engineers of the two States jointly shall appoint a special water commissioner who shall have authority to administer the water in both States in accordance with the terms of this article. The salary and expenses of such special water commissioner shall be paid, 30 percent by the State of Utah and 70 percent by the State of Wyoming.

ARTICLE XIII

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the rights to the consumptive use of the water of the Yampa River, a tributary entering the Green River in the State of Colorado, are hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and Utah in accordance with the following principles:

(a) The State of Colorado will not cause the flow of the Yampa River at the Maybell Gaging Station to be depleted below an aggregate of 5 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification and approval of this compact. In the event any diversion is made from the Yampa River or from tributaries entering the Yampa River above the Maybell Gaging Station for the benefit of any water-use project in the State of Utah, then the gross amount of all such diversions for use in the State of Utah, less any returns from such diversions to the river above Maybell, shall be added to the actual flow at the Maybell Gaging Station to determine the total flow at the Maybell Gaging Station.

(b) All consumptive use of the waters of the Yampa River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made: *Provided,* That consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XIV

Subject to the provisions of this compact, the consumptive use of the waters of the San Juan River and its tributaries is hereby apportioned between the States of Colorado and New Mexico as follows:

The State of Colorado agrees to deliver to the State of New Mexico from the San Juan River and its tributaries which rise in the State of Colorado a quantity of water which shall be sufficient, together with water originating in the San Juan Basin in the State of New Mexico, to enable the State of New Mexico to make full use of the water apportioned to the State of New Mexico by article III of this compact, subject, however, to the following:

(a) A first and prior right shall be recognized as to:

(1) All uses of water made in either State at the time of the signing of this compact; and

(2) All uses of water contemplated by projects authorized, at the time of the signing of this compact, under the laws of the United States of America, whether or not such projects are eventually constructed by the United States of America or by some other entity.

(b) The State of Colorado assents to diversions and storage of water in the State of Colorado for use in the State of New Mexico, subject to compliance with article IX of this compact.

(c) The uses of the waters of the San Juan River and any of its tributaries within either State which are dependent upon a common source of water and which are not covered by (a) hereof, shall in times of water shortages be reduced in such quantity that the resulting consumptive use in each State will bear the same proportionate relation to the consumptive use made in each State during times of average water supply as determined by the Commission; provided, that any preferential uses of water to which Indians are entitled under article XIX shall be excluded in determining the amount of curtailment to be made under this paragraph.

(d) The curtailment of water use by either State in order to make deliveries at Lee Ferry as required by article IV of this compact shall be independent of any and all conditions imposed by this article and shall be made by each State, as and when required, without regard to any provision of this article.

(e) All consumptive use of the waters of the San Juan River and its tributaries shall be charged under the apportionment of article III hereof to the State in which the use is made; provided, that consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other shall be charged to the latter State.

ARTICLE XV

(a) Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact and of this compact, water of the upper Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes, and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

(b) The provisions of this compact shall not apply to or interfere with the right or power of any signatory State to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use, and control of water, the consumptive use of which is apportioned and available to such State by this compact.

ARTICLE XVI

The failure of any State to use the water, or any part thereof, the use of which is apportioned to it under the terms of this compact, shall not constitute a relinquishment of the right to such use to the Lower Basin or to any other State, nor shall it constitute a forfeiture or abandonment of the right to such use.

ARTICLE XVII

The use of any water now or hereafter imported into the natural drainage basin of the upper Colorado River system shall not be charged to any State under the apportionment of consumptive use made by this compact.

ARTICLE XVIII

(a) The State of Arizona reserves its rights and interests under the Colorado River compact as a State of the lower division and as a State of the lower basin.

(b) The State of New Mexico and the State of Utah reserve their respective rights and interests under the Colorado River compact as States of the lower basin.

ARTICLE XIX

Nothing in this compact shall be construed as:

(a) Affecting the obligations of the United States of America to Indian tribes.

(b) Affecting the obligations of the United States of America under the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 944).

(c) Affecting any rights or powers of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, in or to the waters of the upper Colorado River system, or its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters.

(d) Subjecting any property of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, or creating any obligation in the part of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatever kind, to make any payment to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes.

(e) Subjecting any property of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent which such laws would apply without regard to this compact.

ARTICLE XX

This compact may be terminated at any time by the unanimous agreement of the signatory States. In the event of such termination, all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

ARTICLE XXI

This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and approved by the Congress of the United States of America. Notice of ratification by the legislatures of the signatory States shall be given by the governor of each signatory State to the governor of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States of America, and the President is hereby requested to give notice to the governor of each of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States of America.

In witness whereof, the Commissioners have executed six counterparts hereof each of which shall be and constitute an original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America, and one of which shall be forwarded to the governor of each of the signatory States.

Done at the city of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, this 11th day of October 1948.

CHARLES A. CARSON,
Commissioner for the State of Arizona.
CLIFFORD H. STONE,
Commissioner for the State of Colorado.
FRED E. WILSON,
Commissioner for the State of New Mexico.
EDWARD H. WATSON,
Commissioner for the State of Utah.
L. C. BISHOP,
Commissioner for the State of Wyoming.
GROVER A. GILES,
Secretary.

Approved:

HARRY W. BASHORE,
Representative of the United States of America.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, article I of the compact provides as follows:

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies, and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two basins, and an opportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River system is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made.

Article II states certain definitions with respect to the phrases used in the compact.

Article III constitutes an attempt to substitute for the Supreme Court's ruling an agreement to apportion water.

Article III (a) reads as follows:

(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

I observe that the upper basin means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry. That is set forth in article II in describing the upper basin.

The lower basin, which by subdivision (a) of article III of this compact is to be treated equally with the upper basin, consists of the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada. I now read subsections (b) and (c) of article III:

(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a), the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1 million acre-feet per annum.

(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River system, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of the upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

I observe that subsequent to the adoption of this compact the Senate ratified a proposed treaty with the Republic of Mexico under which the people of the United States guaranteed to deliver to the people of Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water annually as the Colorado River enters the territory of our neighbor, Mexico.

Subsections (d) and (e) of article III provide as follows:

(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the 1st day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact.

(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

I omit comment on the remaining subsections of this article.

Thus it was agreed by those who drafted this compact that 7,500,000 acre-feet each year would be apportioned to the lower basin, and a like amount to the upper basin, irrespective of any rights of appropriation which might be acquired subsequent to the adoption of the compact.

In a subsequent section of the proposed compact it was agreed that any rights then in existence to water in the river would remain unimpaired.

There is a serious dispute—and an honest one—as to what article III means. Article III purports to divide the waters equitably, and it speaks of beneficial consumptive use. What is beneficial consumptive use? This question is both relevant and important in any discussion with respect to legislation such as Senate bill 500 contemplates.

One of the great experts on water law, who came from the State of Colorado, and who is called the father of the Colorado River compact, commented on the phrase "beneficial consumptive use." I refer to the late Delph E. Carpenter, who stated, in a report printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 70th Congress, pages 577 to 586, December 4, 1928:

The term "beneficial consumptive use" is to be distinguished from the amounts diverted from the river. It does not mean headgate diversion. It means the amount of water consumed and lost to the river during uses of the water diverted. Generally speaking, it is the difference between the aggregate diverted and the aggregate return flow. It is the net loss occurring through beneficial uses.

In Mr. Carpenter's opinion, the difference between the aggregate diverted and the aggregate return flow constituted beneficial consumptive use under the compact, in other words, diversions less returns to the river.

At any rate, the compact was approved by every State with the exception of one, namely, Arizona. Then it was provided by Congress that if the 6 States would approve the compact—in other words, all except Arizona—the compact would be approved by the Congress, provided that—a second condition—California, by her own legislative decision, limited herself in the use of water.

Before the compact could go into effect, and before any such development could take place in California with Federal assistance, not only would the compact have to be approved by all the States except Arizona, but, in addition, California was required to place a ceiling on the amount of water which she could use. That was the decision of the Congress. The State which I, in part, represent acquiesced and passed the required limitation statute, which the Congress at that time directed her to do.

When the bill which resulted in the Boulder Canyon Project Act was under consideration on the floor of the Senate, in December 1928, an amendment was adopted which now appears as a part of section 4 (a) of that act. It provided, in effect, that the project act should not take effect unless 7 States should ratify the compact within 6 months after the date of its adoption, and the President should so proclaim; or unless 6 of the States, including California, should ratify the compact and waive 7-State ratification, and the President should so proclaim; and California should agree, by act of its legislature, to limit the consumptive use—diversions less returns to the river—of water from the Colorado River system in California. So, as directed, California by law limited herself to 4,400,000 acre-feet of water apportioned to the lower basin by article III (a) of the Colorado River Compact, plus one-half of the excess or surplus water unapportioned by the compact.

That is what Congress told the State which I, in part, represent it must do, and that is what the State did.

Meanwhile, however, a different theory of what constituted beneficial consumptive use was developed among those concerned with the problem in the upper basin. I do not have it in my heart to quarrel with reasonable people who disagree as to the meaning and intent of technical legal language.

I am sure it was upon a reasonable basis that those in the upper Colorado River Basin who are interested in the subject found that "beneficial consumptive use" was different in its intent and meaning from the sense which the State of California found. I vigorously deny the correctness of the upper basin definition.

Subsequently, Mr. President, in 1949, the States of the upper basin entered into their own compact. It contains a provision that "beneficial consumptive use," the phrase to which I have alluded, shall be determined "by the inflow-outflow method in terms of man-made depletions of the virgin flow at Lee Ferry"—appendix, volume II, page 60, article VII.

This constitutes an attempt to convert the compact from an upper Colorado River system compact into a compact relating only to the main stream.

By definition, the Colorado River system includes the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States. I

refer to article II of the Colorado River compact.

"Beneficial consumptive use," as California understood and understands the term, and as it was generally understood at the time of the compact negotiations, would include water lost to the system by evapo-transpiration, wherever such loss occurred.

Under the upper basin theory, only the effect at Lee Ferry of upstream uses is to be relevant and important.

Let me give an example, so that those interested in reading the RECORD may see what I am contending, under the theory of the upper Colorado River Basin States, the so-called inflow-outflow method. Assume a State diverted a million acre-feet of water and transported it to an area for use elsewhere. Had this water continued down the river, and en route through evaporation or transpiration, a loss of 200,000 acre-feet could have been expected by the time it reached the lower basin, the upper basin States would say, "We are chargeable under the Colorado River compact only with 800,000 acre-feet. We are not chargeable with the 200,000 acre-feet which would have been lost between the point of diversion and Lee Ferry." The lower basin States would disagree with that argument and say that evapo-transpiration is a part of the charge of the State which uses the water.

There we would have a question of interpretation, which has a direct bearing upon the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

I wish to allude to one or two more examples of that type of disagreement and then indicate what, in complete good faith, ought to be done with respect to the resolution of those situations.

Senators will recall that in article 3 (a) provision was made for the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum to the upper basin and to the lower basin, guaranteed in perpetuity.

The question arises: Does the apportionment under the compact of the use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum mean an average of that amount over a period of years, or a maximum in any one year?

As in the interpretation of the phrase "beneficial consumptive use," the compact must be given the same interpretation in both basins, the upper basin and the lower basin.

The State of California contends that "per annum" means what it seems to mean, namely, each year, and that under the compact that amount of water shall be sent down annually. It is the contention of those in the upper Colorado Basin—and I believe I can say that it is also the contention of the Department of the Interior presently—that it means an average, and that to satisfy the requirement of the compact the upper basin can send 6 million acre-feet down 1 year if it lets 9 million acre-feet down the next year.

We deny it, and we deny it vigorously.

Ever since the compact was approved, ever since the Hoover Dam was created and built, and ever since the Federal Government found a reasonable area in which to assist the people in my State to operate and to provide water, California, through various public agencies, has entered into contracts with the Government of the United States, under which water has been taken from the Colorado River into the city of Los Angeles and into most of the cities in southern California, to suply them with that which they need to live. That was done under contracts which are firm and exist at the present time, and which call for amounts in excess of 4,400,000 acre-feet, to which California limited itself, but of which, by the same token, the statute passed by Congress permitted California to avail herself.

That brings up the question of how much water should come down into the lower basin States each year, and that, too, may well be a question upon which reasonable minds may differ. However, there ought to be some manner of arriving at who gets what before we enact legislation which involves more than $1,500,000,000.

I want the RECORD to indicate the views of a distinguished American. Those views coincide with my own, in great part, at least. This distinguished American graced the Senate as a highly respected Member. He is now the distinguished and able Governor of Colorado. I refer to the Honorable Edwin Johnson.

I do not remember ever meeting a man who was more generous to me with his time, when I was even less experienced than I am now, than our former colleague, Ed Johnson. I took a great interest in the comments he made on the compact which I am discussing.

Cn December 20 of last year Governor Johnson made a statement suggesting that "storage below the State of Colorado is not the answer." I shall not read his entire statement, although I think I shall, in a few moments, ask unanimous consent that it appear in the RECORD in its entirety. I quote from his statement, as follows:

Either the seven-State compact—

And that, Mr. President, is the same as the Colorado River compact—

specifically denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water which it cannot use for agricultural and domestic purposes or it does not deny us such a right. Either it denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water to develop power or it does not deny us that right. Let us look at the document which has been ratified by the legislatures of seven States for the correct answers to these pertinent questions.

Here is that irrevocable record:

"ARTICLE II

"(h) The term 'domestic use' shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

"ARTICLE III

"(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses."

Mr. President, I again quote from Governor Johnson's statement:

The upper and lower basins were each apportioned from the Colorado River system the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, and in addition the lower basin was given the permission to increase its beneficial consumptive use of an extra million acre-feet per annum of surplus water. However, the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the lower States had a very clear priority over the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the upper States. In reality, the compact gave the lower States 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum and the upper States that much water if there should be any water left in the river, provided the upper States used that water only for domestic or agricultural purposes.

Who said that, Mr. President? That was not an individual residing in my State; that was the gentleman who is the present Governor of Colorado.

Here we have a compact which has been in existence since 1922 and which is susceptible, apparently, of various interpretations. I desire to be as fair and as frank as I can be in this discussion, but there is the comment which the Governor of Colorado made on the relative rights of the lower basin States and the upper basin States.

I read one more paragraph from Governor Johnson's statement:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin. Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

I cite that again, Mr. President, to emphasize that a prominent American, now the Governor of Colorado, agrees that a solemn compact to which all States in the Colorado River Basin except Arizona assented must now be lived up to and adhered to under any legislation which this Congress may enact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Gov. Ed C. Johnson, of Colorado, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STORAGE BELOW THE STATE OF COLORADO IS NOT THE ANSWER

(Statement released to press December 20, 1954, by Governor-elect Ed C. Johnson, of Colorado)

Interested persons on the eastern and western slopes of Colorado have expressed confidence in me, as Governor, to resolve the very controversial water problem that plagues both slopes. This is a tremendous responsibility and challenge but its vital nature demands my acceptance. Accordingly, I shall do my utmost to work out something which will benefit both slopes and injure neither.

However, before we begin the task of allocating Colorado's share of the water of the Colorado River system, we first must take stock of the quantity and the location of the water that is available to us. There are very serious misconceptions, widely held, in regard to the burdens placed on this State by the specific provisions of the Seven State Compact and the official interpretations with respect to them. These limitations should be understood clearly by all parties concerned, since they are basic to any plan to develop the upper Colorado River Basin. It

is with that purpose in mind that I have prepared this document. If my conclusions are in error I want to be shown wherein the error lies.

Either the 7-State compact specifically denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water which it cannot use for agricultural and domestic purposes or it does not deny us such a right. Either it denies to the upper basin the right to withhold water to develop power or it does not deny us that right. Let us look at the document which has been ratified by the legislature of seven States for the correct answers to these pertinent questions.

Here is that irrevocable record:

"ARTICLE II

"(h) The term 'domestic use' shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

"ARTICLE III

"(e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses."

The Honorable Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce of the United States, was appointed by the President to serve as chairman of the Seven State Compact Commission as the official representative of the Government of the United States, pursuant to an act of Congress. He was the chairman of the Colorado River Commission that drafted and signed the Seven State Colorado River compact. In answer to the question propounded by Congressman HAYDEN these points in the compact were interpreted officially by him on January 27, 1923, before any State had ratified the compact, as follows:

"Question 14. Can paragraph (d) of article III be construed to mean that the States of the upper division may withhold all except 75 million acre-feet of water within any period of 10 years and thus not only secure the amount to which they are entitled under the apportionment made in paragraph (a) but also the entire unapportioned surplus waters of the Colorado River?

"Answer. No. Paragraph (a) of article III apportions to the upper basin 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum. Paragraph (e) of article III provides that the States of the upper division shall not withhold water that cannot be beneficially used. Paragraph (f) and (g) of this article specifically leave to further apportionment water now unapportioned. There is, therefore, no possibility of construing paragraph (d) of this article as suggested.

"Question 19. Why is the impounding of water for power purposes made subservient to its use and consumption for agricultural and domestic purposes, as provided in paragraph (b) of article IV?

"Answer. (a) Because such subordination conforms to established law, either by constitution or statute, in most of the semiarid States. This provision frees the farmer from the danger of damage suits by power companies in the event of conflict between them. (b) Because the cultivation of land naturally outranks in importance the generation of power, since it is the most important of human activities, the foundation upon which all other industries finally rest. (c) Because there was a general agreement by all parties appearing before the commission, including those representing power interests, that such preference was proper.

"Question 20. Will this subordination of the development of hydroelectric power to domestic and agricultural uses, combined with the apportionment of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water to the upper basin, utterly destroy an asset of the State of Arizona consisting of 3 million horsepower, which it is said could otherwise be developed within that State if the Colorado River continued to flow, undiminished in volume, across its northern boundary line and through the Grand Canyon?

"Answer. The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above, that cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes."

On December 15, 1922, Hon. Delph E. Carpenter, commissioner for Colorado, reported to Gov. Oliver H. Shoup his analysis of this compact which he helped to formulate. His comments and observations are especially pertinent. In this official report he said:

"Power claims will always be limited by the quantity of water necessary for domestic and agricultural purposes. The generation of power is made subservient to the preferred and dominant uses and shall not interfere with junior preferred uses in either basin."

On March 20, 1923, Delph E. Carpenter in a joint letter to Colorado Senator M. E. Bashor and Colorado Representative Royal W. Calkins, said, among other things:

"All power uses in both basins are made subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes."

The interpretation of Hon. W. S. Norviel, commissioner for Arizona, published January 15, 1923, contains this language:

"The third principle established by the compact was to fix a time when the remainder of the water unallotted and unused might be apportioned.

"The fourth principle fixes a preference in agricultural uses over power.

"The fifth principle, that the upper States shall not withhold water that cannot be reasonably applied for agricultural uses."

Senator Hayden, Arizona, propounded 19 questions to Hon. A. P. Davis, Director, United States Reclamation Service, to which the director made the following replies on January 30, 1923:

"Question 10. Is it true that, if the Colorado River compact is adopted, all of the water that Arizona will ever get out of the main river will be enough to irrigate only 280,000 acres of land, of which 130,000 acres are now embraced in the Yuma project and 110,000 acres in the Parker project?

"Answer. The Colorado River compact does not attempt to divide the water of the river between individual States. Except for rights already initiated by California and Nevada, there is nothing in the compact that will prevent the State of Arizona from taking from the river all the water that it can put to beneficial use.

"Question 19. Any further comment that you may care to make relative to the approval of the Colorado River compact by the Arizona State Legislature will be appreciated.

"Answer. The Colorado River compact provides that the lower basin shall be guaranteed an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually from the upper basin and all of the yield of the lower basin, and that any water not beneficially used for agricultural and domestic uses shall likewise be allowed to run down for use below."

It should be noted that these official interpretations were made before the compact was ratified by any State except Nevada and were not disputed by Colorado or any other State at the time it ratified the compact. Most certainly we are bound hand and foot by them.

At the time the seven-State compact was adopted and ratified, it was contemplated that a treaty would be negotiated later between the United States and Mexico which would allocate to Mexico certain quantities of water defined in acre-feet, out of the Colorado River system. Furthermore, it spelled out just how that burden should fall upon the lower basin and the upper basin. The compact specified that to the extent there is surplus water in the Colorado River system, such surplus water would be utilized and the balance of the burden would be shared equally by the upper and lower basins.

"ARTICLE III

"(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River system, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then, the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of the upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

"(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact."

If the upper basin States build storage reservoirs at the Glen Canyon and Echo Park sites as is now contemplated, the water withheld thereby will, of necessity, be surplus water since the upper States cannot use it for agricultural or domestic purposes, and the upper States, therefore, must deliver such water to Mexico as is allocated to her under the provision of the seven-State compact.

Senator HAYDEN asked Chairman of the Commission, Herbert Hoover, about this and was answered as follows:

"Question 15. Does paragraph (d) of article III in any way modify the obligation of the States of the upper division, as expressed in paragraph (c), to permit the surplus and unapportioned water to flow down in satisfaction of any right to water which may hereafter be accorded by treaty to Mexico? Within any year of a 10-year period, could the States of the upper division shift to the States of the lower division the entire burden of supplying such water to Mexico?

"Answer. (a) No. It is provided in the compact that the upper States shall add their share of any Mexican burden to the delivery to be made at Lee Ferry, whenever any Mexican rights shall be established by treaty. By paragraph (c) of article III, such an amount of water is to be delivered in addition to the 75 million acre-feet otherwise provided for. (b) In the face of the specific provision of article III (c) that the burden of any deficiency must be 'equally borne,' I can see no possibility of placing upon the lower division the entire burden. If the surplus is sufficient, there is no burden on anyone. If it is insufficient the plain language is that it must be equally shared, with the equally plain provision that the upper division must furnish its half."

Delph Carpenter in his official report to Governor Shoup said:

"Any waters necessary to supply lands in the Republic of Mexico (hereafter to be determined by international treaty) shall be supplied from the surplus flow of the river. If the surplus is not sufficient, any deficiency shall be borne equally by the upper basin and the lower basin."

I am certain that Mr. Carpenter would have added, had he thought such a doubt were to be raised, "Water held in the upper basin to generate power and which for physical reasons could not be used by the upper

basin for agricultural or domestic purposes is surplus water to the upper basin." Such an interpretation must be crystal clear to any student of the seven-State compact and the official interpretations of its provisions.

The upper and lower basins were each apportioned from the Colorado River system the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, and in addition the lower basin was given the permission to increase its beneficial consumptive use of an extra million acre-feet per annum of surplus water. However, the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the lower States had a very clear priority over the 7,500,000 acre-feet awarded to the upper States. In reality, the compact gave the lower States 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum and the upper States that much water if there should be any water left in the river, provided the upper States used that water only for domestic or agricultural purposes.

"ARTICLE III

"(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and to the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

"(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a) the lower basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by 1 million acre-feet per annum."

But here is the catch in this award:

"(d) The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact."

The following quotes from the questions by Senator HAYDEN and answered on January 27, 1923, by Chairman of the Commission Herbert Hoover leave nothing to the imagination with respect to the extra 1 million acre-feet of surplus water awarded the lower basin. The extra million acre-feet is to be met out of surplus waters over and above the 7,500,000 acre-feet allocated annually to each of the two basins and it does not take priority over the upper States award of 7,500,000 feet provided they use all of their 7,500,000 for agricultural and domestic purposes. If the upper basin stores water for power purposes at least a million acre-feet per annum must go to satisfy this demand.

"Question 6. Are the 1 million additional acre-feet of water apportioned to the lower basin in paragraph (b) of article III supposed to be obtained from the Colorado River or solely from the tributaries of that stream within the State of Arizona?

"Answer. The use of the words 'such waters' in this paragraph clearly refers to waters from the Colorado River system, and the extra 1 million acre-feet provided for can therefore be taken from the main river or from any of its tributaries.

"Question 22. Does the Colorado River compact apportion any water to the State of Arizona?

"Answer. No; nor to any other State individually. The apportionment is to the groups."

It should be noted, and I repeat, that Secretary Hoover's official interpretations were made before the compact was ratified by any State; furthermore it was not disputed by any of them when they did ratify it.

On December 15, 1922, Colorado Commissioner Delph E. Carpenter in his official report to the Governor of Colorado, the Honorable Oliver H. Shoup, submitted several tables explaining the allocation of the water of the Colorado River system.

Table 4 reads as follows:

Table 4

	Acre-feet
Upper division allocation, includes present consumption	7,500,000
Lower division allocation, includes present consumption	7,500,000
Lower division permissible increase in water consumption	1,000,000
Total allocated or permitted	16,000,000
Unallocated surplus (estimated)	4,500,000
Estimated average annual water supply	20,500,000

Mr. Carpenter also said in this report:

"At any time after 40 years, if the development in the upper basin has reached 7,500,000 acre-feet annual beneficial consumptive use or that of the lower basin has reached 8,500,000 acre-feet, any two States may call for a further apportionment of any surplus waters of the river."

On March 20, 1923, Colorado Commissioner Delph E. Carpenter, in a joint letter to Colorado Senator M. E. Bashor and Colorado Representative Royal W. Calkins, said, among other things:

"Paragraph (b), article III, permits the lower basin to increase its annual beneficial consumptive use of water 1 million acre-feet. The two paragraphs permit an aggregate annual beneficial consumptive use of 8,500,000 acre-feet, and no more. The words "per annum," as used in paragraph (b) are not synonymous with the word 'annually.' No cumulative increase is intended by that paragraph."

On February 10, 1923, Colorado Commissioner Delph E. Carpenter addressed a telegram to the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Chairman, Colorado River Commission, and received a prompt reply. On February 13, 1923, he addressed a telegram to the Honorable R. T. McKisick, deputy attorney general, Sacramento, Calif., and that same day received a reply.

These exchanges of telegrams are pertinent to an understanding of this phase of the compact and are inserted here:

CAPITOL BUILDING,
Denver, Colo., February 10, 1923.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
Chairman, Colorado River Commission, Washington, D. C.

Do you concur with me that the intent of the Commission in framing the Colorado River compact is as follows:

That paragraph (b) of article III means that the lower basin may increase its annual beneficial consumptive use of water 1 million acre-feet and no more?

DELPH E. CARPENTER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 12, 1923.*

DELPH E. CARPENTER,
State Capitol, Denver, Colo.:

I concur with you, and shall so advise Congress in my report, that the intent of the Commission in framing the Colorado River compact was as follows:

Paragraph (b) of article III means that lower basin may acquire rights under the compact to annual beneficial consumptive use of water in excess of the apportionment in paragraph (a) of that article by 1 million acre-feet and no more. There is nothing in the compact to prevent the States of either basin using more water than the amount apportioned under paragraphs (a) and (b) of article III, but such use would be subject to the further apportionment provided for in paragraph (f) of article III and would vest no rights under the present compact.

HERBERT HOOVER.

DENVER, COLO., *February 13, 1923.*

R. T. MCKISICK,
Deputy Attorney General,
Sacramento, Calif.:

Do you concur with me that intent of Commission in framing Colorado River compact was as follows:

That paragraph (b) of article III means that the lower basin may increase its annual beneficial consumptive use of water 1 million acre-feet and no more?

DELPH E. CARPENTER.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 13, 1923.*

Hon. DELPH E. CARPENTER,
State Capitol, Denver, Colo.:

Am of opinion that paragraph (b) of article III permits increase of annual beneficial consumptive use of water by lower basin to 8,500,000 acre-feet total or 1 million in excess quantity apportioned each basin in perpetuity by paragraph (a), article III, and no more. When both paragraphs are read together no other construction tenable. "Per annum" not synonymous with "annually."

R. T. MCKISICK.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 15, 1923.*

DELPH E. CARPENTER,
Denver, Colo.:

My interpretation of article III and VIII well expressed in McKisick's wire of the 13th.

W. F. MCCLURE,
Seven State Compact Commissioner for California.

Utah Commissioner R. E. Caldwell, in his report to the Utah Senate, among other things said:

"The lower basin States, for the most part, when they divert their water, wholly consume it and they get no credit for use of return flow for it does not exist, and they are, therefore, limited to the diversion of 8,500,000 acre-feet and are held strictly to the requirement of consumptive beneficial use of such as they do divert."

In the report to the Governor of California by Hon. W. F. McClure, commissioner for California, made January 8, 1923, appears this statement:

"In conclusion permit me to add that the terms of the compact do full justice to the States in interest, and the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system whereby the lower basin is allocated 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, with an allowable increase of 1 million acre-feet per annum by reason of the probably rapid development upon the lower river, and fully guarantees to California an ample water supply to adequately care for the enormous future growth of the Imperial Valley and adjacent territory."

The Honorable Herbert Hoover, who, as I have said, was the chairman of the commission that drafted and approved by its unanimous vote the seven-State compact, said:

"The lower basin will, therefore, receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes."

The Honorable A. P. Davis, Director of the Reclamation Bureau, on January 30, 1923, announced that:

"The Colorado River compact provides that the lower basin shall be guaranteed an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually from the upper basin and all of the yield of the lower basin, and that any water not beneficially used for agricultural and domestic uses (in the upper basin) shall likewise be allowed to run down for use below."

This data proves conclusively that the extra 1 million acre-feet of water per annum allocated to the lower basin is to be acquired from the surplus and otherwise unallocated water of the Colorado River system. The

same is true of the 1,500,000 allocated annually by treaty to the United States of Mexico.

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin. Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Under the seven-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico before they can use 1 drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the seven-State compact was ratified. In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

The Reclamation Bureau estimates that the proposed storage reservoirs in the upper Colorado Basin will cost the upper basin 880,000 acre-feet annually in evaporation. It will be charged to the upper basin as consumptive use. Colorado's portion of that loss would be 400,000 acre-feet.

Water still does not run up hill, and storage down the river from Colorado to generate electric energy, frowned upon by the 7-State compact, cannot secure for use 1 drop of water, but to the contrary, will cost us 400,000 acre-feet annually in evaporation, which under the upper Colorado Basin compact will be charged to Colorado as consumptive use.

Colorado is close to the bottom of the barrel insofar as Colorado River water is concerned. Colorado has a record of lavish generosity to all of her neighbor States. Now at this late date it will be State suicide unless she looks after her own interests with courage and wisdom. She positively cannot afford the loss of 400,000 additional acre-feet. She cannot afford to agree to a storage plan whose certain effect will be to create additional surplus water out of the upper basin's meager supply, which under the 7-State compact must go to the lower basin. Colorado must insist that the 42 reservoirs surveyed in the high country of Colorado be authorized simultaneously with the authorization of the storage plan and which will give Colorado an absolute right to the water which is developed.

The Hill report prepared pursuant to a contract with the Colorado Legislature indicates there is something over a million acre-feet of unappropriated water in the Colorado River system in Colorado. However, the Hill report did not charge Colorado with the burden of Colorado's portion of the priority commitment to Mexico, which under the 7-State compact cannot be less than 375,000 acre-feet. And, another thing, if Glen Canyon and the Echo Park reservoirs are built, Colorado's portion of the Mexican burden becomes not less than 750,000 acre-feet annually. Had Mr. Hill recognized these binding and irrevocable priorities and the evaporation of the down-river storage plans, which is to be charged to Colorado as "consumptive use" of 400,000 acre-feet, he could not have shown any unappropriated water whatsoever in Colorado for Colorado.

Colorado has entered into irrevocable compacts with all of the States to the east, west, north, and south. In each of these compacts Colorado has been generous to a fault. Now most of her water is lost forever, and yet her neighbors are asking her to surrender more and more of this most precious resource. The time has come when Colorado's dwindling supply must be guarded jealously and protected fully. That is a responsibility which I, as Governor of Colorado, must assume.

Who will say that the Glen Canyon Dam in the State of Arizona and the Echo Park Dam on the Colorado-Utah border are not extraordinary dams from an engineering point of view. Glen Canyon is the sort of project that makes an engineer's mouth water, and the Reclamation Bureau is a Bureau of engineers. Who will say that these projects will not be of incalculable value to the lower basin. Glen Canyon, which will collect 100,000 acre-feet of silt a year, will extend the life of the Hoover project 500 years, but what I want someone to tell me is, "Why should they be built with upper Colorado Basin funds at the water expense of the State of Colorado?"

There is only one route remaining for us to take. We must put our water to beneficial use in our own State if we are to gain any right to it. That is the plain language of the 7-State compact. It states that condition with equivocation. The Reclamation Bureau has explored 42 reservoir sites high up on the Colorado River system in Colorado. We cannot, we dare not settle for less than their authorization now. Congressional authorization does not mean immediate construction, but it will give to these proposed reservoir sites an official priority. Colorado contributes 72 percent of the water of the upper Colorado River Basin. Is it asking too much that we be allowed to use less than one-fourth of what we produce? If that is wrong, then I am wrong.

ED C. JOHNSON.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish now to speak very briefly concerning Indian rights to Colorado River waters.

The 1922 compact provides in article VII thereof that nothing therein shall be construed as affecting the obligations of the United States to Indian tribes. article VII of the upper basin compact of 1948 requires that uses of water by the United States and its wards shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made.

Let me quote one of the witnesses testifying in favor of similar legislation before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs last year. I refer to Judge Jean Breitenstein. He said, page 290 of the 1954 report on Senate bill 1555:

A California spokesman in the House hearings on this project has stated that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has construed the compact as meaning that the Indian claims in effect are prior and constitute the first demand upon the water supply. If such a theory should be upheld, then every right to the use of water of the Colorado River and its tributaries is of doubtful validity.

Mr. President, I wish to reemphasize the importance of that statement, on the part of a witness appearing in favor of legislation similar to that with which we are today confronted:

If such a theory should be upheld, then every right to the use of water of the Colorado River and its tributaries is of doubtful validity.

Mr. President, across the street in the United States Supreme Court there is pending a lawsuit brought by the State of Arizona against the State of California and other parties. The Government of the United States has intervened in that lawsuit. At issue are interpretations of the Colorado River compact to which I have alluded. In part the controversy revolves around the rights of Indians to waters involved in the Colorado River compact. That is a serious question in this controversy. As I have said, the Colorado River compact provides that nothing in that document shall impair the obligations of the United States to the Indian tribes.

In the report of Mr. Delph E. Carpenter, to whom I have previously referred, it is stated that the apportionment to each basin includes all diversions necessary to serve Indians and Indian tribes.

The upper Colorado Basin has a similar provision in its compact. However, in its petition of intervention in the pending case of Arizona against California, the United States alleges that the rights to the use of water by Indians and Indian tribes are in no way subject to or affected by the Colorado River compact.

During the hearings this year, the committee heard testimony by the head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, of the Department of the Interior. I attempted to elicit from him exactly what the position of the Government of the United States was with respect to Indian rights in the waters of the Colorado River. I asked him the following question, which appears on page 41 of the printed hearings:

Mr. Emmons, what is the present view of your office respecting the rights of Indians to water on the Colorado River?

Mr. Emmons replied:

Senator, first and foremost, I am interested in the rights established by treaties for the Indians—all Indians of the country. I believe that the Indians' requirements should be considered primarily.

On this matter, however, the Indians, the same as they have in most other places, have been practical and have indicated just what their absolute requirements might be.

I then asked Mr. Emmons this question:

Does your office have a firm position with respect to any priorities on the rights of Indians to Colorado River water?

Mr. Emmons answered:

I do not believe I am prepared to answer that, Senator.

Indeed, I think I may say, Mr. President, with complete sincerity, that the Department of the Interior has taken one position on the question of Indian rights to the waters of the Colorado River, and that the Department of Justice has taken, or at least has been inclined to take, a diametrically opposite position upon the same fundamental question. If the rights of Indian tribes are finally determined to be a first claim on the waters, then the whole basin will be thrown into chaos.

I respectfully suggest to my colleagues who may desire to read the record that there is only one place in which a fair, honest, and impartial determination of who is right and who is wrong on these legal problems can be made, and that is in the Supreme Court of the United States. As a matter of fact, the State

of California, as a defendant in the action, the other day asked the Supreme Court to consider joining in the lawsuit all the other States which are parties to the Colorado River compact. The Supreme Court appointed a master and referred that question to him.

As the debate on the bill proceeds in the Senate today, and as I suppose it will continue tomorrow, the problem of whether the other States in the Colorado River Basin should be joined in the lawsuit is presently under consideration by a master appointed by the Supreme Court.

While I rather regret that it sometimes is necessary to resort to litigation when the public interest is involved, and I believe that negotiation is the best way to handle these problems, nevertheless, so long as a lawsuit, which involves the question of the interpretation of the Colorado River compact, is being tried in the Supreme Court then I think, and I hope, that the other States may be joined, so that a final judicial decision may answer those questions for all time. But that is not a matter on which I should pass judgment, and I assume I should make no comment concerning it.

I wish to make one more statement with respect to the responsibilities of the States in the Basin. The two predecessors in the Senate of my able colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and me, many years ago objected on the floor to the ratification of the treaty with the Republic of Mexico. They were joined by a handful of Senators—no more. Finally, the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, ratified the treaty. I make no comment today on that action, except to say that some present Members of the Senate, with whom I have discussed the problem, take a little different view from that held by their predecessors in days gone by, when an additional burden was placed upon the States in the Colorado River Basin to carry water to our neighbor, the Republic of Mexico.

The bill before the Senate provides for the construction of 6 storage dams, capable of storing 40,390,000 acre-feet of water, costing $821,886,000; plus 33 participating projects. It calls for an investment of $874,281,800 to supply 1,208,645 acres with new supplemental water. Six storage dams and 33 participating projects, Mr. President.

It is true that the present administration recommended legislation designed to assist in the development of the States of the upper Colorado River Basin. It is also true that the development plan as outlined by the administration consisted of 2 major storage dams, not 6; and 11 participating irrigation and reclamation projects, not 33.

I am certain that my friends, particularly the able junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], will permit me to make the statement, and will agree with it, that the great majority of the projects authorized, or tentatively authorized, in the bill have not been approved by the Department of the Interior, nor have any reports on feasibility been issued.

I must say that, to me, a comparative newcomer in the Senate, it is a little difficult to follow a theory of legislation which would authorize any project in advance, and then would say that when an administrator in the Department of the Interior has subsequently approved it, Congress will approve it. That is putting the legislative cart before the legislative horse, in my judgment.

It is true—and I wish to speak with specific accuracy—that the measure contains a group of projects which it is provided must come back to Congress for a second time. But, again, what useful purpose would be served by such qualified congressional authorization, only to be followed by a second?

I believe a portion of the answer can be found in the discussion in the committee with respect to the intention of the bill. I think the proposed legislation, in its present form, attempts to indicate, if the bill be passed, that the projects included are only a part of an overall development which would follow automatically if the bill became law.

I read from page 7 of the bill, beginning on line 7, as follows:

> SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

This constitutes, I think I may say in complete accuracy, something of a brand new or novel approach to authorizing legislation. Here some projects are authorized; others are authorized, subject to an administrative finding; and a third category is authorized, subject (a) to an administrative finding, and (b) to a second congressional authorization. And here also all these indicated other unnamed projects will in the future be authorized.

In committee I asked what useful purpose could be served by that device and a so-called declaration of intent. I need not say that one Congress cannot bind another, and that a declaration of intent indulged in by the 84th Congress will be of no force and effect on the 85th or any subsequent Congress.

I shall again in all frankness say, Mr. President, that the committee did revise section 2; and I should like to repeat what I said earlier in the absence of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], that I have been treated in his committee with all the courtesy and friendship that any man could expect. I only regret that I was not more effective in the efforts which I made.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. While I recognize there is a problem in trying to commit future Congresses—a problem which the Senator has mentioned—this procedure grows out of the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation has said, in respect to utilizing water in these Western States, "There are certain of those projects we would like to sponsor, but unfortunately the States own the water within their borders. Will you give us some directions as to how you would like to see it done, and we will study those projects?"

This is not an attempt to bind the Congress. This is an attempt on the part of certain States, Colorado particularly, to say, "These are the projects we would like to see studied."

That is the reason why I agree it is loose language, because some projects will have to come to Congress again for confirmation. However, we tried to indicate that we were not endeavoring to commit Congress to anything in the future; we say only that Congress shall have a look at it. I think to that degree and to that extent the Senator from California has made a good contribution to the work of our committee, even though he may think he returned empty-handed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. On the same point I wish to refer to the hearings. When Assistant Secretary Fred G. Aandahl was testifying, and when he was asked if the Department endorsed all provisions of S. 500, his answer was:

> I do not think that I would care to make a full and straight answer to the question that you have asked.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to refer very briefly to the official letter from the Bureau of the Budget. I wish to read from that letter on S. 500, which is dated March 17, 1955, and reads in part:

> In the absence of new information justifying their inclusion at this time we have no basis for reappraising the merits of those projects heretofore considered and not recommended for authorization either by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. Similarly, in the absence of detailed planning reports for those projects not heretofore considered by the Bureau of the Budget, including data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the work, there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of such projects. For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navajo units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, and Navajo participating projects should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress in accordance with established procedures.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from the Bureau of the Budget be printed in the RECORD.

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

> EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
> BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
> *Washington, D. C., March 17, 1955.*
>
> Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
> *Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,*
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge Mr. Stewart French's letter of January 20, 1955, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 500, a bill "To authorize

the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes."

Enactment of legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project was recommended by the President both in his state of the Union message and his budget message this year. The views of this Bureau concerning the details of such legislation were expressed in letters of March 18, 1954, to your committee and to the Secretary of the Interior, which are printed in Senate Report No. 1983, 83d Congress, 2d session. On April 1, 1954, a draft bill, which was developed in collaboration with the Department of the Interior, was submitted to your committee.

With respect to the detailed provisions of S. 500, this Bureau has the following comments:

1. In the absence of new information justifying their inclusion at this time we have no basis for reappraising the merits of those projects heretofore considered and not recommended for authorization either by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. Similarly, in the absence of detailed planning reports for those projects not heretofore considered by the Bureau of the Budget, including data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the work, there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of such projects. For these reasons we believe that the authorizations for the Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho units, and the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, and Navaho participating projects should be deferred until the necessary information justifying such action has been submitted to the Congress in accordance with established procedures.

2. There would appear to be ample justification for the closest cooperation between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior concerning the agricultural aspects of the participating projects. The use of the word "consultation" on page 3, line 25, would, therefore, be understood to mean consultation in its broadest sense.

3. Section 7 and reference to it in section 1 (2) (a) (iii) is interpreted to mean that all costs for improvements in fish and wildlife, as well as mitigation of losses not attributable to the construction of the project, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable and shall be financed by the agencies responsible for these programs. However, the cost of preventing damage attributable to the construction of the project should be treated as a part of the cost and allocated to the various purposes in the same manner as other damages. The addition of clarifying language would avoid misinterpretations.

4. The inclusion of section 10 in our draft bill referred to above, namely, "Construction of the projects herein authorized shall proceed as rapidly as is consistent with budgetary requirements and the economic needs of the country," would appear to be a desirable addition to S. 500, since this would be the principal consideration in determining rate of construction and development.

5. It is considered that the authorization should be limited to $950 million, as proposed in the draft bill, in order to give the Congress a greater measure of control over the extent of the development and an opportunity to review the program from time to time.

6. Since we do not have detailed information concerning the city of Denver's proposed Blue River project or the effects of the provisions of section 11 of S. 500 on the interests of the Federal Government or on pending litigation, we are not in a position to comment on this section at this time, and have requested the Department of Justice to review this section.

7. The Bureau of the Budget also is not in a position to comment on section 12, until we have received the views of the Department of Justice on this section.

8. It is recommended that the title be amended to read, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain initial units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes."

Accordingly, it is recommended that S. 500 be amended as outlined above.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. BELCHER,
Assistant Director.

(At this point Mr. KUCHEL yielded to Mrs. SMITH of Maine, who addressed the Senate and reported on her recent world tour. Her speech appears in the RECORD, following Mr. KUCHEL's remarks.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly now on the question of quality of water as it is raised in the pending legislation. Article VIII of the Colorado River compact provides:

> Present perfected rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River system are unhampered by this compact.

In the lawsuit Arizona against California, California alleges that the word "unhampered" as used in that article of the compact means unhampered as to both quantity and quality of water to which the perfected rights relate. California alleges that as of the effective date of the compact, her present perfected rights are to be not less than 4,950,000 acre-feet of water.

When the hearings were held on S. 500, one of the distinguished citizens of my State who testified was Mr. Evan T. Hewes, a member of the Colorado River Board of California and past chairman of it, and a long-time resident of the Imperial Valley in southern California, where he has made his living as a farmer.

Mr. Hewes said, in part, when he was testifying:

> The major participating projects included in S. 500 would be transmountain diversion projects. These would divert water from high elevations out of the Colorado River Basin. This is water of the highest quality, and, therefore, the result would be a serious impairment of the quality of the water coming into the lower basin at Lee Ferry.
>
> At the present time water in the lower basin contains about 1 ton of salts per acre-foot. This means that if we apply, say, 4 acre-feet of water per acre of crop during the year, we put 4 tons of salt on that acre. Whether the salt content of the water may be increased, and if so, how much, without affecting the production of the types of crops we grow, has not been determined.
>
> We say that until this matter of quality has been finally determined in all respects, there should be no additional transmountain diversion projects constructed in the upper basin.
>
> S. 500 would authorize the construction of six large storage reservoirs, from which there would be evaporation of large quantities of water, also increasing the salt content of the lower basin water at Lee Ferry. These reservoirs are not needed to deliver water for domestic and agricultural purposes in the upper basin and, therefore, under article III–e of the compact, this water lost through reservoir evaporation is water to which the lower basin has a right for domestic and agricultural purposes.

Mr. Hewes in good faith raised a serious question. I say to you, Mr. President, that no adequate scientific research has been conducted by any agency of the Government of the United States, or otherwise, to determine the quality of water in the Colorado River, and at what point salinity would become a serious hazard or problem.

It seems to me that the representatives who appeared in opposition to the pending bill were on sound ground in suggesting that before enacting any such proposed legislation of the magnitude here envisioned, there should be a thorough scientific study by the Federal Government of what effect the projects contemplated by the bill would have on the quality of water as it reached the lower basin.

Mr. President, that does not seem too unreasonable a question for me to raise. It seems to me it is a logical position for the representatives of California to assume.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to allude very briefly to the fact that the two largest storage dams originally encompassed in Senate bill 500—Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams—would be geographically located so that it would be practically impossible for any of the impounded waters in either of those reservoirs to be used beneficially in the upper basin of the Colorado River. Geographically, they approach the dividing line between the two basins. Indeed, I think the proponents of the bill would be frank to concede that those 2 dams—and now 4 more storage dams—are contemplated, not in the interest of the beneficial use of water, but primarily in the interest of the generation of hydroelectric power to foot the bill for the 33 participating projects.

Earlier I referred to the Colorado River compact, and particularly to article III (e), reading as follows:

> (e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

Mr. President, I also wish to refer to article IV (b), reading as follows:

> (b) Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

I suggest that in the absence of a complete agreement, which is not present here, there would be a constant question of administration of the upper Colorado River project and a continuing disagreement as to the responsibility of the Department of the Interior with respect to the waters impounded in the dams provided for in the pending bill. All parties will concede that not one drop of the water in the storage units would thereafter be utilized for agricultural or domestic purposes in the upper basin.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from California understand that in order to comply with the terms of the compact storage dams have to be built to hold water with which to supply the lower basin with the amounts of water it was given under the compact, and that also in order to permit the upper basin States to apply their water supplies to irrigation and domestic consumptive use, they must have these dams, so that, by exchange, they can send to the lower basin water from the dams, and can take out water from the streams higher up? Is the Senator from California acquainted with that principle of irrigation and reclamation law in the West?

Mr. KUCHEL. I reply to my friend and able colleague, the Senator from Utah, by saying that in raising this question, I confine myself—as I suggest he confine himself—to the provisions of the Colorado River compact. To that extent, he and I must agree that the water in the dam—the water in Glen Canyon Dam, for example—can never be used for beneficial and consumptive use in the upper basin of the Colorado River.

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot concede that, if the Senator from California is asking me that question. The physical water at that point may not actually be used there; it is given in exchange for other waters which would have to go down to the users in the lower basin, if it were not for these dams. That principle is now well established in the West—namely, that water can be exchanged. If there is stored in a bank, so to speak, water which can be sent to the users in the lower basin, then water can be taken, in exchange, from the stream from which the users in the lower basin might otherwise obtain their supply. In order to take water from the higher reaches in the upper-basin territory, it will be necessary to have water which can be sent to the users in the lower-basin territory, in order to fufill the terms of the compact.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish that my friend, the Senator from Utah, would agree with me; but I am afraid that he will not. But I do not think there should be any disagreement here when I say that the water stored in Glen Canyon Dam, for example, cannot thereafter be used for beneficial purposes in the upper basin of the Colorado River. The sections of the Colorado River compact to which I refer raise a question, which would be a continuing irritant unless in advance it were clearly understood by all the parties exactly what Senate bill 500 purports to do.

Mr. WATKINS. How could there be any damage to the lower basin States if they obtain the amount of water the compact calls for, regardless of whether it is the exact water which would flow down the stream through these reservoirs or whether it is water taken from these rivers and held back for a time and then allowed to flow down, while at the same time the users in the upper basin are taking water directly from the streams?

I could show the Senator very directly how that operates, if I had time in which to do so. It is a technical matter, which would not involve any substantial damage or any damage whatever to the lower basin States. They would get all the water they require, and it would be water from the identical streams, except it would be water which would have been stored for a while.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall listen with great interest to the presentation my friend, the Senator from Utah, will make.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, I wish to say that I have indicated to the Senate some of the disputes over the meaning of the compact. Everyone agrees that the Colorado River compact must be complied with. Some persons may not like it; but it was entered into in good faith, and it is the law. I do not propose to have it breached to the detriment of California.

My only suggestion on that point is that until the Supreme Court of the United States decides the meaning of the various sections of the compact, my friend, the Senator from Utah, and I will not be able to arrive at what the lower basin is entitled to and what the upper basin is entitled to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to understand the Senator from California. Is he now contending that by reason of what he thinks the compact means, the lower basin States would be in a position to block us from using for power purposes any of the water which we may have stored in the upper reaches of the Colorado River?

Mr. KUCHEL. No; I would not say that. I would say specifically—and then I ask the Senator to allow me to sum up the few remaining points—that the answer to his question is article IV, section (b) of the compact, which I have just read, and which, in essence, says that while water may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, such impounding must be subservient to consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes, and shall not interfere with the use for such purposes.

Mr. WATKINS. I will say that the storage of water in all those dams, the main dams on the upper reaches of the Colorado River, will be for that primary purpose, so that we can use the water consumptively in the upper basin States; and incidental thereto would be the development of electricity. It would be a case in which there could be no damage to the lower basin States. They would get the water. So far as concerns the ability to determine whether it is the exact water they think they should get, or some other, they would have extreme difficulty in making any kind of case in any court on the theory that they had been damaged. They would get the full amount of water. It would be regulated. It would come to them under even better conditions than the compact would call for, because with the building at Glen Canyon, there will be no silt. The silt would be deposited in Glen Canyon, and the Mead Reservoir would have its life extended 200 years as a gift from the upper basin States, and without any cost whatever to the lower basin States. They would have clear water, much better quality water than they would have without such a reservoir.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend for his views. I disagree with them. On the question of quality of water, I do not believe there is anyone connected with the Government of the United States who can point to a sufficient study and survey of the problem and give a correct answer to the question as to the quality of the water.

Mr. President, last December the Department of the Interior wrote a letter to a local Washington firm of attorneys. The letter was introduced in a hearing which a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held. It has a bearing on this problem. The letter is from Mr. Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and is dated December 2, 1954. There was involved a dispute between two cities, one in California and one in Arizona, with respect to a continuing supply of water. That letter says in part:

> As a result of reexamination early in August it was determined that the generation at Hoover power plant should be reduced to 88 percent of the contract amount of firm energy for the current operating year, equivalent to a reduction of 502 million kilowatt hours during a period of ten months. All of the Hoover allottees concurred in this curtailment. The decision of no net withdrawal of storage credit during the operating year was confirmed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 2, 1954.*

COX, LANGFORD, STODDARD & CUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: You submitted a proposal in behalf of California-Pacific Utilities Co. in your letter of September 1, 1954, that the United States contract with the company for 20 million kilowatt-hours annually of the storage credit (sometimes referred to as "pink water") energy available to the Parker-Davis project. The energy would be used to supply the Needles, Calif., system of the company which is presently obtaining energy under the Boulder Canyon project contract No. 11r–1366.

The present circumstances as to Hoover powerplant generation are significant to this matter. The streamflow into Lake Mead during the period April through July 1954 was the second lowest April-July runoff of the 31-year record of flows at Grand Canyon. The integration meeting held June 14, 1954, resulted in the adoption of a generation schedule for Hoover powerplant of firm energy only for the year ending May 31, 1955, because of the low level of Lake Mead and the prospect for deficient inflow. The Parker-Davis project was not to make any net withdrawal of storage credit during the year. As a result of reexamination early in August it was determined that the generation at Hoover powerplant should be reduced to 88 percent of the contract amount of firm energy for the current operating year, equivalent to a reduction of 502 million kilowatt-hours during a period of 10 months. All of the Hoover allottees concurred in this curtailment. The decision of no net withdrawal of storage credit during the operating year was confirmed.

Approximately one-third of this Hoover reduction must be absorbed by the Arizona Power Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, both preference customers of the Parker-Davis project. In the circumstances, the United States was obliged to decline the requests of these preference agencies for storage credit energy, and they have accordingly completed arrangements to purchase steam energy from non-Federal sources to augment their available supplies of Hoover and Parker-Davis energy. It will be seen, therefore, that the requirements of preference customers have not been met, because the United States is unable presently to meet those needs.

We regret the necessity of informing you that until Lake Mead makes substantial recovery, the United States will not be in a position to offer storage credit energy for sale. The time of such recovery cannot be forecast. However, when the reservoir has recovered sufficiently to permit the United States to withdraw storage credit energy, such energy will be disposed of in the manner prescribed by law, and the California-Pacific Utilities Co. will be informed of its possible availability.

Very truly yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KUCHEL. I point that out to underline the fact that there is now a shortage of water in Lake Mead which has required the Government of the United States to curtail the production of power at Hoover Dam. Is there any wonder why the more than 6 million people in southern California are alarmed over the implication of this bill?

When Mr. Dexheimer, the Commissioner of Reclamation, was testifying on Senate bill 500, as reported on page 26 of the printed hearings, I asked him the following question:

Senator KUCHEL. Why are you curtailing the use of the water now at Hoover Dam?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Because we have had low run over the past year or so, and we have had to save that water so it can be utilized at the proper time as the first priority calls for it to be used.

Senator KUCHEL. Assume that low runoff period with the Glen Caynon Dam constructed; what would be your guide lines in determining how much water to send from Glen Canyon Dam down to Lee Ferry?

Mr. DEXHEIMER. The contracts and commitments of the United States in the lower basin, which include the Republic of Mexico, the various irrigation and municipal uses in the lower basin.

Senator KUCHEL. When you say the contracts, you would include the Colorado River compact, obviously.

Mr. DEXHEIMER. Yes; that is the provision for the development.

Let me now invite the attention of the Senate to page 10, line 12 of the bill, where we find the following language:

After repayments to the United States of all money required to be paid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the upper Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

It is to the credit of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], a distinguished member of our committee, that he raised a question as to where the money should go after repayment had been effected. That is an important question. A different yardstick was applied when Boulder Canyon Dam was authorized by the Congress. Then the Congress did not provide that moneys for repayment should go to the lower basin, or to any State in the lower basin. The Congress then provided that the money should go into a special account to be expended for the advancement of the entire Colorado River Basin, not half of it, not the lower basin alone, but all of it.

In the authorization by Congress later on of Parker Dam and Davis Dam, provision is made for revenues, after repayment, to go to the general fund of the Treasury. Why not apply the same yardstick in this bill? Why in this bill should similar revenues benefit only the upper States?

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from California will remember that the question which arose was whether we should write a new yardstick or whether we should pass the pending legislation, perhaps in the Senate, and then decide if modifying language should not be added to the Boulder Canyon Act, as well as to the law which is now applicable to the Parker and Davis Dams, in order that uniform treatment may be given to all.

I wish to assure the Senator from California that I for one feel myself obligated to follow that pattern. In the case of the Boulder Canyon Act, it has been seriously contended by Members of the Senate that once the Boulder Canyon Dam project is paid off and the funds have been completely retired, it should belong to the people in the States surrounding it. In other words, it is contended that it should belong to the people of Arizona and Nevada, and perhaps with some rights being given to California, too, because they would have paid most of the money in the form of payments for electric current. The provision now is that it all go into the Treasury.

I am sure that if there had been a provision placed in the act that upon completion the money might be used for additional development within the lower basin, it would have been desirable.

I am merely trying to assure the junior Senator from California that whatever language is finally put into the pending bill, it will be the desire of many of us to bring the language of all such acts into conformity. I do not believe that this project or any project under it should be placed in a preferential position.

The language was put in the bill only because we felt a solution had not been reached in the case of the Boulder Canyon Dam. We have now had 30 years of experience, and are coming within 30 or 40 years of the payout period, and perhaps less than that. The situation that existed when the Boulder Canyon Act was passed has changed materially. I believe if we were to do it again, we might feel differently about the repayment of the money.

I remind the junior Senator from California that at the time the Boulder Canyon Act was passed, a great many people thought the so-called Hoover Dam or Boulder Dam would never pay itself out and that the Government would be stuck with the whole $165 million, and, furthermore, that there would be no demand for power comparable to that which was anticipated by the proponents of the project. The same experience was had on the Columbia River and elsewhere in the country.

Therefore, taking the experience of 30 years, I believe we should revise the legislation of this character so as to make all of it uniform.

I pledge my assurance that just as soon as there is a demand by the people of Arizona, Nevada, and California for a different deal in the case of Hoover Dam, I shall be glad to see that accomplished.

Mr. KUCHEL. I greatly appreciate the comment of my friend, the Senator from New Mexico. Tomorrow I may wish to suggest to the Senate that the language to which I have just referred be brought in line with the language of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. However I do appreciate the statement of the Senator from New Mexico that all should be treated uniformly so far as the disposition of receipts is concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. In that connection I should like to recall to the Senator that in the executive committee hearings on the bill I raised the question whether, in the proposed legislation, the Juniper project was to be authorized in the absence of any requirement whatever that the Department of the Interior make an administrative finding on feasibility. The Senator from New Mexico, when I called that to his attention, said he agreed that that should not be, and he suggested the change which the committee agreed to.

That is one more evidence of the fact that the Senator from New Mexico is fair. I may disagree with him upon occasion, but no man will deny the fairness of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from California will also recognize that the Glen Canyon Dam, which would involve $400 million in the beginning, and would be the largest project, probably would be the first to be constructed if the plans of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation have any bearing. It should be remembered that not one drop of water stored behind that dam would be stored for any other purpose than to permit the people of Nevada, Arizona, and California to have the water to which they are entitled under the compact. It is water that is now wasting into the Pacific Ocean.

Therefore, while the bill calls for a substantial sum of money, whatever will be done will be done in furtherance of the Colorado compact, which I know the Senator from California is anxious to see carried out fully at all times.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act now requires $500,000 a year to be deposited in a special account for the States of the entire Colorado River Basin, and that will continue until 1987. I wonder whether my friend would consider tomorrow joining in the recommendation of an amendment to that particular language in the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from California that there is a reason why the $500,000 is spent partially in the upper basin States. At the time of the negotiation of the original compact, it was anticipated that the power from the Hoover Dam would be available to all the States. Certain blocks of power were to be sold to Arizona, Colorado, and other States. When the dam was finished, because of the necessities of financing, none of the power was made available in any of those States. Instead of that, money was made available to them. Therefore, there was an exchange, and we would have to bear that in mind if we were to try to take the money away from them. As the work in the upper basin States proceeds, cancellation of that $500,000, so far as the upper basin States is concerned, may be desirable.

That, however, is a matter about which the officials of the various States may want to be consulted. The day may come when that amount properly should be canceled, as the Government itself takes a larger part of the burden of investigation in the upper Colorado States.

The provision was inserted, as the senior Senator from Colorado and I know—and I was present in Santa Fe when the compact was entered into—because of the statement, which was constantly made, that all the work which would be done would be done for the lower basin States; therefore, some money ought to be made available to investigate the whole stream.

It was wise that it was done that way, and the bill before us is a partial result of those investigations.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I might also point out, in connection with the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico, that much of the power that has been developed at Hoover Dam was developed from water that belonged to the upper basin States. We were able to take out only a small amount of that water. The water which ran down into Lake Mead was used to generate power which in theory was emergency power, and California was able to get it at a lower rate. It was able to get it for even less than 2 mills, because of the fact that it was supposed to be emergency power. In actual practice it turned out to be firm power practically all the time. Therefore, when we speak of the $500,000, it should be remembered that California and the rest of the lower basin area have been fully compensated many times over in the kind of water they have been able to get.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all I wish to do on that point is to suggest that what is considered a fair basis for legislation in the lower basin ought to be considered fair when legislation in the upper basin is considered. We should not have two different yardsticks. Mr. President, we do have two yardsticks in this instance, and we adopt a corrective amendment.

Mr. President, I have not commented thus far on the economics involved in the pending bill. I wish to do that, but I should prefer to do it tomorrow. I believe I have touched upon most of the points this afternoon other than the question of economics. I have tried to do so dispassionately. I have tried to do it on a basis that will be accepted by Members of the Senate as sound.

I recognize my responsibilities as a Member of the Senate. They run to my country and to my State. As a United States Senator with those two types of responsibilities, I wish to help my brethren from the other States of the Union develop their own commonwealths as they should be developed. I do not wish California, which I have the honor to represent along with my able colleague, to have one drop of water more than that to which it is entitled under the law and under the compact. By the same token, Mr. President, I do not wish my State to be deprived of one drop of water to which it is entitled and which is so vital to the continuing growth of the magnificent empire which I call my home.

Because I am convinced that there is in this proposed legislation a direct assault upon the rights of the people of my State, I stand on the floor of the Senate today and urge that Senate to reject this bill.

Tomorrow, Mr. President, I should like very briefly to discuss some of the economic aspects involved.

During the delivery of Mr. KUCHEL'S speech,

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am delighted to yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Will the Senator from California yield so that I may make a speech which will last 30 or 40 minutes, if it is understood that my remarks will appear in the RECORD following his remarks?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

WORLD TRIP REPORT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on the Armed Services, it is my responsibility to make decisions on many matters every year involving the national security and defense of our country. With the leadership of the free half of the world thrust involuntarily on the shoulders of the United States, the decisions that I make on matters coming before the Committee on the Armed Services involve even more than the security and defense of the United States. They involve the security and defense of all countries allied with the United States. They involve the mutual security and mutual defense of the free half of the world.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it is my responsibility to make decisions on appropriations involving billions of taxpayers' dollars every year. Those decisions are not only concerned with the objective of the most efficient use of that money and of accomplishing the goals of our country at the least possible cost, but also with the very economic security of our country.

This is particularly the case in my work on two of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee—the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Appropriations—because the great bulk of annual appropriations—thirty-five to forty billion dollars—is first handled in the Senate by subcommittees of which I am a member. In the Senate these subcommittees have the primary responsibility for more than 65 percent of our annual national budget.

How do we make our decisions on matters of such importance and gravity? Principally by the information provided at committee and subcommittee hearings by official representatives of the executive branches and by the supporting printed information they submit, by other witnesses, and by our interrogation of the witnesses appearing before the committees and subcommittees.

SEEING FIRSTHAND

Of course, we have to depend upon the experts in the various fields and be guided by what they tell us. But we are not necessarily limited to such second-hand information, in equipping ourselves for the making of these important decisions. Instead, we can personally seek firsthand information. We can go, and see with our own eyes, hear with our own ears, and feel with our own hands, what is being done with the billions of dollars that the Appropriations Committee appropriates each year, and with the legislative authorizations that the Armed Services Committee makes each year.

For example, I have gone to make observations in my own home State of Maine, by visiting Air Force bases and naval installations there. Having done this, I was in the position that, when witnesses testified before the committees about these bases and installations, I knew from first-hand, personal inspection what they were talking about. And what I could do in Maine, I could do with respect to places overseas.

OVERSEAS TRIPS

It was with this basic thought in mind that I made 2 overseas trips in the past 6 months, to see for myself about our activities, aid, and policies in foreign countries. While I could have made these trips as a member of either the Appropriations Committee or the Armed Services Committee legitimately at Government expense, I chose to do it on my own; and as as a result my two trips were not at Government expense, and did not cost the taxpayers a penny.

My first trip was last October. My second trip was during the latter part of February and the early part of March of this year. Total mileage on the trips was approximately 50,000, covering 23 countries—Great Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Russia, Finland, Denmark, Spain, Ireland, Japan, Formosa, Philippines, Vietnam, Hong Kong, Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Greece, and Italy.

CONFERENCES WITH WORLD LEADERS

I shall never forget the experiences of these trips. In them I had the good fortune of having conferences with prac-

tically all of the leaders of the major nations of the world. A few of the leaders and prominent people with whom I talked were:

Winston Churchill, Anthony Eden, Aneurin Bevan, and Arnold Toynbee, in London; Mendès-France, Faure, De Gaulle, Bidault, Monnet, and Mollett, in Paris; Adenauer, Ollenhauer, Nauman, and Saar representatives, in Germany; Molotov, in Moscow; Tani and Tanaka, in Japan; Chiang, in Formosa; Magsaysay and Recto, in Manila; Diem, in Saigon; the British Governor General, in Hong Kong; Prince Wan, in Bangkok; U Nu, in Rangoon; Nehru and Rahdakrishnan, in New Delhi; Mohammed Ali and the King of Jordan, in Karachi; Nasser, in Cairo; Menderes, in Ankara; Scelba, in Rome; and Franco, in Madrid.

MEETINGS WITH LITTLE PEOPLE

I did not confine my conferences and contacts merely to the officials, political leaders, and prominent personages in each country, because I felt that to get a better feel of public attitudes I should go to the little people—to the common, everyday people.

So, in Great Britain, I spent an afternoon with a typical middle-class London family; in Tokyo, an afternoon with a successful Japanese farm family; in France, with a prosperous farm family and with a poor farm family.

In Germany, I took a train through part of East Germany occupied by the Russians, and from the train studied people on the farms; and in East Berlin, I went into the stores.

In Russia, I walked the streets of Moscow, went into the subway, ate in the restaurants, went on a collective farm and talked with the farmers, went to a hospital, went to a grade school.

In Formosa, I went to nurseries, inspected Chinese soldiers in the field, went into a farmer's rice mill, a medical center, a textile mill.

In Vietnam, I spent an afternoon in a dusty, hot refugee camp on the edge of a jungle.

In Thailand, I went to schools and food markets.

In Burma, I met young Burmese children at the United States Information Service Library.

In Manila, I sat in a session of the Philippine Senate during its debate on the Formosa defense issue.

In Hong Kong, I went to a fishing village.

In India, I attended sessions of state legislatures and the national parliament. I passed beggars sleeping on the streets. I visited small villages and attended their community meetings.

In Pakistan, I attended a state dinner.

In Egypt, I visited the slums.

In Turkey I went to schools, visited small villages, and went into the homes of the poor.

In Italy I went to the session of the Italian Parliament when it voted to ratify the Western European pacts while Communists were demonstrating outside the Parliament building.

In Spain I drove into the country and into small villages.

These are a few of the things I did. Admittedly they are not enough to make me an expert in the field of foreign relations or international military security. But they surely made me a better informed and more intelligent legislator on security, defense, and foreign relations matters—and surely a better equipped member of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittees on Defense and Foreign Relations.

GOODWILL

Reports from our Embassies credit me with having achieved some goodwill and better understanding for our people and our country in the nations I visited. However, the Communist press of Russia has denounced my travel, calling me an Amazon warmonger hiding behind a rose. Such criticism I welcome, for this denunciation of my trip must mean that I did such a good job for my country that it hurt the Communists enough for them to start screaming about me.

I do not wish to burden the Members of the Senate with details of my trip. Rather, I would give my overall impressions of our position in the world today and of our relations with some of these countries.

PESSIMISM AT TIME OF TRIPS

At the time of my first trip, which was to Europe and Russia, the free half of the world had been shocked by France's rejection of the European Defense Community, which she herself had originally proposed. Russia was elated. The United States and her Western allies were dejected and disillusioned by France. Frantic attempts were being made to salvage the situation with new pacts.

At the time of my second trip, which was to Asia and the Mediterranean area, there was considerable dejection and pessimism resulting from the ignominious defeat the democracies of the world had suffered at Geneva at the hands of the Chinese and Russian Communists in the ceding of the northern part of Vietnam to the Communists. This, coupled with the tendency of India through the leadership of Nehru and Burma through the leadership of U Nu to snuggle up to Communist China and Communist Russia, gave rise to some extreme despair for us and our allies in the Asian part of the world.

And at the time of both trips—even now—the great preponderance of all that we read in the newspaper columns and heard from the news commentators and analysts, was to the effect that America and Americans were disliked and resented throughout the world—that our prestige had dropped to its lowest point in all history.

Consequently, I expected to go into an atmosphere of hostility almost everywhere on my two trips. I expected to experience great discouragement, and even defeatism, about the United States abroad. It could not be denied that we had suffered serious setbacks in Asia topped by the Geneva humiliation, and in Europe by the disillusionment that a vacillating France had caused. These developments alone were enough to give great credence to the gloomy reports made by the columnists and the commentators.

AMERICA IS LIKED

But I did not find dislike, resentment, hostility, pessimism, and defeatism. Perhaps my impression is not completely in focus, because I went looking for these unpleasant things. Perhaps because I expected to find conditions so bad, on the basis of what I had read and heard, they looked relatively and comparatively good to me. Perhaps if I had expected to find conditions very good I might have found them to look relatively and comparatively not so good.

Whatever the case may be, and regardless of attempted rationalization of objectivity, I was pleasantly surprised by the warm feeling and friendship shown me by the little people, as well as the leaders, in every non-Communist country that I visited. Even in Russia the little people were warm and friendly to me.

Perhaps we are not liked as well as we would like to be. Perhaps the reception I got was not typical. But it is clear to me from what I saw and heard that America and Americans are far better liked and respected in these foreign countries than I think we realize.

VICTORY IN EUROPE

I am glad to report to the Senate that from what I saw, we are gaining ground in the struggle with communism for the minds of men. Much of the debacle caused by the French rejection of EDC has now been salvaged, and was salvaged during the time of my trips. The London and Paris pacts have been ratified by Great Britain, Western Germany, the United States, France, Italy, and other nations. These pacts were being frantically worked on during the time of my first trip. On my second trip I was present at the session of the Italian Parliament when it voted final ratification.

This has been a clear-cut major victory for our side. It has been a smashing, devastating defeat for Russia. Her attempts to stop this action finally failed miserably after many uneasy touch-and-go weeks.

Yes, we have achieved and secured a very definite victory in Western Europe in the struggle to prevent the Communists from taking over that part of the world. I think the latest proof of that is Russia's sudden reversal of attitude in agreeing to a peace treaty with Austria. Russia would never have done so if the London and Paris pacts had not been ratified.

GAINS IN ASIA

But part of the price of that clear-cut victory was that our preoccupation with saving Western Europe from the Communists caused us to neglect what should have been equal concern about resisting the Communist threat in Asia. So now our principal world struggle with communism is in Asia, particularly Southeast Asia. Let us hope that, with Western Europe fairly well secured, we can concentrate on the objective of at least saving Southeast Asia from communism.

Since I started on my trip, and particularly during my second trip, we made gains in the struggle with communism in Asia, with the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization meeting in Bangkok, and the Communist election reverses in India.

The situation in Vietnam is bad, but not as hopeless as it appeared to be a short time ago. These gains have been somewhat offset by the further deterioration of our relations with the Arab nations in the Middle East and the potentialities of the Afro-Asian Conference just now starting.

BASIC PROBLEM ON ASIA

Much of the success in solving a problem is in the analysis of the problem and determining just what has to be solved. Analysis must precede action. That is certainly true with respect to Asia.

What we may fail to realize about Asia is that that part of the world is going through a most critical period as the people of that area shift from past colonialism to future independence and self-reliance. In going through such a transition, the nations of Asia are suffering from growing pains.

The greatest danger in this growing-pains period is that in the process of throwing off centuries of colonialism—just as we threw off British colonialism by our Revolutionary War or War of Independence, after which we set up our new, free, and independent nation—the peoples of Southeast Asia may have tragically mistaken communism as the quickest means of destroying colonialism. They may have tragically mistaken communism as the antithesis of colonialism.

COMMUNISM IS RUSSIAN COLONIALISM

Those who may have made this mistake fail to realize that communism is nothing less than Russian colonialism or Russian imperialism—something far more drastic than the past colonialism they seek to throw off. But an increasing number are beginning to realize this. For example, the people of Northern Vietnam are learning the hard way. There is a growing recognition that communism is a drastic form of colonialism as they look at Russia's Communist colonies of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Estonia, and Latvia. Some are beginning to realize that Russia would make a Communist colony out of their country and every other country in the world.

Therein lies the greatest potential gain that we have made in Asia. Therein lies our basic hope for Asian rejection of communism and of Russian domination and control—a growing fear and hatred of the modern colonialism, communism.

ASIANS MAKE DECISIONS FOR ASIA

In nurturing the expansion of this self-enlightening realization on the part of Asian people, we must be careful to recognize that the people of Asia want decisions concerning Asia to be made in Asia rather than in London or Paris as they have been for centuries in the past. We should assure them that Washington will not attempt to make the decisions controlling Asia. We should assure them that we feel that decisions concerning India must be made in New Delhi, concerning Burma in Rangoon, concerning Vietnam in Saigon, concerning Indonesia in Jakarta.

We must convince them that the primary interest of the United States is to assure that they make their own decisions, that no outsiders will make those decisions, that there will be no attempt to make the decisions in Washington, and that unless they oppose communism, the modern drastic form of colonialism, those decisions in the future will be made in Moscow rather than in New Delhi, Rangoon, Saigon, or Jakarta.

We must point out to them that the decisions for Peiping are being made in Moscow instead of Peiping, for Hanoi in Peiping and Moscow instead of Hanoi, for Budapest in Moscow instead of Budapest, for Prague in Moscow instead of Prague, for Warsaw in Moscow instead of Warsaw.

EUROPE

First. The brightest spot for us in Europe is Western Germany. The free German people have done an amazing comeback job. Western Germany will steadily become the backbone of our resistance to communism in Europe.

Second. Britain is a trusted ally—but a tired ally beset with the weakness of the dwindling of a once great empire and of the resulting psychological effect. Her weakness and her disappointments make her more vulnerable to economic compromises with the Russian-dominated half of the world. This is most ironic since Red Russia is the present day successor to the role of dominant colonialism.

Third. France's heart is good—but her will is weak. She has not toughened up under adversity like Western Germany has. She lacks in political stability and will as long as she continues with her multiparty system. While we can be sure of her friendship, we cannot be sure of what she will do when the chips are down or of which way she will go in a crisis. It will be a long time before we forget her disappointing behavior on the very EDC she originally proposed herself.

Fourth. The tide against communism in Italy is increasingly going our way. But the weakness of our relations with Italy is that she continues to request and expect heavy financial and economic aid from our country. Italy, unlike Western Germany, is not learning fast enough how to stand on her own feet. Italy continues to lean too much on the economic crutch from the United States with the plaintive warning that unless she can continue to lean on that crutch the Communists will take her over.

Fifth. Except for the fact that she is not so successful at bluffing now, Russia is the same she has been for nearly four decades—all wishful thinking to the contrary. Her leaders may change, but they all continue the same policy of hate and dreams of world conquest. She is not nearly as strong as her propaganda claims. But she is not nearly as weak as we would hope. The little people of Russia are neither for nor against communism—they are simply resigned to it—with no enthusiasm to resist it or defend it. The position of the little people of Russia on communism is a policy of coexistence—they merely coexist with communism. In other words, the status of communism with the great mass of Russian people is simply internal coexistence.

THE FAR EAST

First. It is generally recognized that the place coveted most by the Communists in the Far East is Japan. They want to kidnap the industrial power of Japan. While Russia is a traditional and historical enemy of Japan, unless Japan is able to find a market for her goods outside the Communist world there will be great pressure to secure her economic survival, to trade with Russia. In spite of the Sino-Japanese War of the thirties and World War II, there is a great cultural tie between the Japanese and the Chinese. This militates for trade between industrial Japan and agricultural Red China.

Yet, if we are to prevent trade between Japan and Russia and Red China the pressure then mounts on the United States to buy Japan's products to assure her economic health, survival, and resistance to communism. The dilemma for us on this is that this policy would be at the sacrifice of our own American industry and labor. For example, unrestricted purchase of Japanese textiles could destroy the textile industry of New England and play havoc with the textile industry of the South because of the low textile wages paid in Japan.

Second. As one who has wondered about the manner in which American equipment and aid given to Chiang Kai-shek during the Chinese Civil War ended up captured by the Chinese Communists, I went to Formosa with considerable curiosity. I left Formosa with firm answers to some of my questions.

The spirit of the Free Chinese is tied up completely in Chiang. As long as he lives, he is their symbol of return to the mainland—he is literally their last hope. One Chinese civilian expressed it by saying, "If we do not retake the Chinese mainland before the Gimo Chiang dies, all hope is lost. Should the Gimo die, we will never try to return to China."

I am convinced that as long as Chiang lives Formosa will not fall to the Chinese Communists. But I am equally convinced that unless the Communists try to take Formosa and the United States is consequently drawn into a mainland conflict, Chiang will never have a chance to try to retake China. That is one thing that my interview with him brought out. He said he expected air and naval aid and moral aid from the United States on such an undertaking. Within a few days at a press conference President Eisenhower said emphatically and unequivocally that the United States would not give such aid.

So that the real question now is "What will happen to Formosa when Chiang is gone? What will happen to our personalized foreign policy on Nationalist China?"

Third. We have a strong line from Japan in the north through Formosa down to the Philippines in the south.

Fourth. The strength is essentially consistent down through the entire line, with the greatest feeling of loyalty being in the Philippines.

Fifth. But there is a thread of weakness running through the whole—from the nationalist anti-American feeling and economic difficulties in Japan to the policy of personalization on Formosa to internal political opposition within the Philippines.

Sixth. The overall weakness of our Far East line is in the military and economic dependence of Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines on the United States—a dependence of long-term aspects as contrasted to the other areas.

Seventh. It is a matter of holding, rather than increasing, our strength in this area.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

First. India's Nehru is making a very strong bid to be the leader and spokesman for Southeast Asia. Many of us have been disappointed that Nehru has not seen fit to aline his country with our side. We have felt that his brand of neutralism worked to our disadvantage and to the advantage of Communist Russia and Communist China. We cannot understand his neutralist talk in which he says that he admires communism but deplores its methods.

He is a man of great intellect. But at times we find his thinking difficult to understand. For example, he says that Formosa should be given to Communist China and taken away from Chiang on the thesis that China should not be divided. Yet, he opposes Syngman Rhee's desire for a united Korea instead of a Korea divided in half between the Communist North and the free South. I doubt if we could ever understand what appears to be his contradictory thinking on this score.

But I do think that perhaps generally we have not understood him—or made a real try to understand him and his desire to make India a first-rate power as soon as possible after having gained her independence from Britain. Too few of us realize that he has quite a long record of fighting the Communists and communism inside India. And as of now it would seem that the Communist threat to India is receding with the stunning election defeats given the Communists in India while I was there.

I think that we may have had too much of an inconsistent policy of excessively flattering Nehru at one time and then being tactlessly blunt with him at another time. Instead, I believe that our policy should be one of polite firmness. We should not force ourselves on Nehru. We should not force our aid on him. Rather, we should wait for him to ask for our aid. We should convince him of our friendliness—but not cater to him. And I am inclined to think that he would respect us more if we put our relations with him on the basis of loans not gifts. For example, Russia does not give him anything, but rather deals with him strictly on a businesslike basis on loans requiring the payment of interest as well as the repayment of the principal.

And I do not think it would hurt us to ask for his advice about Asia. The mere asking would not commit us to follow his advice. But the mere asking for his advice would be good psychologically.

It would be a tragic mistake for us to write off Nehru and India to the Communist side. I have hopes that within the next 2 years there will be real improvement in our relations with India. At least, I want to withhold any pessimism on my part on Nehru and India for a while.

Second. Some observers have been inclined to write Burma off to the Communists. That is a mistake. They overlook the fact that U Nu has opposed and beaten the Communists in his country. Some observers have charged that U Nu is under the influence and control of India's Nehru as one of his disciples of neutralism. That, too is a mistake. U Nu is a very independent little man—and Burma is a very independent little country. From my talk with U Nu, I am not only convinced of this independence, but I believe that there is a good chance that within the next year or two Burma will turn away from her neutralism and toward our side of the free half of the world.

Speaking of U Nu, I want to digress just a bit with a personal detail. I do so because I think it will be of personal interest.

I asked him what criticism he might have of America and Americans. He answered that he liked Americans very much—but that he felt that American politicians talk too much and make too many different and contradictory statements. As a result, he said, he was confused as to just what American policy was.

I told him that while I had to admit that there was much in what he said, and could understand his confusion, still he should realize that America was a free country, with freedom of speech, and that such contradictory statements were inevitable. I said that was part of the price of freedom in America, but that we would rather pay that price than to be a slave state where there was no freedom of speech.

Third. We are developing a daily-increasing line of strength in Southeast Asia from Vietnam on the eastern end to Pakistan on the western end.

Fourth. The weakness in that line is in Vietnam and India, but we are picking up strength in both of those nations.

Fifth. The strength in that line is in the middle of Thailand and on the western end of West Pakistan, where our position is extremely strong.

Sixth. The greatest potential gain is also in the middle of that line in Burma, which could turn to our side before too long. To a lesser extent, there is a similar potential in India.

Seventh. We must recognize that Southeast Asia is in a critical and most difficult period of growing independence and self-reliance and that we are handicapped in our relations there by the growing pains of suspicion of our intentions and the mistaken belief of some Southeast Asians that communism offers the quickest road to elimination of colonialism and to independence.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE MEDITERRANEAN

First. The stand-out impressions that I came away with from the Middle East and Mediterranean areas were those with respect to Spain and Turkey.

I think that perhaps some of us in the past have misjudged Spain and Franco. We had misgivings about where Franco and Spain stood during World War II—thinking his neutralism was benevolently for Hitler and Mussolini. Perhaps we misinterpreted what was actually the intense opposition of Franco and Spain to Communist Russia. Today, at least, there is no possibility of misinterpretation about Spain being on our side and against Communist Russia. My conference with Franco increased my belief that our aid to Spain and the establishment of our air bases in Spain are wise investments in security.

I do not understand the attitude of opposition of admission of Spain into NATO. It apparently stems from the fact that Franco was neutral in World War II and seemed to have sympathies with Hitler and Mussolini. I do not like such sympathies—if he did have them. But after all, Western Germany was an active enemy against us under Hitler in World War II—and so was Italy under Mussolini—and yet we have forgiven them and taken them into NATO for mutual-security purposes. If we can do that with former active enemies like Germany and Italy, then why can we not do the same in the interest of real security with a Spain that was not an active enemy but rather a neutralist?

Second. In some respects the biggest inspiration of all that I saw and heard on my trip came in Turkey—that little tough country that neighbors on to Russia and lives under the very threatening shadow of the giant Russian bear. The Turks have refused to let Russia frighten them. They have refused to be intimidated. They have stood right up to Russia and literally thumbed their noses at, and defied the Communist threats.

Our past aid to Turkey was easily among the smartest and most productive acts we ever took in our foreign policy. It has certainly paid off real dividends in combating the spread of communism in this part of the world where Europe meets Asia.

There is another refreshing thing about the Turks. They do not want any gifts from us. Instead they seek loans which they want to pay back as soon as they can. And they do not want a long-term period of loans—but rather only for the next 5 years or so. After that, they say they will be able to carry their own load and pay us back.

Third. We are developing a daily-increasing line of strength in that area from Turkey on the eastern end to Spain on the western end.

Fourth. The weakness in that line is in the middle, as contrasted to the Southeast Asia line where the middle is our strongest area. The weakness is in our position in Egypt to the south, Yugoslavia to the north, Italy and France in the center.

Fifth. The weakness of France and Italy is in the instability of their multiparty systems and their psychology of pushing for American economic aid by talking about the Communist threat.

The bright spot in Italy is Clare Boothe Luce, our Ambassador there. In a policy of polite firmness, she is giving a very effective administration of a law passed by Congress which directs that offshore procurement contracts be taken away from plants that show a trend toward communism—plants where Communist membership among the workers is increasing, however slightly. That offshore procurement policy is paying dividends in fighting communism in Italy.

It should be followed more firmly by our representatives in other countries.

Sixth. A promising potential gain is Egypt, in that in her newly acquired independence her leaders are receptive to advice and guidance, provided suspicions about our policy on colonialism and Arab-Israeli relations can be overcome. This is a particularly important potential because of the Afro-Asian Conference and attempts to knit Africa and Asia together against the rest of the world.

The Communists have so exploited the issue of colonialism that the leaders of Arab nations have to be very careful in their expressions and acts against the Communists lest they be accused of being the paid puppets of so-called British and American colonialists.

There are two favorable aspects in an otherwise unfavorable situation in Egypt and the Arab States. The first is in the tremendous respect the Arabs have for President Eisenhower. They have no major criticism of him. The second is in what I believe to be the case with Egypt's Prime Minister Nasser. He is feeling his way along. I think that he wants Egypt ultimately to be alined with the United States, but feels that he will have to lead his people gradually away from their suspicions about American foreign policy being designed to take over where Britain leaves off on colonialism.

Seventh. I think that in this area we must recognize that our strength is dependent upon the very will and determination of each nation; that Turkey and Spain show the greatest will and determination, and therefore merit our aid and support the most; that France and Italy show less determination and will, but that part of their lack of firmness and response stems from our own lack of firmness on such matters as offshore procurement policy; that Egypt in its uncertain steps of national "childhood" can be developed into an ally.

EISENHOWER RAISES AMERICAN PRESTIGE

I am glad to report, from what I saw and heard, that American prestige abroad is no longer on the wane. It may have been a year or two ago, but not now. To the contrary, it is going up. And I think this is largely because President Eisenhower in the last few months has begun to exercise real leadership.

I saw a difference in reaction on this attitude abroad between the time of my trip in October, when repeatedly people said to me that they wished President Eisenhower would give the world more vigorous leadership, that they were almost hungry for him to do so, and that they would quickly follow, and my trip in February, when I found that the attitude had changed. Now people in the various countries are inspired by the manner in which President Eisenhower has been asserting world leadership. They want him to continue to do it, and in even greater degree. It has done much to build up their courage to resist the threat of communism.

LEADERSHIP MUST INCREASE

That leadership must increase in boldness and firmness in the future if we are to cope successfully with the threat to the freedom of the world.

In spite of the pessimism that prevails in some circles, we have plenty to be thankful for and confident about. Our strength, prestige, and position in the defense against the aggressive advances of the Communists is greater than we realize and is gradually increasing. While we are gaining, we still have a great deal to do and we cannot let up in our alertness and vigilance.

I have heard the State Department and its employees attacked time and again, but I want to say that I am proud of the personnel in our Foreign Service. They are doing a real, patriotic, and effective job for our country.

One of the principal criticisms I have about the State Department is leaving such key ambassadorships as those to India and Burma vacant and unfilled for so long. This, I believe, is inexcusable. Another criticism is the failure to recognize the necessity of having career personnel in the top spots.

NEEDED CHANGES IN FOREIGN POLICY

The time has come when there should be some changes in at least the approaches of our foreign policy. We should stop trying to force our aid on countries. Our policy should be to let nations ask for our aid rather than to attempt to force it on them. We should give more aid in the form of loans on a businesslike basis than in the form of gifts. Such a policy will not only provide wiser investment in truly mutual security, but will breed greater respect for us. We should concentrate more of our aid in those countries on whom we can depend.

ACT FROM CONFIDENCE INSTEAD OF FEAR

Every American should be made to realize that the cold war is something that we will have to cope with for many, many years—perhaps decades—perhaps for the rest of our lives. Even so, cold war is preferable to hot war.

The time has come when the very basis of our foreign policy must change. It must shift from the past negative basis of fear—fear of Russia—to a positive basis of confidence in ourselves and nations friendly to us. We have every reason for confidence in ourselves. We are the greatest nation in the world. If we do not have confidence in ourselves then surely we cannot expect other countries to have confidence in us.

The free, liberty-loving nations of the world must stop living in fear and acting from fear. We must act from confidence. We cannot accomplish our goal of peace if we continue to think in terms of fear of Russia.

I believe that we must start charting our course on the basis that we are not going to let Russia scare us any more; that we are plenty capable of taking care of ourselves; and that we must strive for positive construction instead of fear minded, negative defensiveness.

CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

During the delivery of Mr. KUCHEL's speech,

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield with the understanding that the Senator's remarks will appear at the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, when a former President of the United States undertakes to attack his successor, it behooves him to check up on his own history. Mr. Harry Truman's speech last Saturday evening was a sorry attempt to revive the name-calling, inflammatory methods used by one element of the Democratic Party in years gone by. Fortunately, the American people have learned to evaluate this technique, and its value today is zero.

Mr. Truman declared that President Eisenhower has been "playing partisan politics with our security, with our foreign policy, with our civil service, and with our Nation's resources." These charges come with peculiar grace from a former President who threw American military forces into war without consulting Congress, who froze thousands of temporary employees into permanent civil-service tenure, and whose administration was marked by a series of the most shocking scandals in our history.

I prefer to believe that the bitterness of our former President is based upon the amazing contrast between the Washington atmosphere under Truman and the Washington atmosphere under Eisenhower.

Irresponsible criticism is a luxury which our country cannot afford in these perilous times. I am certain that the overwhelming majority of American people look at President Eisenhower through the eyes of another spokesman of the Democratic Party, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. SAM RAYBURN. Mr. RAYBURN said: "Our hearts go out to President Eisenhower as in terrible loneliness he wrestles with the problems of life and death that confront the Nation."

Americans are accustomed to the extremes of partisan debate. We have learned to take them with more than a grain of salt, but in these troubled times, we can stand a moratorium on political oratory designed to confuse the mind and comfort the enemy.

President Eisenhower is not the one who reduced the dollar to a 50-cent piece.

President Eisenhower is not the one who increased the national debt from $21 billion in 1932 to $267 billion in 1951 to $277,600,000,000 in 1955.

President Eisenhower is not the one who increased the cost of Government from $5 billion in 1932 to $74 billion in 1952.

President Eisenhower is not the one who recognized Soviet Russia.

President Eisenhower is not the one who coddled Alger Hiss, let Gerhardt Eisler escape, and blocked every effort to smoke Communists out of Government.

President Eisenhower is not the one who made the disastrous agreements at Yalta.

President Eisenhower is not the one whose blundering policy lost China to the Reds.

President Eisenhower is not the one who ordered the "police action" in Korea.

President Eisenhower is not the one who fired General MacArthur.

President Eisenhower is not the one who has brought us a spurious prosperity through war and by mortgaging the future through debt.

President Eisenhower is not the one whose extravagance and fiscal policy have brought on inflation, and then has cried to high heaven for greater authority to bring on more of the same to stop inflation.

President Eisenhower is the leader of the party which has made it so hot for the former administration that they were forced to order crime investigations; but he is not the one whose political connections with the underworld have been revealed by the same investigations.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY OF REPORT BY HIM TOMORROW TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as a courtesy to the Senate, I desire to make an announcement.

The former Gillette committee, as the Senate knows, was concerned with McCARTHY's finances for a number of years, as were also the Watkins committee and the special session of the Senate last year.

The Internal Revenue Service has just completed a 3-year investigation of a 7-year period. In view of the amount of money which has been spent on the investigation by the two committees, and the time spent during the special session, I feel I owe an obligation to the American people to give them a detailed report of what the Internal Revenue Service has discovered after a 3-year field investigation.

Therefore, tomorrow afternoon at 5 o'clock I shall make a report, not to the Senate, but to the American people, by way of the press, in a press conference.

I felt that as a matter of courtesy I should let the Senate know that the report would be made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment, the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

The message also anounced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. TABER, and Mr. CLEVENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

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

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield without his losing his right to the floor, so as to permit me to place 2 statements in the RECORD?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a statement entitled "The Origin and Characteristics of the Colorado River and the Colorado River Storage Project," and a statement entitled "Western Water Law and the Colorado River Storage Project."

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

THE ORIGIN AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COLORADO RIVER AND THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The United States is blessed with 10 great river systems providing water for consumptive use, power generation, and irrigation. Of these, the Colorado has for months been the topic of discussion in the press, on the radio, and in the Halls of Congress where legislation relating to its control, development, and use have been under consideration since 1954. Approval of this legislation will make possible the full utilization of the Colorado River, provide the water and power necessary to maximum, municipal, agricultural, industrial, power and recreational development and make the beginning of 100 years of round, consistent, and economic growth in the four upper basin States (Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming).

The Colorado River drains parts of seven States in the arid West where water is literally the lifeblood of the economy. The States are California, Nevada, and anyone in the lower basin and Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming in the upper basin.

The Colorado is a unique river. It is long and crooked. It rises in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming and after dropping swiftly down its numerous tributaries, which drain the snow-capped peaks, it enters a deep gorge which cuts through the Colorado plateau for several hundred miles. This gorge is often more than 3,000 feet deep with nearly vertical side walls. Along this stretch of the river there is little usable land and few people. Getting the water out of the river and transporting it to the irrigable, populated valleys through this section of the river is impossible. After the river leaves the deep canyon section near Toposh, Ariz., diversions of water for irrigation are possible and several such divisions were made late in the nineteenth and early in the twentieth century. The diversion works, however, were subject to frequent damaging floods which seriously limited irrigation development. On the upper tributaries of the river many small diversions were made during the same period. These too were limited by the difficulty of controlling the widely fluctuary flow of the river.

The Colorado River is a snow-fed stream. Its origin is in the great snow blanket which accumulates each winter on the high watersheds of the Colorado River drainage basin. This snow blanket is a huge natural reservoir the outlet of which cannot be controlled by man. The snow melts with the rising temperature in the spring and the rapidity and duration of rise of the temperature together with the extent and water content of the snow cover determines the waterflow. Contrary to indications in eastern streams precipitation falling as rain, being a minor part of the total annual precipitation, has little effect on the flow of the Colorado River. The lower elevations in the Colorado Drainage Basin are extremely arid and contribute very little to the total flow of the river. The lower basin (Arizona, Nevada, and California) being at low elevation contribute only 10 percent of the total flow of the river which the upper basin (Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming) containing most of the high watersheds and the heavy snow pack produce 90 percent of the total flow. In fact California produces none of the waters of the Colorado and Nevada very little.

Depending solely on a precipitation (rain or snow) which varies widely from year to year and on an unpredictable temperature, the flow of the Colorado varies widely from month to month and from year to year. This wild, unruly river, which defied the efforts of man to control it up to the time the Hoover Dam was built, varied from a virgin low flow at Yuma, Ariz., of 1,200 cfs to a virgin high flow of 300,000 cfs.

The maximum development of water source of this kind, which varies widely and is difficult to control, is limited to its low water flow without storage for regulation. Prior to 1920 the low water flow was fully appropriated and put to use and continued development but in the upper basin and the lower basin began to impinge upon existing rights. This situation prompted the development and signing of the Colorado River compact which divided the waters of the river between the upper and lower Basin States prior to its being put to use.

This compact by itself had no effect on the flow characteristics of the river but it provided a basin for the development of necessary physical controls which would effect the flow characteristics. Shortly after the Colorado River compact was signed the Hoover Dam was proposed and by 1935 it

was completed and the Colorado River below the dam was under complete control. This control made possible the full and complete use of the waters allocated to the lower basin.

Since the completion of the Hoover Dam the Parker and Davis Dams, in the lower basin, have been completed for the purpose of generating power, the All American Heading and Canal have been completed to deliver water to the Imperial Valley and authorization to build the Pilot Knob power plant on the All-American Canal has been granted.

This power plant will discharge water into the Colorado River just above the Mexican border where it will be of no further use to the United States. The construction of the Hoover Dam and other facilities in the lower basin has completely changed the flow characteristics in the lower basin and made possible the full use of this water and power resource, not only that which the Colorado River compact allocates to the lower basin, but the entire flow that passes the Hoover Dam.

But what about the Colorado River above Lee Ferry? In the 32 years since the signing of the compact, except for the Colorado-Big Thompson transmountain diversion and a few other very small projects, nothing has happened except investigations. These investigations, costing between $7 and $10 million have been thorough and exacting. These investigations show that no further development is possible in the upper Colorado River Basin without storage for regulation of the river. Based on these investigations, a proposed plan for the control and utilization of the waters allocated to the upper Colorado River Basin under the Colorado River compact has been made. This plan when carried out will completely control the river and make possible the beneficial consumptive use of the water allocated to the upper Colorado River States by the compact, the generation of power which will provide revenues for the repayment of the power costs with interest and have left over revenues to help pay the irrigation costs all within 50 years and then yield a net annual revenue of millions of dollars for public benefit.

Legislation relating to this project is now before the Congress. Its approval means the control of the Colorado River for the benefit of the people by providing water and power for the agricultural, industrial, and municipal development in the upper basin States and constitutes an investment in the future for this Nation.

Western Water Law and the Colorado River Storage Project

The Colorado River storage project legislation now pending before the Congress presents another forward step in the development of the Nation's land and water resources. It involves a planned basinwide development supported by a compact agreed to by the United States and the seven Colorado River basin States. This compact departs from the basic principles of western water law in that it divides up the water resources before it is put to use in order that the areas that, due to physical or other handicaps, develop more slowly will not lose their share of the water to those who could and would put it to use first.

The first law relating to waters to be established in the United States was based on the common law of England and is known as the doctrine of riparian rights. It is a humid area law because it does not depend upon nor has any relation to the consumptive use of water. In effect it says a man owning land on the bank of a stream has a right to have the water in that stream flow by his land undiminished in quantity and unpolluted in quality for all time by virtue of his ownership of the land. Use of the water does not create a right and nonuse does not forfeit it. It did not permit a consumptive of water. A man owning land not abutting on the stream has no rights whatsoever in the stream. This doctrine still remains the basis law in the humid areas.

When the arid West was settled it became apparent from the first that consumptive use must be the basis of the right and inasmuch as there was never enough water to satisfy all needs the principles of first in time is first in right, became established. Thus a new doctrine of water law was born. It is called the doctrine of appropriation: "First in time is first in right and beneficial use is the basis and the measure of the right." The Intermountain States (Utah, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona), from the first abrogated the doctrine of riparian rights and accepted the doctrine of appropriation. The other Western States (North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, California, Oregon, Washington, and Montana) retained the doctrine of riparian rights but have since so modified it by statute and court decisions that the basic water law of these States is practically the doctrine of appropriation. The principle of beneficial use is paramount in the States signing the Colorado River compact with some modification in California and is recognized as between States. Furthermore, the State contributions provide in most States, and only a right to use can be acquired.

The Colorado River, being a wild and unruly stream, subject to wide variations in flow, and traveling rugged topography developed slowly. The early users of water in the lower basin had appropriated the entire low-water flow. Development on the tributaries in the upper basin began to effect the low-water flow in the lower basin. Water users on both basins became fearful of their rights based on priority of use and proposed a compact which would circumvent the doctrine of appropriation and divide the waters of the river between the States in advance of its use. Thus was born the Colorado River compact now accepted as the basic law of the river. Under the compact use does not establish the right nor does nonuse forfeit it.

The law of gravity, however, operates in spite of the compact. Since the signing of the compact facilities have been constructed in the lower basin to permit the use of the entire flow of the river for consumptive use and power generation. Already water belonging to the upper Colorado River States, but not being used because there are no facilities for storage, diversion, and conveyance, is being used in the lower basin to generate power which is now supporting industrial and domestic users in the lower basin. They will probably not establish a right by such use in spite of the compact but continued for power and a developed consumptive use on lower basin lands would make it difficult if not impossible to secure an authorization to build facilities in the upper basin if such action would destroy developed uses in the lower basin.

It is therefore apparent that nonuse in the upper basin for an indefinite period would result, practically, in the loss of the right given by the Colorado compact. Such nonuse will be forced on the upper-basin States if the facilities proposed in the Colorado River storage project are not authorized.

Inasmuch as water runs downhill, failure to authorize the upper Colorado River storage project under the same ground rules as have been afforded other reclamation projects will be tantamount to giving away the water and power resources of the uper basin States to the States of the lower Colorado River Basin and Mexico.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of real regret that I take the floor to oppose the upper Colorado project. My feeling of regret is due largely to the esteem and affection which I have for the Senators from the States in the upper Colorado Basin; notably the Senators from Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, but of course, not excluding the Senators from Arizona and Nevada. I am aware that the bill means a great deal to them individually as representatives of their States; and I am aware that it means a great deal to the States themselves.

The Bill and Its Effects

The bill calls for the expenditure of $1,658,460,000, as the report on pages 16 and 17 shows. But this, as I shall show, is only the beginning, because it has been the past record of the Bureau of Reclamation that the actual costs are more than twice the originally estimated costs.

It is also true that the interest upon the irrigation features of the project, for which the construction costs will be approximately $915 million, is forgiven; and ultimately the taxpayers themselves will have to pay the interest on the bonds which will have to be floated. This will amount, probably, to $1,153,000,000, according to Mr. S. W. Crosthwait, Acting Commissioner of the Department of Interior as given in his letter on page 555 of the hearings on S. 500.

Lurking behind the projects which are authorized in the bill are additional projects, the magnitude of which we cannot guess, but which we can be quite certain will be very great indeed. Among these will be the completion of the Central Utah project.

So the bill before the Senate provides for direct and indirect expenditures of $2,750,000,000, and probably substantial sums will be required in addition to that amount.

The direct outlay of over $1,600,000,000 in the upper Colorado River region, distributed over an area roughly shown by the map I hold in my hand, will, of course, result in a great deal of employment in that area. Thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of persons will be employed in constructing the dams, laying out the irrigation projects, and installing the generators. This will have a very stimulative effect upon the trade and industries of the region.

Furthermore, the acres to be irrigated, even though at a high cost, will increase the population of the region and will be of economic benefit to it. So I am quite well aware of the interest which the people of those four States take in the proposed legislation, and of the obligation which the Senators from those States feel, in a sense, as ambassadors from their States to defend the interests of their localities.

Burden Borne by the Whole Country

Mr. President, if this were all to the story, I would, of course, support the measure. But I cannot do so, because it is not all. Whence will the money come with which to pay for the projects? It will certainly have to be advanced by the country as a whole. The States to be affected will, in their payment of taxes, contribute only about 2 percent of the amount which will be invested. If it should happen that the national deficit

will be increased, as will probably be the case, bonds will have to be floated. But the interest on those bonds will have to be met by the taxpayers of the Nation as a whole. Further it looks as though the principal is not to go back into the Treasury but is to be used for more irrigation projects. Therefore, the bill is not a matter of concern merely to the States immediately affected.

In my opinion, too often in these matters we turn the issues over to the States which will be benefited, and which naturally wish to have representation on the committees which deal with them, while the Senators from the other States of the Union largely wash their hands and take what the States immemediately interested decide upon. But obviously the burden ultimately has to be borne by the Nation as a whole.

I have great affection not only for the Senators from the four States concerned, and the neighboring States, but also for the Senators from the great northern tier of States—Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and the upper New England area. They are all fine members, and their localities could also be benefited if Congress appropriated over $1.6 billion with which to erect hot-houses in which to grow bananas and luscious strawberries. Think of the employment which would be created in those regions if Congress decided, as a public project, to grow bananas in the wintertime, and thus alleviate the shortage of fruit. Prosperity would bloom throughout the northern area. But someone else would have to pay the bill.

As I recall Benjamin Franklin, in his autobiography, described how he used to walk along the waterfront of Boston. One day, as he was walking, a hawker approached him and asked him to buy a whistle. Franklin wanted a whistle, so he bought the one which the hawker offered. Later he found that he had paid about five times too much for the whistle, and he repented his purchase for the rest of his life. Franklin said that ever afterward, when he contemplated making an expenditure, he asked himself, "Did you pay too much for the whistle?" I think perhaps that was the only time in his life when Franklin made an imprudent purchase.

In connection with the projects under consideration, the Federal Government and the people of the entire country will be committed to uneconomic expenditures, which will largely be borne by other sections than those directly benefited. Granted that it is fine to generate electricity from water power and to develop irrigation projects; granted that it is fine to see the desert blossom as the rose; nevertheless, the question today is, just as it was in the time of Franklin, "Are we paying too much for the project? Are we paying too much for the whistle?" The money spent on these projects in a normal period must be withdrawn from other purposes. The taxes which the taxpayers pay decrease the amount of money which they can spend for their private purposes. The interest which the taxpayers will pay upon the bonds to be floated will diminish their incomes and decrease their purchases.

THE GOOD OF THE NATION SHOULD BE THE YARDSTICK

We can foresee the expansion of employment in the four upper Colorado Basin States, but we cannot calculate the precise decrease in purchasing power and the decrease in employment in the regions which will pay the taxes. As a Senator from an industrial State, one of the "conquered provinces" of the Nation which have very little voice in the Senate of the United States, or, if they have a voice, very little effect upon the processes of legislation, I am of the opinion that we should look at this question from the standpoint of what is good for the country as a whole. How can the labor and the purchasing power which we have be used most advantageously? Is what is proposed the best use of the money and the labor we have to furnish? If it is, we should pass the bill. If it is not, we should reject it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois has ever visited the Salt River Valley of Arizona.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I have.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did he find there automobiles made in Detroit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did he find products from all over the United States being used there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that, as I remember, the Salt River Valley was almost the first of the irrigation projects. Is that not true?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the water not come from the Roosevelt Dam?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr, DOUGLAS. The Roosevelt Dam, I think, was the first large-scale dam constructed to impound water for irrigation purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not at the moment making an attack on all irrigation projects. In fact, I think the early irrigation projects were beneficial. The cost was low, the land which was irrigated was fertile, the growing seasons were long, and I think those projects were desirable. My point is that on the upper Colorado—and I hope to develop this point—there is a short growing season, costs per acre are enormous, benefits per acre will be comparatively low, and what is projected is not a good way to spend such enormous amounts of money.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wish to say that I shall be happy to hear the Senator's discussion. I merely want to point out that a very natural thing happened with regard to irrigation projects. The best and the most available dam sites were used first. Subsequently it was difficult to find additional dam sites. I think that if the Senator will compare the growing season where the pending projects are located with the growing season in the Grand Coulee Dam area, he will find that the areas embraced in the Columbia River projects do not have a much longer growing season than do the areas where the projects contemplated by the pending bill are located. He will find in those areas projects which have worked out extremely well, and have turned out to be of value to the country generally.

As I hope to develop in a short time, if we do not continue to develop these projects to be used for the production of food for the people of the United States, people who live in States like Illinois may a little later confront more problems than they might have from the competition they are anticipating in connection with these projects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from New Mexico that if money is spent on an uneconomic project, it is taken away from other portions of the country, and their purchasing power is diminished. The Senator may be able to say that there would be more automobiles in New Mexico, Colorado, or Utah, but there would be fewer automobiles in New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

ARE ADDITIONAL ACRES NECESSARY?

There is one final point I should like to make with respect to the argument that it is now necessary to have large amounts of additional land put under cultivation. At the moment the cry is intended to withdraw land from cultivation. Wheat acreage is being cut by 20 million acres. The Secretary of Agriculture wanted to have the cultivation of other crops cut by 20 million more acres, and to have withdrawn from cultivation 40 million acres which were, to be put into grass and nitrogen fixing legumes. So at the moment the desire is not for additional units of land to be put under cultivation; it is quite the contrary. It is said we have a surplus of land under cultivation, and that some of it should be withdrawn from cultivation.

Mr. ANDERSON. If we were legislating for the moment, I grant that what the Senator has said would be correct; but if we are trying to legislate for the future, even 15 years from now, I think the Senator will not then find land will be withdrawn from cultivation. I shall demonstrate later this afternoon that before the proposed projects are completed, we will be a have-not nation agriculturally; and it is for that reason that I desire to have the proposed legislation enacted, and not for the advantage of the moment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is a much better expert on the subject of agriculture than I am, since he was once Secretary of Agriculture, and was a very distinguished official in that role. However, I may say that I think we are going to find that there will be a continued increase in output per acre, and that such continued increase in output per acre in the fertile sections of the country will largely remove the necessity for putting under cultivation the less fertile, semi-arid, and arid regions of the Nation.

I might mention one final point. Probably the greatest authority on the geography of the country is Mr. Paul Sears, who was once a professor in Oklahoma, then in Ohio, and I believe is now

at Yale. He has pointed out that if we really want to increase farm output, the thing to do is to put more water on the fertile sections of the country, on the land of Iowa, on the land of Illinois, on the land of Indiana, on the land of Ohio—and, yes, on the land of Minnesota—at much less expense than would be involved in the pending legislation, not $800 an acre, but somewhere between $30 and $60 an acre. That is, water would be taken from the Mississippi, from the Great Lakes, or from other great rivers of the country, would be put on land which is fertile, at much lower costs, and the land would produce a much larger yield, and it would pay off.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know of Paul Sears and of his book Deserts on the March, and other works of that nature. I agree there is much in what he has said. It will gladden the heart of the Senator from Illinois to know that in the delta of the Mississippi, one of the greatest agricultural areas of the country, irrigation is today starting to be practiced.

The Senator referred to land which is designated as fertile. I want the Senator to remember, and I am sure he knows this well, that there are many areas of the country where land is not regarded as particularly fertile, but where the light, sandy soil is easily adapted to the growing of crops.

It is interesting to note that the proposal which has been made to bring water from the Mississippi Valley to the high plains of Texas would involve cost far in excess of that contemplated for the pending project, yet a cost which the country would be prepared to pay, because it would be the only course by which it would be possible to feed the population of this country.

I intend to deal with the question that merely by increasing the fertility of our present cultivated lands we will not be able to feed our increasing population and maintain our present standard of living, to say nothing of improving it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not proposing that the waters of the Mississippi River should be shipped overland a thousand miles to Texas; but I do say that for an acreage cost of one-twentieth of the cost contemplated by the pending bill, we will be enabled to obtain a greater output of farm production by putting water on already fertile land, than by carrying on this project on the Colorado, and putting water on very high land where the growing season is short.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield, Mr. President. Today, I seemed to have stirred up the lions, as usual. I hope to proceed with my speech, but meanwhile I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the agricultural crops produced on lands under irrigation in projects such as the ones sought to be authorized by means of this bill are not of the types that are in surplus supply?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am quite well aware that this project will provide for the raising of feed for livestock—in other words, for the raising of hay and a little corn. This project will not result in the rich yields which are obtained in certain sections of Arizona or southern California. Instead, this project is primarily—insofar as its agricultural phases are concerned—for the purpose of providing feed for livestock; and I say that is about the most unprofitable use which could be made of irrigated land.

Mr. WATKINS. That depends upon the section involved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have studied the reports for each and every one of these irrigation projects; and in each and every case the Bureau of Reclamation, which certainly is not prejudiced against this product, since it is its baby, says that primarily the project is for the production of hay and other livestock feed.

Mr. WATKINS. In some sections.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In virtually every section.

Mr. WATKINS. In some of the high sections of Colorado and elsewhere, but not everywhere.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know the altitude of Salt Lake or of the beautiful section in the Wasatch Mountains; but on the profile map, the altitudes are between 5,000 and 7,000 feet above sea level; and, inevitably, that means a short-growing season.

Mr. WATKINS. In Salt Lake Valley we cannot use irrigated land for the growing of feed for livestock. We do not attempt to raise hay, grain, or oats on the land made available by these projects. Most of the water which will come from this dam will be for industrial use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now the Senator from Utah is shifting to industrial use. But I am talking about irrigation. I say that insofar as irrigated land is concerned, this project is about of the least possible value; and the proof is that the landowners are supposed to pay only about 15 percent of the cost of these projects.

Mr. WATKINS. The landowners are also the power users.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are not identical with the power users.

Mr. WATKINS. They are all power users.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But not in the same proportion.

Mr. WATKINS. They are all in the same community, and they are cooperating to build these projects. That is the only way by which we could build these projects. All the people—both those on the farms and those in the cities—cooperate to build these projects. All of them are willing to pay the costs for power in the same area; all of them are willing to pay enough to retire all the expenditures for construction. The only part which would not be retired with interest would be the part allocated to irrigation. The principal would be repaid, but not the interest.

If the Senator from Illinois wishes to check on these projects, I shall undertake to show exactly what happens, namely, that the benefits coming from these projects are sufficient—on the basis of comparing construction costs with the benefits—to justify them; and the benefits are sufficient to pay for all the costs, but not including interest, after they have been in operation for, let us say, 10 years.

That is the actual history of these projects. One of the worst of them, I think, is the Seedskadee, in Wyoming, where the irrigated land has been used for production of the type of crops the Senator from Illinois has been mentioning.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will examine the hearings beginning on page 59 and continuing for approximately 25 pages, he will find that in virtually every one of the projects the analysis shows that the primary production is that of crops for the feeding of livestock. My point is that of course in the past, irrigation projects have not been used for this purpose because they are uneconomical when so used; but now it is proposed to use the water for this purpose—about the most uneconomical use one could imagine.

IRRIGATION FEATURES ARE NOT SELF-SUPPORTING

Furthermore, the irrigation features of the project do not stand on all fours; there will have to be more surplus for power; and I shall point out that it is possible and, to my mind, probable, that the surplus for power will not be sufficient to meet the irrigation costs, and that therefore not only will the interest on the irrigation costs have to be met by the taxpayers—and that will mean at least $1,153,000,000—but that also the principal of the irrigation cost itself will have to be met by the taxpayers.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, we shall show to the contrary. The history of these projects shows that they have been beneficial.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course if the rest of the country pours money into a certain area, that area can be made prosperous. But the purchasing power which is withdrawn from the other sections of the country——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the benefits which come from the deveopment make it possible for the other sections of the country to be more prosperous.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if the money had stayed in the other sections of the country, it would have built up employment and purchasing power still further in those areas.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention—as we have done over the years—to the flood-control program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if my good friend, the Senator from Utah, will permit me to do so, I should like to develop my argument. I am trying to make an introduction to it. Then I shall speak of power, and then of irrigation; and then I shall take up the reserve

water supply; and then I shall say a few words about recreation. But I do not wish to be drawn immediately into a discussion of flood control.

Let me say that I have been down into the valley of the Colorado, as a great many others have been. I walked down there and I walked back and I got very sore walking there. I have camped in the deep gorge of the Grand Canyon. There are no great industrial settlements in that canyon, and there is no danger of flooding farms or industries there. The problem on the Colorado is entirely different from the problem on the Columbia or on other rivers on the banks of which there are great industries.

The Senator from Utah knows this region. It is where a great river flows through a series of deep canyons—beautiful canyons, awe-inspring canyons.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say that for many years my home was on one of the large tributaries of the Colorado. I have been up and down it, more or less, and am acquainted with it from New Mexico to the headwaters, in Wyoming. I say, Mr. President, that there are no great industries on the river itself because the river is crooked and for most part flows through deep canyons; and we have to spend money to bring the water from the river to the farms where it is needed, and also to take the water over a mountain range to Los Angeles and that area.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, we could build hot houses in northern Maine and northern Minnesota, and in them could grow bananas and strawberries, and that would seem at first blush to be a fine thing. But the question is whether it would be an economical expenditure of funds. That is all I ask.

Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Utah, that the people out west are grand people. The outdoor life has a splendid effect on their character. But they cannot expect to do with about 14,000,000 acre-feet of water a year what they could do if they had 140,000,000 acre-feet of water a year.

Mr. WATKINS. Of course that is simple arithmetic.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is too bad that these fine people live in a semiarid region, with a river running through deep canyons. We are sorry for them, but I do not think that creates for them a perpetual claim on the Public Treasury.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me ask about flood control. The Senator from Illinois lives in an area which itself could take care of its rivers if it wished to do so. Why should the rest of the Nation pay millions of dollars for flood control on those streams, in view of the fact that those expenditures are not of direct benefit to the people in the other States? It is just the opposite.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Utah is well aware of the fact that I have not been a very ardent advocate of the rivers and harbors bills and the so-called flood-control projects. I think probably more land has been reclaimed by the Army engineers than by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. That is not surprising. They spend a great deal more money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What happens in those cases is that the stream is deepened, the water is drained off from the swamplands, levees are constructed, and land which was swampland and virtually useless has bulldozers turned onto it, and, at slight cost, what was worthless land becomes extremely valuable land.

Mr. WATKINS. And the landowners do not pay any of the cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The Senator from Illinois once proposed that half the cost of the improvements should be paid by special assessments upon the land benefited.

Mr. WATKINS. Why did not the Senator go all the way?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am willing to go all the way. Will the Senator from Utah agree to support any effort in that direction, and vote for it?

Mr. WATKINS. If a different rule is set up for reclamation, I certainly will.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But two wrongs do not make a right. We are not dealing now with rivers and harbors, or with the Mississippi River or the Missouri River. We are dealing with the upper Colorado River, and I would appreciate it if the Senator from Utah would let me discuss it, instead of bringing in extraneous issues which have nothing to do with the case. "The flowers that bloom in the spring, tra-la," as Gilbert and Sullivan wrote, "have nothing to do with the case."

Mr. WATKINS. In 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 the appropriations for flood control were $2,587,112,298, none of which was returned to the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Army engineers' bill comes before the Senate, I am perfectly willing to discuss it, and I hope my good friend from Utah will "man the pumps" on that occasion. But for the moment, let us discuss the pending bill, namely, Senate bill 500, which deals with the upper Colorado project.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the Senator from Illinois "man the pumps" last year when the flood-control annual authorization was before us?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought I would give the new administration a year to see if it would not reform, and I was ill. But no, it is just as bad as ever.

Mr. WATKINS. Just as bad as previous administrations which have been inaugurating flood-control projects through the years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. There has been no improvement.

ACTUAL COSTS WILL EXCEED ESTIMATES

If I may return to the subject, what is the upper Colorado project? In the first place, it calls for an expenditure of $1,658,460,100, of which $915 million is allocated to irrigation, $656.6 million to power, and $72 million to municipal water. In all probability, the actual cost of these projects will be greatly in excess of the estimated cost. I hold in my hand a report from the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives in the 82d Congress, entitled "The Civil Functions Program of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army." It is House Committee Print No. 21. There is also in the report a section on the Bureau of Reclamation. On pages 17 and 18 it is pointed out that in the case of the Corps of Engineers, the actual cost of 182 projects exceeded the estimated cost by 124 percent from the time they were initially considered in Congress. That is to say, if the Corps of Engineers estimated the cost to be $1 million, the actual cost, on the average, would be $2,240,000.

The Bureau of Reclamation was not quite as bad as that, but the actual costs of the projects studied exceeded the estimated costs by 106 percent. That is to say, if the Bureau of Reclamation estimated the cost at $1 million, the actual cost would prove to be $2,060,000. In other words, the past record of the Bureau of Reclamation has been that it understates the final cost by at least one-half of the final cost. Interestingly enough, the report states that the present estimated cost of the Missouri River program is approximately 274 percent greater than the figure used at the time the project was approved by Congress. For example, if the estimate had been $100 million—of course, it was much more than that—it now appears that the cost will be $374 million.

Therefore, when a project comes before us with respect to which it is admitted that the costs will be $1,658,460,100, in view of the past record, I think we can be fairly certain that the actual costs will be greatly in excess of that amount.

I may say in this connection that only about 30 percent of the added cost of the projects studied by the Public Works Committee was due to changes in the price levels. Forty-three percent was due to structural changes. Having had some experience with public works on a local and State scale, I can say that that is a phrase which is used to cover a multitude of sins. A slight change in plans can be made, to justify a huge increase in cost.

Approximately 27 percent was for other reasons, such as structural engineering modifications, changed local needs, unforeseen conditions, inadequacy in planning, administrative decision, and so forth. So I think we can be certain that we are not only being let in for $1,658,460,100 of capital expenditures, but for what may run into $2, $2½, or $3 billion worth of capital construction costs.

In addition, there is the interest factor, which is quite important. On power projects capital costs are repaid, and interest costs are repaid. That, I think, is as it should be. I believe that interest is a true and proper charge. In the case of irrigation projects capital costs are repaid, but not interest. In the case of land redeemed from flooding, as the Senator from Utah said, neither the capital cost nor the interest charges are repaid. I think we need a real reform in connection with such expenditures. In the past the Senator from Illinois has advocated such a reform. I was almost alone in such advocacy, I may say. I hope that when the Senator from Illinois brings forward such a proposal again, he will have the support of the senior Senator from Utah.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Last year I thought probably the Senator would bring forward such a proposal, after he told me he was introducing a bill requiring payment of half the costs, but, as I gather from the RECORD, I do not think the Senator from Illinois raised the question, and, as I remember the RECORD, he did not even vote on the legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois was not in good health during the concluding days of the session last year, and was in bed a great deal of the time, so he missed a number of the late rollcalls, although his attendance record in general has been very good, namely over 90 percent. I am sure the Senator from Utah does not wish to criticize the Senator from Illinois because at that period he was physically worn out. I believe the Senator from Utah has suffered physical incapacity upon occasion. He knows how difficult it is to be present always.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sorry the Senator from Illinois was incapacitated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the attendance record of the Senator from Illinois was about 93 percent, as shown by the rollcalls.

Mr. WATKINS. I was not aware of the disability of the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not blazon my illness publicly, nor make any appeal for sympathy because of it; but since the Senator from Utah implied that I ran away from a fight, I think perhaps he is entitled to know the truth.

Mr. WATKINS. I am only taking the RECORD as it stands. It indicated that the Senator did not vote.

ANNUAL FLOW OF COLORADO RELATIVELY SMALL

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe certain fundamental facts about the Colorado River project need to be noted. The first is that in spite of all the talk of the flow of water in the Colorado River, in relative terms, it is limited. I know that the lower valley is pledged 7½ million acre-feet, that the upper valley is pledged 7½ million acre-feet, and that by a subsequent treaty entered into with Mexico, that country is given a million and a half acre-feet. Therefore we have pledged 16½ million acre-feet of the Colorado. I know, however, that over a 40-year period the average flow in the Colorado at Lee Ferry is a little more than 15 million acre-feet. Am I in error?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the Senator is in error. I believe the water allotted to Mexico must come from the water of the various States in case there is not a surplus of water in the river.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then over a period of 40 years there has been enough water to fulfill the claims of 15 million acre-feet. Of course, for the past 10 years, largely because of low rainfall, the average flow for a 10-year period has been 13.6 million acre-feet. Therefore, at the present time there is a deficiency in the flow of the Colorado River water below that which has been pledged.

However, that is not the precise point I wish to make. The flow of the Colorado is relatively small in comparison with other great rivers of the United States. Let us take, for example, the flow of the Columbia River. The flow of the Columbia River at The Dalles is 141 million acre-feet a year. That is more than 10 times the average flow of the Colorado River. The flow of the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, upon which some of us want to erect that great dam at Hells Canyon, is 32.2 million acre-feet a year, or more than twice the flow of the Colorado.

The basin figure for the flow of the Tennessee is 48 million acre-feet a year, or more than 3½ times the flow of the Colorado. The Niagara—and we do not hear many people talk about the Niagara—has a flow of 140 million acre-feet a year.

If we want to develop power, Mr. President, the place to develop it is on the Columbia, the Snake, or the Niagara, not on the Colorado.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to ask the Senator, if a citizen of Utah wanted to develop waterpower, would he be able to develop it on the Columbia, the Tennessee, or the Niagara?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Utah was not in the Chamber when I said that I understood and appreciated and did not attack the motives of the Senators from the four States concerned. Those Senators are not only Senators of the United States, but they are also, in a sense, ambassadors from their respective States. I can quite understand that they should wish to defend the interests of their States. I do not attack them for their advocacy of this bill. It is understandable. For them to do otherwise would be political suicide. It is not unethical for those Senators to do what they are doing. Quite to the contrary, I should say.

However, I feel it is time that we consider this issue from the standpoint of the national interest; namely, whether it is best for the welfare of the country as a whole, and whether this is the best place to put the people's money.

So far as power is concerned—and I shall come to irrigation later—the place to develop power now is on the Columbia, Snake, and Niagara Rivers, not on the Colorado River.

I have already pointed out that, so far as putting water on the land is concerned, if Professor Sears is correct—and I believe he is—more crops can be raised by putting water on already fertile land, such as in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, upper New York, western Massachusetts, and the lower Mississippi Valley, than on semiarid, high altitude land.

Professor Sears wrote an article on the subject, which was published in the Annals of the American Academy. In it he gives the acreage costs. According to Professor Sears, the acreage costs in those areas are one-tenth or one-twentieth of what they are in the area under discussion, and his figures do not take into account interest.

Mr. President, let us take up the various purposes for which this money is to be spent. I take it there are three purposes, namely, power, irrigation, and water supply.

I do not believe anyone takes very seriously the "red herring" which the senior Senator from Utah has injected, that of flood control. There is not much of a flood control problem on the Colorado River.

EXCESSIVE COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION PER KILOWATT OF CAPACITY

Let us start with power. Power developed on the Colorado is extremely high-cost power. It is upon this high-cost power that the advocates of the project depend for meeting 85 percent of the irrigation costs of the upper Colorado River Basin. I believe that is a correct statement, Mr. President.

Glen Canyon is to have a construction cost of $421 million, and $370 million allocated to power. It is to generate 800,000 kilowatts of power. There will be $463 of construction cost per kilowatt capacity.

Echo Park is to have spent on it $128 million allocated to power. It is to generate a capacity of 200,000 kilowatts. That will be generated at a cost of $640 per kilowatt.

The figures for the Central Utah project show a construction cost of $765 per kilowatt. At Cross Mountain, the construction cost per kilowatt will be $605. At Curecanti, the cost will be in excess of $1,030. At Flaming Gorge, the cost will be $722 per kilowatt capacity. The average cost will be $500 per kilowatt capacity.

What have been some of the construction costs at other major dams? The cost at Bonneville was $115 per kilowatt. At Fort Peck, it was $156 per kilowatt capacity. At Dennis Dam, on the Red River, it was $279. At Norfolk, Ark., $184. At Marrows, Ark., $290. At Bull Shoals, Ark., $314. Fort Gilson, Okla., $519. Tenkiller, Okla., $416. Whitney, Tex., $407. Hoover Dam, $112. Grand Coulee, $90. Shasta, Calif., $130. Parker Dam, on the lower Colorado, $134. Davis Dam, near Parker Dam, $278. The construction cost of the 17 multiple-purpose dams on the TVA was $166 per kilowatt capacity.

Therefore, the cost of construction per kilowatt capacity is about 3 times as high as it is in the Tennessee Valley, over 4 times as high as it is at Bonneville, almost 5 times more than at Hoover, and almost 6 times what is is at Grand Coulee.

In other words, Mr. President, we are being asked to spend $656 million on power in about the worst place in the United States where hydroelectric power could be developed.

EXCESSIVE GENERATING COSTS PER KILOWATT-HOUR

What will this mean in terms of costs per kilowatt-hour?

I shall discuss only generating costs. Gen. U. S. Grant, the grandson of the great General and President of the United States, testified before the committee that the generating costs at Glen Canyon, which is the lowest of the dams just before Lee's Ferry, will be from 4.2 to 4.7 mills a kilowatt-hour.

At Echo Park, the costs will be from 5.9 to 6 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Upstream from Echo Park, the costs will be greater, and it is provided, as everyone who has studied the report knows, that the power is to be sold at 6 mills a kilowatt hour.

Let us see what these costs are in comparison with Columbia River costs and TVA costs.

The generating cost at Bonneville, in the year 1954, was a little over six-tenths of a mill. If we include all indirect charges, it would not exceed 1 mill.

The cost at Grand Coulee was less than half a mill a kilowatt hour, and if we included all indirect charges, such as interest and depreciation, the total cost per kilowatt-hour was less than a mill.

At Hells Canyon the best estimates range somewhere between 2.5 and 2.6 mills.

I may say that the great advantage of a high dam at Hells Canyon is not so much lower costs of generation at the spot but the fact that a great deal of water will be stored which can then be released to the dams downstreams, reducing the costs at those points still further.

In other words, the costs of the Columbia River are from one-sixth to one-fifth as much as the costs on the Upper Colorado River, where they are from 5 to 6 times the costs on the main stem of the Columbia, and over twice as much as at Hells Canyon.

What about TVA, Mr. President? I hold in my hand the Annual Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the year 1954. There we find the production costs for the multiple-use dams and the single-use dams on page A25. These include not only operating costs, but interest and depreciation charges. What do we find?

The cost at Kentucky Dam was 0.487 of a mill, or less than half a mill.

Pickwick Dam, 0.900 of a mill.

Wilson Dam, 0.669, or approximately two-thirds of a mill.

Wheeler Dam, 0.795, or about four-fifths of a mill.

Guntersville, 0.723, or about seven-tenths of a mill.

Hales Bar, 1.227, or about one and one-fifth mills.

Chickamauga, 0.739, or approximately three-fourths of a mill.

Watts Bar. 0.726, or a little over seven-tenths of a mill.

Fort Loudoun, 1.009 mills.

Norris, the first dam of the Tennessee system, 0.894 of a mill.

Hiwassee, 0.617 of a mill.

Cherokee, 2.073 mills.

Fontana, 0.588 of a mill.

South Holston, 1.552.

Watauga, 3.048 mills.

Douglas, 1.505 mills.

Boone, 2.371 mills.

There is a grand average for the total of multiple-use dams of 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour contrasted with the 4.2 to 4.7 mills at Glen Canyon or the 6 mills at Echo Park, or the more than 6 mills on the power dams high up on the Colorado or on tributary streams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator give me some indication of how long he will speak.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had intended to speak for approximately an hour, but I had so many interesting interruptions from the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Utah that I am just getting warmed up in my argument.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator be agreeable to the Senate's taking a recess at approximately 6 o'clock——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; with the understanding that I may have the floor tomorrow after the morning hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is what I intended to propose to the Senator if I could have concluded my sentence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought that was what the Senator intended, but I wanted to stake out my ground so I would not forget it later and so the Senator from Texas would not forget it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may yield the floor at this time with the understanding that tomorrow, following the morning hour, he will be recognized and will have the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend substantially to object—I should like to finish the argument on power costs so that the record on that point may be complete.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be happy to have the Senator do so. I then wish to be recognized, Mr. President, and shall then yield to Members who wish to introduce bills or make brief statements.

Has the unanimous-consent request been agreed to?

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I have indicated, the costs per kilowatt-hour in the case of the projects contemplated by the pending bill, are four times the average costs of the multiple dams on the Tennessee River, and the cost at Echo Park is six times the average cost on the Tennessee River. The cost of the farther-upstream dams is over six times the cost on the Tennessee River.

Mr. President, what about the single-use dams on the Tennessee River, where nothing is charged off for navigation or flood control?

The average cost of these 10 single-use dams is 1.575 mills per kilowatt-hour, or about one-third the cost at Glen Canyon, only a little over one-fourth of the cost at Echo Park, and probably less than one-fourth with reference to the other dams upstream.

Mr. President, if we wish to generate the power in this region, is the Colorado River the best means of generating it? There are large deposits of coal, shale, and oil in Colorado and Wyoming. These are all potential sources of fuel. I wish to point out that on the upper Colorado River power can be generated more cheaply from coal, in all probability, than it can by the use of waterpower.

We have more material on this subject from the reports of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They have a number of steam plants, 9 steam plants plus 3 small plants. Their average cost of generation is 2.988 mills per kilowatt-hour, or just under 3 mills per kilowatt-hour. The waterpower cost is about one-third of this, and about one-half of the amount in connection with the single-use dams.

So hydroelectric power is economical in the valley of the Tennessee. Similarly, it is economical in the valley of the Columbia, because there are no alternative sources of power or heat in the Columbia, unless atomic energy should later be used.

But the point I wish to make is that the upper Colorado region has coal. We know that the region back of Pueblo, in Colorado, has coal. We know of the coal mines and coal resources of Wyoming.

If it costs 3 mills to generate power by steam, which comes ultimately from coal, in the valley of the Tennessee, will it cost much more than that to generate power from coal in the upper Colorado? Possibly it will cost a little more. There may be differences in the quality of coal and in the costs of transportation. But by locating the powerplants close to the mine mouths transportation costs could be reduced, and lower cost power could be obtained from coal in the upper Colorado area—I venture to predict—than could be obtained by using the waters of the Colorado River.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTING PUBLIC POWER AT WORST SITES

It is extraordinary that this administration, which has frowned upon additional dams on the Columbia, which has turned down a high dam at Hells Canyon, and which certainly has frowned upon power projects in the Niagara, should choose the upper Colorado as the place where it intends to launch a public power program. It has chosen the worst possible place for its public power program, while it is giving away the best locations such as on the Snake to private industry. If it were the intention of the administration to discredit public power, and I wish to make this statement carefully, it could not have proceeded in a more effective fashion than by giving to the private companies the rich pickings, while pushing the public projects away up in the mountains where there are inadequate water flows, inadequate power facilities, and high costs; where the experiment will be discredited and will be regarded thereafter as an indication of a failure of public power.

Mr. President, though I come from Illinois, where the rivers flow gently and there are not great possibilities for hydroelectric development, I have voted for public power projects on the Tennessee and on the Columbia. I was very proud to place my name on the Hells Canyon bill, because I think that will be a justifiable project, which will pay out, even though the direct benefit to my section of the country will not be great.

I say this to indicate that I try to take a national point of view on these issues. However, I object to the expenditure of

hundreds of millions of dollars on projects which, in all probability, cannot pay out; which involve a waste of public funds; and which will discredit the system of public power.

So I urge that we look to see whether we "are paying too much for the whistle."

There are many persons who favor irrigation and will support any irrigation project, lest it be thought that they are enemies of irrigation. There are many persons who favor public power and therefore feel compelled to vote for every public power project, no matter whether or not it is justifiable.

If I may use the analogy, I think we should look each of these projects in the mouth, to see whether they are justifiable. If they are justifiable, we should proceed with them. If they are not justifiable, we should not go ahead with them.

The projects on the Columbia and the Tennessee are sound and of great public benefit. The Hells Canyon project would be sound and of great public benefit. Additional dams for the generation of power on the Columbia and the Niagara would be of great benefit. But, for heaven's sake, let us not start the project on the upper Colorado. To do so would be a waste of money, because it would produce high-cost power which, in all probability, would be driven out by steam plants, and might result in not even the paying back of the capital cost, let alone the interest.

Yet it is upon the believed surplus earnings of the Glen Canyon project that all the rest of the program is based, because 85 percent of the capital cost of the irrigation projects is to be met by charges for power. The rate is to be 6 mills. That is a high rate. The only dam which can possibly produce power at less than 6 mills is Glen Canyon. It is possible that a dam at Glen Canyon might be justifiable. But certainly the project as a whole would be a wasteful, high cost project, which should not be carried out.

Mr. President, I shall now yield the floor. When I resume tomorrow, in addition to summarizing the ground I have covered, I shall discuss the question of irrigation costs, water reserves, and recreation.

FOREIGN TRADE—PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION VERSUS 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, all that the American workingmen and investors of this Nation have ever asked for is an even break in their own American markets.

FLEXIBLE DUTY TO EQUALIZE EFFECTIVE WAGES

They have demanded a flexible duty or tariff to equalize the effective wages and taxes here and in the chief competing country on each product.

DUTY REDUCED AS FOREIGN LIVING STANDARD RAISED

Such a duty would be reduced as the foreign wage standard of living increased, and when the cost of production approached our own then free trade would be the almost automatic and immediate result.

FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The principle of air and reasonable competition was the answer of Congress to the low-wage foreign competition for almost a century of time. It established the highest standard of living of any nation in the world.

EQUAL ACCESS TO AMERICAN MARKETS

The principle established equal access to the American market for the American workingmen and investors.

DUTY TAKES PROFIT OUT OF SWEATSHOP LABOR

Such a flexible duty, adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, simply takes the profit out of foreign sweatshop labor. It does not prevent imports, but brings them in on our wage standard of living basis.

AMENDMENTS TO SAVE INDIVIDUAL INDUSTRIES

The desperate effort of investors' and workingmen's groups to save their own particular industry or product from annihilation by amending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is proof enough of the damage the act has done and that it offers for the future.

I introduce a bill proposing to amend the 1930 Tariff Act. The amendment provides the flexibility needed, after 22 years, to establish foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, and to provide equal access to his own American markets for the American workingmen and investors.

MANIPULATION FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

It is well known that the low-wage foreign nations manipulate the price of their currency in terms of the dollar and subsidize their own exports through grants, multiple rates of exchange and by other methods to defeat any regulation of imports into this country, and to prevent American imports into their own nation.

FOREIGN PRODUCTION COST

The amendment provides that the Tariff Commission may take cognizance of such manipulation in the adjustment of duties or tariffs, and may take into consideration the "landed duty paid price," and the "offered for sale price" in the determination of the cost of production of an imported article.

QUANTITATIVE LIMITS

The amendment also provides that the Commission may impose quantitative limits—quotas—on the importation of any article in its determination of the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

THE AMENDMENT TO 1930 TARIFF ACT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, my bill—amending the 1930 Tariff Act—regulating foreign trade on the principle of fair and reasonable competion, giving to the American workingmen and investors equal access to their own American markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1723) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States economy;

(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports.

(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

(d) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(e) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 12, 1955, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding after section 331 the following new section:

"SEC. 331A. Administration of trade agreements.

"(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of this act are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Commission, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed—

"(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of this act;

"(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with this act."

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 336. Periodic adjustment of import duties.

"(a) The Commission is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domes-

tic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Commission finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Commission shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"(2) any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"(3) The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"(5) The actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"(6) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"(7) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Commission either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Commission until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"(d) The Commission, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purpose of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of this act or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of this act.

"(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Commission is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Commission shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Commission and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"(g) No order shall be announced by the Commission under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Commission finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"(h) The Commission, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of this act.

"(i) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'domestic article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term 'foreign article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"(2) the term 'United States' includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"(3) the term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"(4) the term 'landed duty paid price' means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"(j) The Commission is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

SEC. 5. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word "President" and substituting therefor the words "Tariff Commission."

(b) Sudivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Commission, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this Act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry."

(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Commission may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Commission shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exists."

STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

SEC. 6. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Tariff Commission is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce, as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final."

REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

SEC. 7. The Tariff Commission, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed as superseding the provisions of section 101, title I of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect as of June 12, 1955.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, my bill amending the 1930 Tariff Act would return the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, through the adjustment of the duties or tariffs in accordance with article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

The Constitution pointedly separates the regulation of the domestic economy from the determination of foreign policy.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution places the regulation of the domestic economy and of foreign commerce in the legislative branch, and article II, section 2, places the determination of the foreign policy in the executive branch.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act transferred the constitutional responsibility of Congress to adjust the duties or tariffs and to regulate foreign commerce to the executive branch, thus amending the Constitution through a simple act of Congress.

TO DEVELOP THE WHOLE COUNTRY

Abraham Lincoln's platform in 1860 proposed to adjust imports or tariffs—"So as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country."

That principle held, in general, until the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. This act provided, and still provides, that the

President may trade any sector of American industry for a concession in foreign policy.

ABANDONED PRINCIPLE FOR INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

The 1934 act for the first time abandoned the principle of regulating foreign trade through the adjustment of duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition for all products produced in appreciable amounts here—and made the domestic jobs and investments pawns in the hazardous game of international politics.

Mr. President, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is a "dead-fall" over the head of American jobs and investments.

The President may at any time trade any sector of the economy—dependent upon a duty or tariff to equalize the standard-of-living wages—for a foreign political adjustment that he may judge to be important. Investors and workers are even required to show their importance in national defense as well as serious injury to be eligible for the "escape clause" which even then may or may not be invoked.

Mr. President, let us return to constitutional government—treating all industries alike—on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18, 1955:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, TO BE EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACCEPTANCE

To be senior surgeon

Shih Lu Chang

To be surgeon

Wilton M. Fisher

To be senior assistant surgeon

Tamarath K. Yolles

To be assistant surgeon

Calvin L. Young

To be scientist director

Louis C. McCabe

To be senior assistant scientist

Thomas E. Anderson

To be assistant scientists

Virgil R. Carlson
Donald S. Blough
Donald S. Boomer
Philip Roos

II. PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior assistant sanitarian

James V. Smith

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for Thy kind and beneficent providence which is our shield in the stillness of the night and our strength for the duties and responsibilities of each new day.

Grant that nothing may ever disturb or destroy our faith in Thy greatness and righteousness as we seek to bring to fulfillment our aspirations and longings for world peace.

Inspire us with moral and spiritual stamina and courage in our dedication to the arduous task of conquering the forces of evil which would impede us in the struggle to release the hidden splendor of humanity.

May our own personal life be more firmly rooted in those lofty ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained and which alone will enable us to remain strong and steadfast in these days of crisis and confusion.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 14, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 35. An act to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, ROONEY, PRESTON, TABER, and CLEVENGER.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, May 2, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday, April 19, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

TVA BONDS TO FINANCE POWER FACILITIES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great interest that we have learned that the Tennessee Valley Authority, with the concurrence of the full Board, has now prepared a plan under which the need of the TVA for power facilities in its area could be met by the issuance of bonds to be paid off through receipts from the sale of power.

This plan was developed at the suggestion of the President and I assume will have the wholehearted support of the present administration.

It seems to me that this is a natural and logical development of the Authority idea. It will require no increase in the national debt. It will allow the people of the TVA area to pay for needed power facilities on an orderly basis. It will make the TVA far more flexible than it is today.

This plan, I believe, marks the coming of age of the TVA. While there may be many and perhaps valid reasons for restricting TVA from moving into new areas, it is an established and vital organism of the area it now serves. It should always be able to produce sufficient power to maintain the steady and normal economic growth of the area. This new self-financing plan will make this possible.

I hope and trust that the plan will have the unqualified approval and support of the Eisenhower administration and that its leading policymakers will not throw stumbling blocks in the way.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], acting chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret reading in yesterday's newspapers that President Eisenhower has ordered Secretary of State Dulles to create a new foreign giveaway agency.

Despite the fact that Congress ordered the liquidation of these so-called aid programs in 1952, the President is now calling for the establishment of a new agency to be known as the International Cooperation Administration and an appropriation of nearly $4 billion. And the President is quoted as saying he recognizes this foreign handout business as an "integral part of the fabric of our international relations."

I would remind Mr. Eisenhower that this profligate foreign spending is also an integral part of the fabric of our stupendous Federal debt and annual deficits.

And so, Mr. Speaker, a brandnew three-letter contraction—ICA—for another perfumed title—International Cooperation Administration—is to be added to our vocabularies; the moving vans will back up to the doors of the expiring and unlamented FOA, and the game of tossing out the taxpayers' money to foreign governments will open at a new stand.

PAY RAISE FOR CLASSIFIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Evening Star I was more than disturbed to read in the Federal Spotlight by Joseph Young this statement:

> The outcome of the postal pay fight will determine whether Federal classified employees will get a pay raise this year.

Now, I have a great sympathy for the employees of our Post Office Department, but why, why in the name of ordinary common decency, should the classified Federal employees suffer because of postal reclassification and other issues which have delayed this legislation?

Joseph Young's article—and he is certainly informed on the situation—says if the postal pay bill is vetoed and Congress does not override the veto, the pay raise chances for classified employees would be very dim.

Is that fair? Of course it is not. Last year the classified employee failed to get a needed adjustment and lost out completely on account of the postal wrangle. Surely we cannot let that happen again.

THE RIGHT-WING REPUBLICANS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], admonished the Republicans that they should not talk about a party of traitors, or the party of treason, or something of that kind.

Any statement, if such a statement was made, that the Democratic Party was the party of treason was, of course, an absurdity.

The Speaker quite properly, when this session of the House convened on January 5, gave us all to understand that we should be tolerant, rather than critical, when expressing an opinion of the opposition. Expressing that thought, he said:

> * * * I want to say as I said on the stump last fall, that we as Democrats do not indulge in personalities; we are not an accusing kind of people; we do not have to be that way.
>
> * * * It matters not what the heat may be, here or out there, we are not going to indict people en masse. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 10.)

Yet yesterday in the Washington Post and Times Herald I read this statement:

> The 73-year-old Speaker, first Democrat ever to be so honored—

Of course, that honor was richly deserved, and we all join in honoring him—

> lashed out bitterly at the Republican right wing. He termed it a disloyal opposition.

If I know what that term means, I am a right-wing Republican, and I would like to know what the Speaker meant when he implied I was disloyal because I am classified as a right-wing Republican. Disloyal to whom? To the administration? To my country?

I wish the Speaker would read what he said some time ago about being careful about our language, about not indicting people "en masse."

I know of many former and present Members of this House, Democrats from the South, some from the Speaker's own State, as well as many Republicans who have political views with which I am in full accord. Many of them might be accurately described as right-wing Republicans. They certainly are far to the right of many of the views announced and followed by left-wing Democrats and left-wing Republicans.

Since when has it become permissible to characterize a political opponent, for example one who does not accept the views of the gentleman from Texas, whatever they may be, as above criticism or opposition, as being disloyal?

If we concede, as we do, that the Speaker is a man of exceptional ability, unquestioned integrity and patriotism, it does not necessarily follow that all or many who have a thought which is not in accord with his thinking are disloyal to either the party or to the country.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to what my good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] had to say about the proposed new International Cooperation Administration and the consideration of an appropriation of some $4 billion, I presume, for the fiscal year 1956. I was also interested in listening to my good friend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] discuss the postal pay increase. I understand that there is approximately $140 million differential in the final determination of this postal pay increase legislation. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee and this House have spent hours and days and weeks discussing and debating this postal pay increase and the approximate differential of $140 million. This pay increase has been long overdue. It has been screened carefully; in fact, meticulously. It has been reviewed from every angle, given hours of discussion and consideration and will again be debated sometime during this week.

Now the point I am trying to make is this—when this proposed International Cooperation Administration legislation comes up for your consideration for $4 billion—and let me preface my remarks by stating that a million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars and a billion dollars is a thousand million dollars—that this international cooperation legislation is a 4,000 million dollar project that you will be just as technical and will screen this proposal just as meticulously and carefully as you have the postal pay increase for our workers. Let us give a little attention to some of the people in our own back yards and along with postal pay increase legislation that legislation for increases Federal workers be given immediate consideration.

We talk continuously about a balanced budget, effecting economies and reduction in taxes, and we are faced with a deficit in fiscal year 1955 estimated at $4½ billion. We have a debt of approximately 280 or more billion dollars. If we paid off this debt at the rate of $3 billion a year, it would take almost 75 to 100 years to pay it off. So, in my opinion, it is about time that we cut down on our foreign spending, or screen it as carefully as we screen every appropriation that affects the welfare and well-being of our people to see if we cannot effect some economies by reducing this foreign spending. These countries have benefited now for the past number of years and their economic and industrial rehabilitation is about complete. We

should, therefore, reduce these appropriations, balance the budget, and give some relief to the long-suffering American taxpayers who have generously and willingly carried these burdens for a number of years. At least I hope this proposed International Cooperation Administration appropiation will be given the same meticulous study and careful screening as we have given to the postal pay increase legislation.

TROUBLE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press dispatch from Budapest this morning significantly points up the trouble the Communists are having behind the Iron Curtain. It tells of the ousting of Premier Imre Nagy from his job and from Communist Party posts.

This latest Red purge follows on the heels of the Malenkov ouster in the Soviet itself and other international difficulties the Reds are having in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Communist China, and other areas. Whenever the Communists have to shake up their leadership, it means that the day can come when the Red empire will come apart at the seams.

The American people who have been told of the invincibility of the Communists should particularly note the fact that the Reds are having trouble in their own backyard. These difficulties prove that the Communists are nowhere near as strong as they would like us to believe and that the chances of a Soviet-launched third world war at the present time is remote.

It is also important that we recognize the need to keep alive the hopes of the millions of people behind the curtain who would like to be free and whose resistance to the Reds is helping to cause the present difficulties outlined in the Associated Press dispatch which I include in these remarks.

[From the Washington Post of April 18, 1955]

PREMIER NAGY OUSTED IN HUNGARIAN SHAKEUP

BUDAPEST (Monday), April 18.—Hungary's Communist Party announced today it has fired Premier Imre Nagy from his top government job and stripped him of all his party posts.

The purging of the 58-year-old government chief had been expected since the party's central committee 5 weeks ago accused him of right wing deviationism. He had been the spokesman in Hungary for the New Look emphasis on consumer goods production, which the Communist countries abandoned with the demotion of Georgi Malenkov from the Soviet premiership.

An official announcement said that in addition to Nagy, Mihaly Farkas had been fired from the party's five-man secretariat and expelled from the political committee (Politburo).

The action against Nagy and Farkas was taken at a session of the central committee April 14, today's announcement said. It added:

"Imre Nagy represented ideas which were controversial to the interest of this people's democracy. His activities caused grave damage to the party, to the people's democracy and to our social building.

"For that the central leadership expelled him from the party's political committee, its central leadership and recalled him from every function which he had, and from the confidence of the party."

"Farkas," the announcement said, "supported Imre Nagy's ideas for a long time and his expulsion from the central leadership, and the political committee also was decided."

Farkas' disgrace was not as complete as Nagy's however. The announcement said that although he was being removed from the party secretariat, he would be commissioned with other party work.

Hungary's Parliament was expected to elect a new Premier at a session convening later today.

BAREFACED POLITICAL FRAUD

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, returned to Washington over the weekend for the dinner honoring the Speaker of this House and correctly branded the policy of the present administration in regard to the 7th Fleet and Formosa as a "barefaced political fraud."

Members of the House may recall that after the first state of the Union message of President Eisenhower, in February 1953, I took the floor to say much the same thing.

When war broke out in Korea in June 1950, President Truman ordered the 7th Fleet to impose a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. He ordered the 7th Fleet to act as a fire warden, to prevent the conflict in Korea from spreading elsewhere.

This was not, as President Eisenhower later shabbily suggested, to "defend" mainland China and its Communist overlords from Chiang Kai-shek. The Chiang forces on Formosa did not have the strength to threaten the mainland seriously.

As Mr. Truman said on Saturday night, at the dinner honoring the Speaker, the warships of the American 7th Fleet were there "to protect Chiang."

The leader of the present administration did not do well when he pretended, in his 1953 state of the Union message, that Mr. Truman's orders to the fleet must be changed. He did not do well when he intimated, unmistakably, that there had been something evil about these orders which protected Formosa with American ships and men.

President Eisenhower used his first definitive message to the Congress for narrow political purposes. He did what a President should never do—he acted in a partisan manner in the field of foreign policy. He distorted the facts and the motives of Mr. Truman's orders to the 7th Fleet.

The administration, having played with peril, now is talking about negotiating a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. It issues background assurances to the people that we have not given Chiang Kai-shek a blank check to involve us in war.

We have a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits, however, from 1950 to February 1953—a practical, enforceable cease-fire controlled by our Navy. If Harry S. Truman's policy had been continued, we would not now be forced to negotiate something we should never have given up.

I made the statement in 1953 that the Eisenhower administration had blundered in trying to deceive the people, about Mr. Truman's orders to the 7th Fleet. Mr. Truman himself hit the nail on the head when he described this partisan deceit as a serious mistake which the administration is trying to correct by putting the fleet back.

I hope that the Eisenhower administration has learned a lesson from its blunder regarding Formosa and the 7th Fleet. The lesson is simple: It is a capital error for a new administration, dizzy with political success after 20 years in the wilderness, to go around changing orders merely to change orders. The trouble is that the whole country may have to pay the piper for a barefaced political fraud.

PROTECTION OF RECREATIONAL AREAS FROM MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, April 14, a Nike broke loose from the launching rack at Fort Meade and exploded directly over the new Baltimore-Washington Parkway, about 3 miles from the point of escape. The military authorities issued a statement:

All normal devices to prevent a launching were in effect.

An investigation followed, the report of which stated in part that the escape of the Nike was due to malfunctioning of a device for holding it securely in its moorings.

Fortunately, the accident did not have the serious consequences which might have attended it. On the other hand, it may have been providential: a warning to all of us and a call to duty. It is the province of the Congress not only to provide for national defense but to be assured that installations of new, and in many respects experimental, devices are safeguarded. A congressional investigation may be the answer.

Perhaps I should explain, in pointing out these facts to my colleagues, that I have a very personal interest in Nike installations. For some time the Army has been proceeding with such an installation at Promontory Point, a recreational area in beautiful Jackson Park in the Second District, Illinois, the district I have the honor to represent. This is a beauty

spot in a busy, crowded, industrial area, and the people of Chicago have invested many millions of our taxpayers' dollars in building and maintaining it. My constituents have been concerned over the possibility that the Army, concerned only with military expediency, should destroy that which the people, through the years, have invested in an effort to beautify their city and provide recreational facilities for themselves and their children. In their concern, the people have enlisted my services, as their representative, the only elective officer whose services they have a right to command. As their spokesman, I have presented the case to the Army whose reply has been:

> The established location, on which construction has been started * * * is considered to occasion the least adverse effect on the Jackson Park area.

Must the residents of Jackson Park accept as a "least adverse effect" the possibility that one of these still experimental devices may break loose and effect the destruction destined only for an enemy? May I recommend to the Army that it reexamine the location of these installations in light of the warning from Fort Meade? I have but recently directed attention to the plan for the construction of mid-Atlantic and mid-Pacific bases for defense against atomic attack. My thought, at the time, had been to request consideration by the Department of Defense for such bases as a means for conserving the beauty and recreational facilities of Jackson Park. The accident at Fort Meade has served to alert me not only to the need for placing such bases in Lake Michigan as a means of preserving these facilities but also as a precaution against an accident similar to that of last Thursday resulting in wholesale murder in Jackson Park and South Lake Shore Drive.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding organization of the Daughters of the American Revolution is meeting in Washington this week.

These very fine and outstanding ladies are the direct descendants of our forebears, those people who established this great democracy of ours. I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to this outstanding organization of fine women of America and to commend them for the outstanding work they have done in keeping alive the principles of democracy upon which this country of ours was established.

PRISONERS HELD BY CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have properly heard a great deal about the 15 American airmen of which 11 have been unjustly charged and imprisoned, all of whom are held by the Chinese Communists in violation of international law and of procedures of decency. But there are other Americans held in custody, some civilians. There are also an unaccountable number of Americans who served in Korea, and undoubtedly some of them are still living and being held as prisoners.

Our country is interested in all citizens who are held prisoners by the Chinese Communist regime, whether they are civilians, or one who wore the uniform.

The action of those now in control of China mainland in their violation of both international law and the rules of decency cannot be expressed in words.

Even the cloth of the clergy and the garments of the nun are not respected by the Chinese Communists.

While there may be spiritual leaders of other religions held as prisoners, and my remarks apply to them as well as those I mentioned, I do know there are at least three Catholic priests that are still prisoners at the present time.

There is now going on at Bandung, Indonesia, an important meeting of 29 Asian and African nations. I sincerely hope that far-seeing statesmanship will be represented there by the great majority of the participating nations. I also sincerely hope that the conference will be a great success and that the great majority of participating nations, through their representatives, will take action that will bring about a better economic outlook for their people, and make a decided contribution toward world peace.

I think I can convey to the nations represented at this conference that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of America is just as strong against colonialism as it is among their own people.

I hope that in conection with American prisoners, as well as the nationals of other countries held prisoners by the Chinese Communists, that the other nations participating in the conference will take steps either by open action or by negotiation, to bring about the immediate or early release of all prisoners.

It would seem to me that the representatives of Communist China would be in a position where they could not very well refuse such a request. The conference has a real opportunity for service in this matter.

THE CONSENT CALENDER

The SPEAKER. Today is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3560) to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to advise us whether or not this bill involves an appropriation of over a million dollars.

Mr. CELLER. It does not involve any appropriation whatsoever. All it does is to forgive certain claims that would be established against certain general and warrant officers.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all payments of station per diem allowances heretofore made to commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force permanently stationed at Fort Richardson, Alaska, or Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, after January 31, 1949, and before October 13, 1950, for service at Fort Richardson, Alaska, or Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, are validated to the extent that those station per diem allowances were paid, because the military department concerned determined that no Government mess was available to those commissioned officers and warrant officers under regulations promulgated pursuant to section 12 of the act of June 16, 1942 (ch. 413, 56 Stat. 364), as amended by section 203 of the act of August 2, 1946 (ch. 756, 60 Stat. 859). Any commissioned officer or warrant officer who has made a repayment to the United States of the amount so paid to him as station per diem allowances is entitled to be paid the amount involved, if otherwise proper.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, of the Army, Navy, and Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in section 1 of this act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of those officers or agents for payments which are found to be free from fraud and collusion.

SEC. 3. Appropriations available to the military department concerned for the pay and allowances of military personnel are available for payments under this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of January 2, 1942 (ch. 645, 55 Stat. 880), as amended, is further amended by—

(1) amending the first section by deleting the words "arising in such foreign country" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "arising outside of the United States, its Territories and possessions";

(2) amending the first section by substituting the figure "$15,000" for the figure "$5,000" wherever it appears therein;

(3) amending section 7 by deleting the words "In time of war" and by capitalizing the next following word "any"; and

(4) adding immediately after section 7 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of Defense may designate any claims commission or commissions, appointed under section 1, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payment with respect to claims, as described in section 1 hereof, for damages caused by a civilian employee of the Department of Defense other than a civilian employee of the Department of the Army, Navy, or Air Force. Claims under this section shall be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, and paid in the same manner provided in this act for the settlement of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps claims. All payments in settlement of claims under this section shall be made out of appropriations available to the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the payment of claims."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by clauses (1) and (4) of section 1 of this act shall be effective with respect to claims accruing after the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER AMENDING MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (a) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "not in excess of $2,500."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of this amendatory act is effective as of July 2, 1952, and, notwithstanding section 1 (e) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended, any claim heretofore settled in the amount of $2,500 solely by reason of the maximum limitation established by the act of July 3, 1952 (ch. 548, 66 Stat. 321), may, upon the written request of the claimant made within 1 year from the date of enactment of section 1 of this amendatory act, be reconsidered and settled in accordance with the amendment contained in that section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5089) to extend the time for filing applications by certain disabled veterans for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, to authorize assistance in acquiring automobiles or other conveyances to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill according to information contained in the report, indicates that it is not in accord with the program of the President. Furthermore, I am certain and positive that the total cost will be substantially more than the $1 million limitation which is one of the guiding lines for the objectors on the Consent Calendar.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OUTPATIENT DENTAL TREATMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5100) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a) to clarify the entitlement of veterans to outpatient dental care.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill affect the right of the Spanish War veterans to outpatient dental treatment?

Mr. LONG. It does take care of the Spanish-American War veterans. That is one thing this bill does that we did not do last year.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I know the great interest of my friend from Louisiana in the Spanish War veterans. I want to be sure they are protected.

Mr. LONG. May I say to the gentleman that this was voted out of the committee unanimously. I am chairman of the subcommittee that reported it to the full committee and am the author of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman is satisfied this will protect the right of the Spanish American War veteran to outpatient dental treatment?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this apparently is a very laudable bill and one for which all Members would vote, but if I am not mistaken it is also one that will call for about $17,564,000.

Mr. LONG. I think the gentleman must have this bill confused with another.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I was misinformed.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Veterans' Regulation No. 7 (a) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"II. Outpatient dental services and treatment, and related dental appliances, shall be furnished under this regulation only for any dental condition or disability—

"(1) which is service connected and compensable in degree;

"(2) which is service connected and is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge or release from active service, but only if application for treatment is made within 2 years after discharge or release, or by December 31, 1954, whichever last occurs;

"(3) which is a service-connected dental condition or disability due to combat wounds or other service trauma or of a former prisoner of war;

"(4) which is associated with and is aggravating disability from some other disease or injury which was incurred in or aggravated by active service; or

"(5) of a veteran of the Spanish-American War (including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection): *Provided*, That benefits afforded under clause (2) shall be on a onetime completion basis, unless the services rendered on a onetime basis are found unacceptable within the limitations of good professional standards, in which event such additional services may be afforded as are required to complete professionally acceptable treatment."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall not be construed to affect the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish dental services to veteran trainees under part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), or under Public Law 16, 78th Congress, as amended and extended.

SEC. 2. The provisos in the paragraph "Outpatient care" under the heading "Veterans' Administration" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "2 years" and insert "1 year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLACE FARM LOANS ON PARITY WITH CITY LOANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5106) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 501 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 694a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding section 502 of this title, but subject to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, any loan made to a veteran under this title may be guaranteed if the proceeds thereof will be used for any of the following purposes:

"(1) To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

"(2) To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

"(3) To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home.

If there is an indebtedness which is secured by a lien against land owned by the veteran, the proceeds of a loan for the construction of a farm residence on such land may be expended also to liquidate such lien, but only if the reasonable value of the land is equal to or in excess of the amount of the lien."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of such section is hereby amended by inserting immediately after "specified in subsection (a)" the following: "or subsection (c)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO RICHLAND COUNTY, S. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5177) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., a portion of the Veterans'

Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of approximately 110 acres of land which constitute a portion of land conveyed to the United States by Richland County. The 110 acres now comprise a portion of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C., lying west of the main hospital buildings. The exact legal description of the land to be conveyed shall be determined by the Administrator or his designate and, in the event that a survey is required in order to make such determination, Richland County shall bear the expense thereof.

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance authorized under the provisions of this act may contain such 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.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR HOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 735) to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OATHS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4221) to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgements by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4004, title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§4004. Oaths and acknowledgements

"The wardens and superintendents, and associate wardens and superintendents, of Federal penal or correction institutions, and such other officers or employees of such institutions as may be designated by the Attorney General, may administer oaths to and take acknowledgements of officers, employees, and inmates of such institutions, but shall not demand or accept any fee or compensation therefor."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the second "and."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "superintendents", insert "chief clerks, record clerks, and parole officers."

Page 1, strike out lines 9 and 10 to and including the word "Attorney General."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT OF JULY 31, 1947 (61 STAT. 681)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 230) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sections are hereby added to the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended by the act of August 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 571; 43 U. S. C. 1946 edition, supp. IV, secs. 1185–1188):

"SEC. 5. Deposits of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders when situated on public lands of the United States shall not be subject to acquisition under any law other than this act, except a law providing for the disposition of such materials on specified areas or authorizing their disposition for the purposes and in a manner provided in the Federal reclamation law (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That this shall not prevent the location and patenting under the United States mining laws of lands containing such materials, if such locations are based upon the discovery in said lands of other minerals, specifically named in the notice of location, which are subject to location under the mining laws. Rights acquired under such mineral location and any subsequent patent issued pursuant thereto, however, shall be subject to and shall not interfere with the rights of any purchaser to purchase and remove materials which have been sold under the terms of this act where such contracts of sale were made pursuant to notice of sale first published prior to the date of the recordation of said mineral location.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this act insofar as it relates to the materials described in section 1 shall apply to lands in national forests and such materials when situated on national forest lands may be disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the terms, conditions, and limitations of this act, as hereby amended. All moneys received from the disposal of materials by the Secretary of Agriculture under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as other receipts from the land from which the materials are disposed of. The word "Secretary," as used in said act, shall refer to the Secretary of Agriculture where lands within the national forests are involved."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, following the word "sand," insert the word "common."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike the words "pumice, pumicite," and insert in lieu thereof the words "common varieties of pumice and pumicite."

Page 2, line 16, add the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this act, common varieties of pumice and pumicite shall not include so-called block pumice, which occurs in nature in pieces of 2 inches or more in one dimension."

Page 2, line 19, following the word "forests", insert the words "and other lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Page 2, lines 19 and 20, strike the words "national-forest" and insert in lieu thereof the word "such."

Page 3, line 1, following the word "in" strike the words "said act," and insert in lieu thereof the words "sections 5 and 6 of this act."

Page 3, following line 3, add the following new section:

"SEC. 7. Nothing in sections 5 and 6 shall affect the validity or patentability of any valid mining claim located before the date of their enactment."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. There is no department report on this bill and the report of the committee does not conform to the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF BUY-BACK PROVISION OF PUBLIC LAW 480

The Clerk called the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. (a) For the purpose of carrying out agreements concluded by the President hereunder, the Commodity Credit Corporation, in accordance with regulations issued by the President pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, (1) shall make available for sale hereunder to domestic exporters, surplus agricultural commodities heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price-support operations, and (2) shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commodities, whether from private stocks or from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In supplying such commodities to exporters under this subsection the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be subject to the sales price restrictions in section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897), shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3092) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to

claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1835) to provide for the discharge of tax liens on certain real property deeded to the United States of America subject to unpaid taxes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any law, prior determination, statute of limitations, or prior acceptance of judgment of partial allowance, the United States of America hereby accepts as a binding obligation and agrees to pay to the treasurer of Sedgwick County, Kans., from such funds as shall hereafter be appropriated for that purpose, the sum of $259,925.09 as the unpaid balance of the base taxes assessed and levied for the tax years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947, against three tracts of land in sections 11 and 14, of township 28 south, range 1 east of the sixth principal meridian in Sedgwick County, Kans., constituting the aircraft factory and grounds owned of record in such years by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and leased to the Boeing Airplane Co. and deeded on or about February 25, 1948, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States, subject to unpaid taxes for the years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947.

Payment of said sum shall be contingent upon and subsequent to the enactment by the Legislature of the State of Kansas of a law authorizing and directing the treasurer of Sedgwick County, Kans., to accept said amount as full payment of the unpaid balance of the base tax assessed and levied for the years aforesaid and as a release and forgiveness of all interest, penalties, liens, and charges on or in connection with said taxes.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2194) for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Military Department of the State of Florida is hereby held free from all claims of any nature for damage to, or monetary liability for, certain properties under license to the State of Florida from the Department of the Army, United States engineers, through its district engineer office in Jacksonville, Fla.; said property at one time being used by the State of Florida to house equipment issued to Battery A, 712th AAA Gun Battalion, Key West, Fla., and consisting of two and fifty-nine one-hundredths acres of land and certain improvements thereon.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF AUGUST 18, 1941, AS AMENDED, PERTAINING TO EMERGECY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3878) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1945, PERTAINING TO THE COLUMBIA RIVER AT BONNEVILLE, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3879) to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if there is some Member present familiar with this particular item who could answer questions? If not, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING TITLE II, FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4052) to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone familiar with this bill a question. Has not the Comptroller General always opposed the continuance of this power in the past?

Mr. CELLER. As I understand it, that is not the case. These emergency powers were reactivated during the Korean emergency and have been reactivated yearly ever since that time.

Mr. PATMAN. It is really providing for renegotiation of contracts, although it does not state that it is. It is really to renegotiate contracts?

Mr. CELLER. For clarification, I might read just briefly from the report:

Under the act, executive departments and agencies are empowered to amend or modify Government contracts without additional consideration, where, for example——

Mr. PATMAN. Without additional consideration.

Mr. CELLER. Well, for the reasons which will be stated—

for example, an actual or threatened loss on a defense contract will impair the productive capacity of a contractor whose continued existence is needed for the national defense.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, does not the gentleman construe that language to mean a renegotiation of existing contracts to the extent it could cost the Government more?

Mr. CELLER. That may be, but the departments involved would have to justify their actions.

Mr. PATMAN. How much could it go to? Could it go to $1 million, $10 million, or $100 million?

Mr. CELLER. There is no limitation. You must remember this, that under the act these powers can cease by concurrent resolution of both Houses or by Executive order issued by the President. In emergencies we have always granted these powers. Are we not in an emergency, considering the state of the world today, especially in the Far East? We have always extended these powers from year to year, and there is real urgency for the extension now.

Mr. PATMAN. Obviously it is a renegotiation of contracts, and since it is likely to involve a large amount and certainly over $1 million, it occurs to me that it would come within the unwritten rule that bills like this one should not be on this calendar; that a special rule for its consideration from the Rules Committee should be sought.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, I differ with the gentleman on that. This bill itself provides for no specific appropriation whatsoever.

Mr. PATMAN. I know it does not, but it provides for a change in existing contracts. Where there is a threatened loss of any kind, they can change it and give the contractor more money. They can make lots of changes. They can renegotiate it. They can exempt the requirement of a performance bond. They can relieve the contractor of the performance bond although he has given one in the contract. They can say under this act here that "We will not require it in the future, and we will also exempt you from liquidated damages" that the statute says shall be paid and the contract says shall be paid. If we pass this bill, we are giving them the power to exempt them from liquidated damages on performance bonds, contracts, or anything else.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope my friend will not object. This is emergency legislation. And, of course, everybody recognizes that an emergency exists at the present time. The very fact that the present administration asks for this extension, despite statements to the contrary that no emergency exists, is confirmation of the fact that a grave emergency not only confronts our country but the world, and there is no question but what that is so. Under those circumstances, the extension of this law is of vital importance to the best interests of

our country, and I hope my friend from Texas will not object to the consideration and the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. On the basis of the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think it would probably be justified in view of the fact that we are in a national emergency, and being in a national emergency, the President of the United States has asked for the passage of this bill, and I assume we should let it pass without objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257), as amended, is further amended by striking out "1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "1957."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND SECTION 7 OF THE ACT APPROVED SEPTEMBER 22, 1922

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4426) to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922 (Public Law 362, 67th Cong.), as amended by section 203 of the act approved May 17, 1950 (Public Law 516, 81st Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter the provisions of section 7 of the act of August 23, 1912, as amended (37 Stat. 414; 54 Stat. 175; 31 U. S. C. 679), or any other law prohibiting the expenditure of public money for telephone services installed in private residences, shall not be construed to apply to or forbid the installation and use of such telephones as may be necessary for the prosecution of Government business in connection with the construction and operation of locks and dams for navigation, flood control, and related water uses, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers. Not more than $30,000 shall be expended for such telephone services in any 1 fiscal year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELEBRATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACADIAN MIGRATION

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas this year marks the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia and their journey to find refuge and haven in Louisiana and other areas; and

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

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

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

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

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes all the eligible bills on the calendar.

FORT POINT CHANNEL AND SOUTH BAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1816) to declare the tidewaters in the waterway—in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay—above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because I understand this is a request from the State officials of Massachusetts and the bill comes out of committee with no opposition.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. It was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was requested by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts through the commissioner of public works, Mr. Volpe, and also by Mayor Hynes, of Boston. This area is in my district, and the bill is designed to declare a certain area of water up there nonnavigable for the purpose of filling it in.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the tidewaters in the waterway in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay in the city of Boston, Mass., lying above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN E. NELSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with immeasurable sadness that I must inform the House of the death on Monday last of a former Representative from the district I now represent, the Honorable John E. Nelson. It would be ungrateful to divine providence should I say I did this with regret, for he died full of rich, golden, fruitful years and the hand of God took him mercifully from what would have been unendurable suffering and pain to what he knew to be the resurrection and the life. His fine mind clear to the end, he joyfully welcomed death.

John Nelson's full and extraordinary life cannot be written only in words of praise. All that is necessary is a simple recital of the facts. And a recital of those facts begins with the simple annals of the poor.

John Nelson came of very poor parents living in a small town in Maine. Everything he got he had to earn himself, his college education at Colby, his law degree at the State university, and the slow fees of early law practice. He was laborer, hack driver, and schoolteacher. As he worked his way through college, he somehow found time to become an outstanding debater and to make the national honorary society, Phi Beta Kappa.

And so this man who had the courage, the faith and the dogged perseverance to overcome so many handicaps and fight his way upward went on to become the finest trial lawyer in Maine and then a Member of this House.

It has been truly said that the basis of American life is the family and family life. John Nelson was rich in that fundamental. Married to a wonderful woman who was a loving, devoted, and tireless mother, he was all that a father could be to his family of 8 children—5 girls and 3 boys.

Years ago in a talk to a service club John Nelson expressed his own philosophy when he said:

I should, of course, tell you to teach your boy to love the truth, to hate a lie, to value friendship, and to know that friendship means not receiving but giving. He should be taught the nobility of labor, that genius is but the capacity for hard work. He should be shown that there is something more important than making a living, and that is making a life.

This to him was not book philosophy. It came from the sweat, the heartaches, and the anxiety of the life he had had to live. He constantly endeavored to pass it on to his children.

To all of his children John Nelson was friend, companion, counselor. To each of them he was an ever-present help in time of need. To each, a sense of constant security in a rather frightening world. He gave freely and unstintingly of his love and understanding and wisdom.

To all of them he gladly proffered all the advantages he had so hardly earned, a college education and to the three boys years of schooling for graduate degrees.

Nor was this done without a very great deal of effort and sacrifice on his part.

John Nelson was the grandest of fathers.

There are some few among you who served with John Nelson in this House. You will remember how impeccably he dressed with an ever-present buttonhole bouquet. You will remember far better than I the caliber of his service in this House.

For 1 year I had the priceless privilege of serving as John Nelson's secretary. I am sure you will forgive me if out of deep personal interest I recount a few of the guideposts he left for me. These things I shall always remember.

From his early experiences John Nelson carried through life a deep and abiding faith in the dignity and integrity of the workingman. Because of this he was a champion of the Norris-LaGuardia Act to outlaw yellow-dog contracts, a bill that became the Magna Carta of organized labor. Because of this he was the individual member of the Fish Committee To Investigate Communism created way back in 1931 who concluded:

> We found that for years, unknown to us here, radicals had been active in the United States seeking to undermine our institutions, and that it was organized labor that had been, and then was, patriotically and uncompromisingly bearing the great burden of the Communist attack in this country; that they constituted the great bulwark of defense against the potential dangers of communism in America.

And with prophetic vision far beyond his time he went on to forcefully point out:

> The solution of this problem lies in the wisdom of our legislators and in the unselfishness of our industrialists. In proportion as we work out economic justice here in America and so order our social system that labor shall share in the economic life of the Nation as fully and fairly as it now shares in its social and political life, in just that proportion will radicalism fail of its own inanition and the threat of communism cease to disturb us.

These words I shall always remember.

In 1932 the shadow of impending defeat fell darkly across the life of John Nelson. Repeal of the prohibitory law was an overriding national issue. During all of his congressional career he had voted for prohibition and unfailingly practiced his political convictions in his personal life. A major depression had laid its heavy, cruel hand on the lives of all Americans. Because John Nelson was the strong man in Maine, redistricting had given him the strongest voting precincts of the opposite party.

And yet at that critical time, when veterans were camped on Washington grounds, John Nelson had the conviction, the courage to speak against what he considered a premature cash payment of the soldiers' bonus. Everyone was suffering, so help, he thought, should go to all, not just one class. In that speech he said:

> Better to die politically conscious of our own respect and intellectual honesty, than to preserve a mean political existence through hiding behind others or refusing to listen to the voice of duty whose call a man must answer or lose his soul.

At the conclusion of that speech the House accorded him a standing ovation. That I shall always remember.

The dark shadow became a reality. Defeat came to John Nelson. He took that defeat regretfully, because of the many fine friends he would now seldom see. He took it sadly because of the service he could no longer render. But there was in him no bitterness or rancor. Rather, there was courage, good heart, and a fine spirit of good sportsmanship. In defeat as in victory, John Nelson showed the measure of a real man.

The fine man who defeated him and served ably in this House, Hon. Carl Moran, had these sincere and heartfelt words of tribute to say:

> Just before commencing my duties in 1933 as a Member of Congress, I was invited by my predecessor, whom I had defeated for reelection, to share his office and learn the ropes. His cordiality and kindness to me were unlimited; his introduction of me to his friends in Congress resulted in some lifetime friendships. He left for my use his thousands of files, which aided me immeasurably in completing such cases as veterans' claims in process at the time he left office.
>
> The man who did all that for his political opponent was John E. Nelson.
>
> At this time of his passing, I want the people of Maine to know how he placed their interest far above partisan considerations; he was a real public servant.
>
> John E. Nelson was a statesman, and far ahead of his time in his thinking. I join with his relatives and many friends in mourning his passing.

John Nelson carried throughout the rest of his life the richness and depth of the friendships he had made in this House, friendships welded the closer in the sharing of a common, a great responsibility. His was ever the lasting confidence and assurance that can only come to one who has been the chosen representative of a sovereign people and who has, on their behalf, made critical and momentous decisions without compromise, without evasion, and without fear.

So has ended a life that in its living immeasurably enriched the lives of others, his family, his countless friends, his colleagues. He died full of years and rich, purposeful memories, memories of love and friendship and service, and an unflagging pursuit of truth and beauty. He died as he wished to die. His was a passing beautifully expressed in the poetry he loved so well and often quoted:

> So be my passing!
> My task accomplished and the long day done,
> My wages taken, and in my heart
> Some late lark singing,
> Let me be gathered to the quiet west,
> The sundown splendid and serene,
> Death.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was a happy privilege that I had of serving on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with John Nelson. He was a man who, from the very beginning, challenged my respect because he was honest; and he was able—he was a good American. He loved this country and he loved his fellow man. He had a wonderful sense of humor and splendid judgment. You always knew where John Nelson stood—that was at the place where he thought he could be of the most service to mankind and to his day and generation. It is a rich heritage and a splendid memory that I have of my association with him, and the friendship I had, as he had mine, of this doughty, this splendid, able American statesman.

Mr. NELSON. I am very grateful, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret that I learned last Monday of the death of John Nelson of Maine. It was my privilege to enjoy his friendship for many years. During this long period I came to know him well and to appreciate his splendid qualities. He was one of the ablest men who ever served in the House of Representatives. His outstanding ability, his eloquent oratory and his rugged courage won him the admiration of all. John Nelson served as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which our beloved Speaker was at that time, I believe, chairman. He served at a time when there were many great difficult problems before the country. His fine talents and his knowledge were helpful in bringing about a proper solution of these problems. John Nelson, with his farsighted vision, was one of the first to discern the clouds of communism slowly appearing. He warned the people of America against communism over 20 years ago, and as a member of a subcommittee presented a report which so stated publicly. John Nelson was a great lawyer. Everyone who knew him knew him not only as a great trial lawyer but a man of profound legal ability. Death has removed a fine man; a man who was kindly and helpful to all; a man who had but one purpose, and that was to serve the country he loved to the best of his ability. The world is better for his having lived in it. I know he was very proud of the fact that his son was elected to his old seat in Congress. He wrote me to this effect and I am glad to see the splendid services of the son equalling that of his illustrious father. CHARLIE NELSON is carrying on with the splendid Nelson tradition.

So I pay tribute to a friend who has passed away. He has left his impress upon his day. To the living members of his family my deepest sympathy is extended in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, some 33 years ago, when I was a relatively new Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John Edward Nelson was elected to the 67th Congress from the State of Maine. On last Monday I received the regrettable announcement of his death.

John Edward Nelson was an able and respected lawyer when elected to the

Congress of the United States and his 10 years of service in this body was in full keeping with his sterling character and ability. He served both the Nation and his district with honor and distinction.

Few who have the honor to serve here enjoy the additional honor and great personal satisfaction of having a son elected to the Congress. But such was his deserved reward. John Edward Nelson's son, the Honorable CHARLES P. NELSON, is our colleague today, serving his fourth term.

Few men have the privilege of serving their country in the Congress, with honor and distinction, living to see a son elected to the Congress, and completing 50 years of active and distinguished service in the honored profession of law. But our colleague of yesterday was one of those few so highly privileged.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who remember him so well, deeply regret his passing, even in the twilight of a rich and happy life. I know my colleagues join me in this sincere expression of sympathy to our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES P. NELSON, and the other members of the family who mourn this inevitable but unhappy occasion.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can add to the eloquent tributes paid to the memory of the late John E. Nelson, but I can assure the House that the mourning in the House for the memory of our distinguished former Member is shared by all the people of the State of Maine. His death was recognized by everyone as a great loss to our whole community.

John Nelson sat in this body for 10 years, from 1923 to 1933, representing the old Third Congressional District in Maine, in the days when Maine had four Representatives instead of three as at present. He might have continued to sit here for many years thereafter had it not been for the redistricting of the State. As it was, he went down in the great political overturn as a result of the depression which brought a full Democrat delegation to the House of Representatives from the State of Maine, something that had never happened before.

Mention has already been made of Mr. Nelson's outstanding service on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and of his remarkable service on the special committee headed by Hamilton Fish to consider the operation of communism in America. Bear in mind that this was in the twenties when things were very different from what they are now. John Nelson, as others have already said, showed his statesmanship and moderation in his understanding of this problem, later to become so impressive.

When John Nelson left Congress to return to the practice of law in Augusta, he served as the liquidator of the largest bank in his county and his part of the State which did not reopen after the bank closings in 1933.

As has already been said, John Nelson was a very eminent and able lawyer, who had not his superior certainly in the State of Maine. He made a name for himself at the bar before he came to Congress, but his ambition brought him here for perhaps the most fruitful years of his life.

John Nelson struggled with great valor and fortitude against the ailment which finally proved fatal to him.

It is gratifying to me that there are so many Members here who remember John Nelson, and everyone who remembers him remembers him with the utmost affection and the utmost admiration. I have known John Nelson myself ever since the year 1922. I followed with great interest the primary contest which led to his nomination and ultimately to his election. I had the highest esteem and warmest personal friendship for John Nelson. He was always extremely kind to me. My sympathy goes to his widow and to all his surviving children; and, above all, I wish to express my sympathy to my colleague, his son, who now succeeds him and whose service here was so justly a source of pride and satisfaction to his father.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to assure the distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. NELSON] that each and every one of us appreciates and understands the trying position he is now in of announcing to the House of Representatives the recent death of his beloved father. But I am sure the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON] will derive great consolation in the knowledge that his father is smiling upon us, knowing that his son is rendering such outstanding service in the House, making announcement of his death, and also the very dignified and deep eulogy that he so properly paid to his dear father.

I arrived in this body in the latter part of 1928, and I served with your distinguished father for a period of over 3 years. During that time your late father and I became very close personal friends. That middle aisle means nothing to us in our personal contacts and in the development of our friendships, and that middle aisle meant nothing to your late father and to myself, in the strong feeling of friendship on my part and the strong feeling of respect which I am sure he held for the character of service we both rendered.

Your father's contribution during his period of service in this body leaves to you and your loved ones a heritage that you can always appreciate, to which you can always look with pride, and to those who are left behind constitute an inspiration for continued service of like nature.

So I extend to my dear friend and colleague my heartfelt sympathy in the loss of his father, and I extend through you to your loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlemuan from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I join with those who have paid tribute to a distinguished man, the late John Nelson, of Maine. Mr. Nelson was a Member when I came here.

I no doubt like nearly every other new Member made my appraisals of those I met and sometimes I made them quickly, and with good reason, of course. I very distinctly remember the impression I got of Mr. Nelson. He impressed me as being a man not only of keen ability but of great honor and integrity. I enjoyed talking with him because he was a courteous, sensible man upon whom I could depend. He was truly a capable, courteous and honorable man.

I want you, his son, to know that your father was a great statesman and a great American. I extend to you and the other members of your father's family my profound respect and sympathy.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deepest regret of the death of our old friend and colleague, John Nelson. For a decade he was one of the notable Members of the House of Representatives, from the State of Maine.

I felt particularly close to him because he and I came here together in the 68th Congress. I believe he filled out an unexpired term; however, he was elected to his first full term in the 68th Congress. There remains, in addition, in the House at this time only the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] who were Members of the class of the 68th Congress.

Congressman Nelson was particularly fortunate in his associations. He came from a historic district. Although the district has been changed in many respects in subsequent revisions, he represented an area, for example, in which a great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine, was born and reared. The district also included counties which had been represented by Asher Hinds, author of the Precedents of the House, the greatest parliamentarian who ever served in the American Congress.

And he and Asher were alumni of the same alma mater, Colby College, an institution which has graduated an exceptional number of eminent and useful men.

Mr. Nelson served also as a member of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the chairmanship of the present Speaker of the House, Speaker RAYBURN, and collaborated with the great Speaker in the drafting of some of the most important legislation of the day. He was the senior member of one of those rare instances in the history of the House of father-and-son teams which occur in the Congress from time to time and which had their counterpart in the Elder and Younger Pitt, of the British Parliament.

He was the worthy sire of a worthy son and that son carries on the tradition which he established, and adds honor and luster to the name, in distinguished service in the House today.

Perhaps the most notable feature of his service here was his membership on the committee chairmanned by the gentleman from New York, Hamilton Fish, which in a historic investigation extending over a period of more than 8 months, pioneered the investigation of communism in congressional jurisprudence. After detailed and exhaustive inquiry they reported to the House a measure which, had it been carried to its ultimate and complete conclusion, would have disposed once and for all of a subject which has been one of our troublesome problems down to this day. That report recommended the outlawing of communism. It recommended the deportation of all known and convicted Communists. It recommended the establishment of an embargo against entrance into this country of any known and recognized Communist and in that respect anticipated disastrous developments. He was one of the pioneers who led the way and subsequent events have demonstrated the correctness of his views.

His death removes a man who has served in the House and in other capacities in his home State with great distinction; a man who exemplified the finest attributes of citizenship; a man whose farseeing statesmanship made him the ideal leader in public affairs under our American form of government.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with the noble father of the distinguished gentleman from Maine. I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of the late Honorable John Nelson, of Maine, a man who possessed the highest attributes of character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood; a man of outstanding and recognized ability and devotion to public service. He served with great credit and distinction as a Member of this House for a decade and enjoyed the greatest degree of confidence, respect, and esteem and genuine affection of all of his colleagues. His distinguished son, who is now rendering such outstanding service as a Member of this body, may look to his great record as an inspiration to continue the great service that he is rendering here. Other Members of this body may likewise emulate the great record of public service as was rendered in such an outstanding manner by the distinguished gentleman from Maine, Mr. John Nelson, in whose honor we utter these brief words of tribute today. So I join with other colleagues in conveying to my good friend, his noble son, our distinguished colleague, and other members of the family, my sincere and heartfelt sympathy in the hour of their great bereavement.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, deeply regret that a close friend, and an outstanding Member of this House in bygone days, has been called to his reward.

When I first came to Congress, John Nelson was a Member from the State of Maine, serving here, as has been pointed out, for a period of more than 10 years.

I shall never forget him.

He was a man of the highest character, with a fine mind, and a fine personality. He had outstanding ability both as a lawyer and as a legislator. He was a splendid speaker. He had great courage and a broad knowledge of human nature.

I can see him now standing here in the well of this House, formally dressed for the occasion, addressing the Members on the floor with his great influence on both sides of the aisle.

I have always considered him one of the ablest Members of the Congress during my entire period of service here.

I am saddened by his death and I join in heartfelt sympathy to his widow; to his son, our beloved colleague, who today represents the Second District of Maine with such ability; to the other members of his large family; and to all those close to him.

John Nelson was a fine man. He was a fine lawyer. He was a fine public servant.

He made a great contribution here in the Congress to his district, to his State, and to the Nation.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, as the father of a dear friend, Hon. John Edward Nelson has my thought today, and his passing has the attention of this House, of which he was an able and beloved Member from March 27, 1923, to March 3, 1933.

Mr. Nelson was born in China, Maine, July 12, 1874, studied at the Friends' School in Providence, R. I., and was graduated from Colby College and University of Maine College of Law. One who took his parenthood and citizenship seriously, his interest in education led to his principalship of one of Maine's larger high schools for 4 years, while the rest of his active years, except for those here, he gave to the practice of his profession. When Hon. John A. Peters resigned as Representative of Maine's Third District, John E. Nelson was elected to serve his unexpired term, and was thereafter reelected for five more consecutive terms. Redistricting placed Augusta, our State's capital and the home of the Nelson's in Maine's Second District, which his son, our beloved CHARLIE NELSON, now represents ably and well.

As a lawyer, the late Mr. Nelson's quickness of mind was reflected in the reputation he earned as a cross examiner, which led to his association with outstanding members of Maine's bar—two of them ex-governors of our State.

While I was not privileged to know him personally, I recognize that John Nelson's contribution to his State and country was outstanding. Father of a fine family whose intelligence their inheritance guaranteed, he gave each the educational privileges which would insure their usefulness to society, and his interest in their careers remained keen to the end of his days.

Because their professional and public service followed similar lines, our colleague, the gentleman from Maine, CHARLIE NELSON, was perhaps particularly close to his father, and his concern for the latter's health, failing for some years, was apparent to those of us who knew of the frequent trips made to the bedside of one whose passing was anticipated with sorrow.

We mourn one who was formerly a Member of this House. I voice the sympathy of the people of the Third District of Maine for the family of the deceased. Whatever there is of solace in the love and regard of one's friends we offer to CHARLES NELSON here today.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I have learned of the death of our former distinguished colleague, John E. Nelson of Maine. I had the pleasure of serving in the House with John Nelson for 6 years. I came to have a high regard for him. To me he seemed to typify the traditional virtues of that part of the country from which he came. To his family and especially to his son, Charles, our able colleague, I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think we all appreciate the very difficult task that has confronted the gentleman from Maine this afternoon in bringing this information to our attention. I know his father would be most proud of the manner in which he has performed this task. I did not know the gentleman's father, although I did meet him on one brief trip to Maine. From what has been said here by those who served with him in the Congress and from knowing his son, there can be no question but that he was a great American. I certainly want to assure the gentleman who is addressing us of my sincere sympathy in the loss that he and the rest of his family have sustained.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of the late John E. Nelson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the death of the Honorable John E. Nelson, of Augusta, Maine, a former Member of this House and who held the seat now so ably filled by his distinguished son and our colleague, CHARLES P. NELSON.

When I first came to the Congress it was my great privilege to be taken into

the confidence and to enjoy the friendship of John E. Nelson. I feel today, as the news of his passing is announced to the House, a very great sadness and a very distinct personal loss. John Nelson was a brilliant man, generous, warm, and considerate. He was kind enough to take me under his wing and into his confidence as a freshman Member when I needed the counsel and the help of those men more experienced than I. I looked upon him in many ways as a father. I went to him for advice. I got it freely, generously, and expertly.

John Nelson was a giant of a man physically and he had a heart to match his size. It has been a number of years, it is true, since he has been here in these Halls; but over those years I have never forgotten the warmth and the kindliness of his friendship; and the privilege that was mine in having been associated with him during his service in the House.

I am saddened and grieved to hear that he has passed from among us. There are no adequate words to fully express the integrity that was his, the brilliance of his mind, nor the generosity of his great heart. I hope that I have learned well and have practiced the lessons which he gave me because John Nelson made a great contribution to this House, and the country is richer and better for his having been a Member of this House. So as the pupil to the master, I should like in my humble way to pay my respectful tribute of thanks for the privilege of having known him and to say with the deepest of feeling that his passing has created a void which for many will not soon be filled.

To his son, following so ably in his footsteps, and to his family, may I express the deep sympathy which I feel for them in the loss of so distinguished a citizen and so generous a father.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks regarding the passing of our late colleague, John E. Nelson, of Maine, I hereby express my sympathy to his distinguished son, our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES P. NELSON, of Maine, and to the members of his family.

John E. Nelson was a Member of this House when I first came to Congress to serve. During the time I was here he was considered by his colleagues to be an extremely able Member of Congress. Always he had time to help a colleague in his work and to offer helpful suggestions in regard to difficult matters. John Nelson was a great friend in the truest sense of friendship.

A deeply patriotic American, John Nelson was that type of individual whose word was his bond, who was completely dependable, who was always honest and fair above all with his colleagues and fellow men.

During the decade he served in this Congress, from 1922 to 1932, John Nelson etched his name in the distinguished history of this country. His decisions on the great issues of that period disclose his wisdom and his loyalty and his feeling toward the welfare of Americans throughout the country.

In the early days of my service here in this House John Nelson gave me many helpful suggestions and helped me greatly in my committee assignments and in the parliamentary work of the Congress. His unselfish interest in helping others will stand forever to his credit. He was one of the very distinguished gentlemen who have helped down through the years to make this House the greatest representative parliament of the people in any country in the world.

John Nelson was my colleague and was my friend. With his thousands of friends in his home State of Maine and the thousands all over America, I join in mourning his passing. His gentle qualities, his great ability, and his fine character will be forever enshrined in the history of the House of Representatives here in Washington and in the history of his country.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress as a youngster in 1929, one of the men I first became acquainted with was Hon. John E. Nelson, of Maine. He had served with high distinction and great honor in this body for 10 years, and few men impressed me as much as he did.

John Nelson possessed not only Yankee shrewdness, Southern chivalry, Midwestern warmth, and hard sense, but also the daring and adventuresome spirit of the Far West, and he also displayed a comprehension and understanding of our national problems which few men then or now possess. Always he fought for the interests of his own constituents, but he never overlooked or neglected the needs of others.

Modest in victory, strong in defeat, John Nelson worked hard in committee and was an able debater on the floor of this House. He was devoted to his family, helpful to his friends, and loyal to his country. He followed in and upheld the fine tradition of the statesmen whom Maine has given to this Nation. I shall not attempt to enumerate these great men of Maine, but John Nelson will follow along with Thomas Brackett Reed, James G. Blaine, Hannibal Hamlin, Frank Fellows, and others.

We are indeed fortunate to have serving with us today John Nelson's fine son, CHARLES NELSON, a respected and valuable member of our Committee on Armed Services. Like his illustrious father, Charlie knows the necessity for hard work, and is following faithfully in the footsteps of his distinguished father.

To our understanding and cordial colleague, CHARLES NELSON, of Maine, to all the family and many friends of John Nelson, we extend our sincere sympathy and can truthfully say that earth's loss is Heaven's gain.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

OUR FOOD SURPLUSES ARE BEING PUT TO WORK MEETING HUNGER AND NEED

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include some tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has just issued a report which clearly shows the extent to which surplus food distribution activities have been stepped up during the past year in order to gain maximum benefits from our food abundance. In this way greatly increased quantities of food have been made available to help feed needy persons both at home and abroad and also to improve the nutrition of our children through the school-lunch program.

Through the intensified efforts of the Department of Agriculture, our agricultural surpluses are being put to work in filling hungry stomachs and in improving the diets of our growing children. New legislation enacted by the last Congress played an important part in making possible the increased utilization—particularly in the relief of hunger and need—of foods acquired by the Department under price-support and surplus-removal programs.

It is apparent from the record that the aim of the Department of Agriculture is to make the best and most effective use of the agricultural surpluses acquired under these programs. While making strenuous and effective efforts to expand market outlets, the Department is also mindful of the needs of those who are in want and has been pressing hard for increased use of the surpluses, both at home and abroad. This is evident from the greatly expanded volume and the broadened distribution of surplus foods among eligible recipients.

The striking fact shown by the Department of Agriculture's report is that this distribution of surplus foods to meet hunger and want has been so stepped up since the middle of last year that it now is at the rate of a billion pounds a year. During the first 9 months of the present fiscal year the Department distributed for use of eligible recipients more surplus food than in all 12 months of the last fiscal year. The details of this expanded distribution of surplus foods are given in the Department's report as follows:

USDA SURPLUS FOOD DISTRIBUTION CONTINUES TO INCREASE

Distribution of surplus foods to users in this country and abroad continued to increase sharply during the first quarter of 1955, the United States Department of Agriculture reported today. Principally responsible for the continued gains were the new legislation enacted by the last Congress, and the intensified efforts to make best use of these foods acquired under price support and surplus removal operations.

Food donations by the Department during January through March of 1955 totaled 407 million pounds, raising the total for the first 9 months of the current fiscal year to 849 million pounds, compared to total donations of 602 million pounds during the 12 months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

Donations to schools, institutions, and needy persons in this country totaled 392 million pounds in the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, against 418 million pounds during the full 12 months of the previous fiscal year. Donations to United States welfare agencies for distribution

abroad during the same 9 months totaled 457 million pounds—almost 2½ times the 184 million pounds distributed during the entire 12 months of the fiscal year ending last June.

Recipients of the food distributed in this country included 11 million schoolchildren, and over 1 million needy persons in charitable institutions. In addition, there are currently about 3,388,000 needy persons in family units certified by State agencies to receive commodities. The number of people actually receiving commodities at any one time is always somewhat below the number certified. During these 9 months greatest increases were made in donations to these needy persons, who received about one-third of the total distribution.

Foods distributed domestically included butter, cheese, dry milk, cottonseed oil, shortening, beef and gravy, dry beans, rice, and several other commodities in smaller amounts. All of these commodities continue to be available for donation except beef and gravy, the limited available supplies of which have now been completely distributed.

Commodity distribution abroad increased to 258 million pounds during the first 3 months of 1955, more than one-quarter larger than distribution during the last 6 months of 1954. The sharp gains came as the new Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act took full effect, following the period of its administrative organization, after its passage last summer by Congress.

The number of countries receiving commodities increased from 41 to 53 during this 3-month period, while the number of participating United States welfare agencies increased to 17. Commodities distributed abroad included butter, cheese, dry milk, shortening, and cottonseed oil.

The following tables show quantities and costs of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use:

Quantities of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use, fiscal year 1954, and estimated, July 1–Mar. 31, fiscal year 1955

[Millions of pounds]

Commodity	Domestic						Foreign distribution		Total distribution	
	Schools		Institutions		Needy persons					
	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955
Butter	42.6	42.3	24.2	20.8	4.9	23.9	60.2	68.6	131.9	155.6
Butter oil								[1] 49.6		[1] 49.6
Cheese	26.7	27.3	13.4	11.7	5.0	26.5	31.0	75.0	76.1	140.5
Dry milk	13.5	19.8	11.0	10.1	5.0	28.4	92.7	219.2	122.2	277.5
Beef and gravy	114.7	25.2	52.7	7.2	10.4	5.6			177.8	38.0
Dry beans	2.0	25.7	5.5	9.3	2.4	25.1			9.9	60.1
Rice		3.3		4.2		6.1				13.6
Shortening [2]	15.2	24.5	10.0	13.1	3.7	20.1		44.4	28.9	102.1
Other [3]	31.3	9.5	17.5	1.9	6.1	.1			54.9	11.5
Total	246.0	177.6	134.3	78.3	37.5	135.8	183.9	456.8	601.7	848.5

[1] Butter equivalent of 39.7 million pounds of butter oil.
[2] Includes cottonseed oil.
[3] Includes several commodities in limited amounts.

Cost of surplus foods donated for domestic and foreign use, fiscal year 1954, and estimated, July 1–Mar. 31, fiscal year 1955

[In millions]

Commodity	Domestic						Foreign distribution		Total distribution	
	Schools		Institutions		Needy persons					
	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1954	July–March fiscal year 1955
Butter	$29.5	$25.7	$16.8	$12.6	$3.4	$14.5	$41.7	$41.6	$91.4	$94.4
Butter oil								34.1		34.1
Cheese	10.4	10.8	5.2	4.6	2.0	10.5	12.1	29.8	29.7	55.7
Dry milk	2.8	3.7	2.2	1.9	1.0	5.3	19.0	41.0	25.0	51.9
Beef and gravy	45.0	10.1	20.6	2.9	4.2	2.3			69.8	15.3
Dry beans	.2	2.7	.7	1.0	.3	2.6			1.2	6.3
Rice		.8		1.0		1.4				3.2
Shortening [1]	3.8	6.1	2.5	3.3	.9	5.0		10.8	7.2	25.2
Other [2]	2.5	1.1	.9	.2	.1	[3]			3.5	1.3
Total	94.2	61.0	48.9	27.5	11.9	41.6	72.8	157.3	227.8	287.4

[1] Includes cottonseed oil.
[2] Includes several commodities in limited amounts.
[3] Less than $50,000.

Mr. Speaker, another significant development this year in expanding the distribution and use of agricultural surpluses was the inauguration of the special school milk program by the Department of Agriculture. Milk, that otherwise might be processed into manufactured products and sold to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program, is being consumed in fluid form by children at school.

This new program was authorized by a provision of the Agricultural Act of 1954, which provided for the use of $50 million of CCC funds annually to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children during this and the next school year. Despite the fact that the 1954 act did not become law until August 28—when most schools were about to open for the fall term—the program has made considerable progress in its first 7 months of operation.

By mid-February, 45,000 schools throughout the country had been approved for participation in this new school milk program. Some of these schools had never before made milk available during school hours. Others, which previously had served milk at the lunch hour, started to make milk available at the midmorning or afternoon recess periods.

Because the program did not begin to operate on a nationwide basis until January, the full $50 million will not be used this year in increasing milk consumption among schoolchildren. With improvements growing out of this year's experience, and with a full school year's operation in 1956, the special school milk program is certain to make a continuing and increased contribution to the expansion of domestic markets for fluid milk.

Another program undertaken by the Department of Agriculture to open outlets for surplus foods is the channeling of additional quantities of healthful dairy products to the men in the Armed Forces.

Legislation passed last summer—section 202, title II, Agricultural Act of 1954—enabled the Department to speed up the regular movement of surplus dairy products, particularly butter, into military rations. As a result of this legislation, dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation are made available to the Department of Defense throughout this year and next without charge except for packaging costs.

Recognizing the need for additional consumption of fluid milk, the Departments of Defense and Agriculture have also worked out an arrangement under which the Department of Agriculture underwrites increased milk rations for our military forces, thereby reducing the quantity of surplus milk that would be purchased by the CCC as butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk under price-support operations. Under this program fluid-milk consumption by our military forces is now being increased at a rate of around 12 million pounds a month.

Earlier steps taken by the Department of Agriculture sought to move additional butter into Army messhalls by stepping up total military consumption of this protective food. Last summer's legislation accelerated this movement, and through March 1955 approximately 60 million pounds of butter acquired in support operations had been channeled into this highly useful and desirable outlet. Over 2 million pounds of surplus cheese and nearly 6 million pounds of nonfat dry milk also have been moved into these military channels.

Arrangements have also been worked out to supply the Veterans' Administration surplus dairy foods for rations in veterans' installations. This program got under way considerably later than the movement into military channels, and about 1.5 million pounds of butter have been moved so far.

Altogether, it is apparent that the Department of Agriculture is following a wise course in making its surplus food stocks available for use by eligible recipients and also encouraging increased consumption and improved nutrition. It must be recognized, of course, that this Department is not a relief or welfare agency. This is as it should be. However, it is clear from the record of what is being accomplished that the Department of Agriculture believes that as long as there is a Government-owned accumulation of surplus foods, full advantage should be taken of the opportunity to avoid waste when market conditions are such as not to permit resale of these holdings. This is being done by making those surplus foods that lend themselves to donation programs available for use by the needy and other eligible recipients who otherwise would not get enough of them. By following such a course, the Department of Agriculture has made great progress since last year in moving sharply increased quantities of many surplus foods into consumption among people who need and could use this food most advantageously.

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, back in February I had a most interesting exchange of letters with Gen. Douglas MacArthur concerning his suggestion to abolish war. That exchange of correspondence is reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1955, on page 1655. For those of you who may have overlooked it, I urge you to read these two brief letters. General MacArthur's letter, in particular, is thought-provoking and challenging.

Briefly, it concerns the following:

On January 26 General MacArthur delivered a major address in Los Angeles in which he urged the United States to proclaim its readiness to abolish war in concert with the other powers of the world. Several days later, on February 3, I wrote to General MacArthur and offered to introduce a resolution in Congress declaring that "it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes." In his reply, February 7, General MacArthur expressed the viewpoint that it would require more than a congressional declaration "to trigger a worldwide movement for the abolition of war." He suggested that, instead of a resolution, I should present the matter on the floor of the House and from this rostrum "build up gradually to more aggressive action to implement the basic concept."

That was a challenging thought. I, subsequently, stated that I would be happy to take up the general's suggestion and bring this matter to the attention of this House, at which time I would discuss it in greater detail and present my views on the subject. I am now prepared to do so. I shall welcome any comments or discussion at the conclusion of my remarks, for only in the free exchange of opinions can we hope to make a worthwhile contribution toward the solution of so difficult a problem. The late great Justice Louis D. Brandeis once observed:

> If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold.

Mr. Speaker, at the very outset let me emphasize that I am extremely interested in the idea of developing a people-to-people approach to the problem of international peace. In conducting this discussion I shall follow your sage words uttered last Saturday evening at the national Democratic dinner in your honor.

I would, therefore, beseech Democrats and Republicans alike to conduct themselves with a becoming restraint in all those things that pertain to war and peace, since they pertain also to the life and death of all men.

In this atomic age, it seems to me that this approach is one of our avenues leading toward hope for the future and the survival of human civilization. I feel we should explore this avenue to the fullest degree in our search for peace.

All of us will agree, I am sure, that the most important concern of the nations of the world today is to remove the fear and the threat of war, which is hanging over the heads of mankind like the sword of Damocles. Soviet Russia and Communist China are the two nations most responsible for engendering this fear. Red China, so prominent in the news these days, is a threat to world peace not merely by virtue of her alliance with Russia. Swelled by her successes in the Far East and possessing tremendous resources of manpower and a strategic location, she constitutes a menace in her own right. The threat to the free world lies in the possibility that Communist China may overrun Formosa, that Japan may fall, and that all of Southeast Asia may eventually be lost.

In years past, the tradition of friendship between the United States and China was an accepted fact in our international relations. Our open door policy helped to protect China from partitioning by the great powers of that period. In World War II, China was allied with us in bringing Japan to a crushing defeat. We had reason to believe and to look forward to the existence of a strong China, friendly to the democratic nations of the West, as a central stabilizing force in Asia. Unfortunately it did not work out as we had anticipated, but we have not lost hope for the future.

In 1950, the Chinese Communist armies swept over China and the Nationalist Government, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, withdrew to the island of Formosa. Almost overnight the vast land area of China, with its 400 or 500 million people, was lost to the free world. The victory of communism in China overturned the historic basis of our relationship with that country. This change affected not only United States policy in Asia, but it set in motion a reappraisal of the global policy of the rest of the free world.

The transformation of China from a free nation to a police-state of the well-known Communist brand is by now a matter of history. In Red China today brainwashing has replaced freedom of thought. In this overpopulated and underdeveloped country, where for centuries the people have eked out a marginal existence, the effect of the social and economic changes introduced by the Communists spreads very thinly. Soviet Russia appears to be the model which the Chinese Communists seek to emulate, and Russian experience and advice are being fully utilized.

What are the issues in our relations with Communist China? What, specifically, makes that country a threat to world peace?

In its new-born flush of power, the Communist regime of Mao Tse-Tung bitterly resented the fact that the United States continued to recognize the Chiang Kai-shek government in Formosa, and also the refusal of the United Nations to admit Red China. Frustrated and embittered, the Communists embarked upon a "Hate America" campaign which resounded throughout China and beyond its borders into many parts of Asia.

Then, in November 1950, China entered the Korean conflict and waged war against the United Nations until the armistice was reached in 1953. Red China also aided the Communist Viet Minh forces in Indochina and succeeded in gaining control of North Vietnam during the armistice concluded last year with the French. Now, the same Chinese Communist regime is threatening Formosa and the adjacent islands. All of these events are regarded with some alarm, because they are interpreted by many in this country as an indication that the Chinese Communists are not

satisfied merely with control of their own country, but that they are seeking to extend their realm and to expand their power.

Naturally, this situation calls for a high order of statesmanship—and that applies to both sides. For us, it means that our methods of thinking must assume newer and more dynamic proportions. We need not be frightened by bold and provocative ideas, because the times require dynamic leadership and bold action if we desire to survive as a free Nation. It also means that we must continue unrelentingly our search for world peace, we must explore every possible angle, every hopeful idea, as long as the opportunity for peace still exists.

I have given much thought to this whole problem in recent weeks. I have thought about it day and night. I have no panaceas to offer, no solutions to suggest which would bring about miracles. All I know is that we have been losing ground, slowly but steadily, in the ideological conflict of freedom versus slavery. We have been fighting a cold war with Communist Russia for nearly a decade, and we have not fared too well in that struggle. Ten years ago, in 1945, Russia's armies were almost destroyed and her land laid waste. Today, Russia and Communist China control some 800 million people and together they have enslaved about one-third of the world.

Russia's planned propaganda has been responsible in large measure for the Communist gains. We are depicted as the capitalist aggressor, while Russia is shown as the champion of the oppressed peoples of the world. This form of propaganda has been used with great success by the Communists and has enabled them to exert a terrific impact on those areas of the world which suffer from illiteracy, a low standard of living, periodic famines, and no mass media of public information, such as a free press and radio, whereby the people can learn the true story as presented by the free world.

I believe the time has come for us to meet this type of propaganda head-on. Let us remember that people who are oppressed and hungry will listen to anything, to any idea, that holds out a ray of hope for them. We have no quarrel with the Russian people as people, or with the Chinese people, or with any other people. We want to live in peace with all of them. In the past, our quarrel has been with the Hitlers, the Mussolinis, the Japanese warlords. In recent years, it is with the Stalins, the Khrushchevs, the Maos, and others who set themselves up as dictators by exploiting their people and instigating them to hate their fellow men.

What the United States badly needs in Asia now is not guns and atomic weapons, but ideas to counteract the Communist propaganda in sweep and dynamic appeal. Our major weakness to date has been that we have been thinking primarily in terms of guns and atomic weapons, but we have failed to develop bold ideas to combat communism whose false ideology still appeals to untold millions in Asia. Ideas are no less important than weapons in this world-wide struggle. Unquestionably, we can produce more guns than any other country or combination of countries, but guns alone are not enough. Ideological warfare has become a very important part of the struggle for men's minds and hearts, but when it comes to producing dynamic ideas to combat communism we are suffering from mass hardening of our intellectual arteries.

It is getting very late in Asia, but still not too late. We must face up to this whole complex problem and seek to regain the ideological initiative and the confidence of the peoples of Asia, including the undecided fence-sitters and those now under the yoke of Communist imperialism. In determining this approach, in setting our Asian policy to convince the hundreds of millions of people of this vast continent that their hopes for freedom and a better way of life can be achieved through cooperation with the free nations of the world, we must better understand these people and their aspirations, we must know their political problems, we must have a better conception of their efforts to attain economic and social equality. One thing is certain: We cannot offer 20th century democracy based on an industrial society to underdeveloped countries and illiterate peoples who in many instances are still pulling their own plows. They will not understand us.

There are many millions of people throughout Asia, and also in Europe, who are undecided as to whether they should cast their lot and life with the Communists, or follow our leadership and our way of life. Their decisions may change the whole pattern of the world. In order to win the cold war and to avert a world catastrophe, we must reach the people flanked against us and those who are undecided, with sincerity and understanding, with charity and love—not with acts of hatred which will further inflame them to support their leaders against us. We must appeal to their minds and their hearts, to their feelings and emotions. We must give them the necessary assurances that we desire peace and that we want them to live in peace, too.

I have stated earlier that I have no solutions to offer. But I do want to propose three ideas in the way of suggestions for consideration by the Congress. I want to share these ideas with my colleagues here. I ask you to mull over them. You may agree with one or more of these, you may disagree with all. I am primarily interested that we discuss this whole problem together in our search for permanent peace. I am interested that we give serious consideration to these and other ideas, instead of assuming a frozen posture of fear when faced with the problem of communism. We shall never solve it in a state of fear. An exchange of ideas may lead to some concrete plans or action, in which case our efforts here will not have been in vain.

My first suggestion is that the Congress of the United States should adopt a simple resolution along the lines indicated in my letter of February 3 to General MacArthur. This resolution is to state in clear and unmistakable terms that it is the will of the American people to abolish war and bloodshed as a means of settling international grievances. The resolution should be so framed that it will leave no doubt in the minds of other nations that we abhor war, that we devoutly hope and pray it will be abolished as an instrument of national or international policy, and that we call on all peoples to join with us in this effort so that mankind will not continue to crucify itself on the cross of war as it has done several times in the last four decades since 1914.

True, General MacArthur in his reply voiced the opinion that it requires more than a congressional resolution "to trigger a world-wide movement for the abolition of war." Nevertheless, I feel that as a preliminary step it is logical and advisable to have this country go on record with an expression such as I have indicated a moment ago, so that the whole world would know where we stand in the matter. Certainly, it can do no harm; it might even help to convince some of the undecided fence-sitters to see us in a more favorable light and to cast their lot with us. My colleagues, what I am aiming at is a people-to-people approach to our international problems. I feel that when the House of Representatives speaks in unison, it is echoing the voices of 165 million men, women, and children in America. Such a resolution will be more effective and more appreciated by the peoples of other nations than the statement of any single individual in our Government.

Furthermore, by proclaiming our readiness in concert with other major powers to outlaw war we will demonstrate moral leadership, courage, vision, and strength, as is referred to in General MacArthur's letter. I am thinking of course, of the moral leadership of nations, not the leadership of an individual. I fear that under an individual, no matter how well-intentioned, leadership tends to disintegrate into dictatorship—a notable example being present-day Communist Russia.

There was a time not so very long ago when our Nation was regarded as the moral leader of the world. I am afraid that in recent years we have lost our initiative; if you doubt that, let me remind you that even our friends and allies at times voice the fear that we have become trigger-happy and that we fail to comprehend the madness of an atomic war.

A resolution, such as I suggest, will help restore our initiative and responsibility. It will help dispel all doubt concerning our views on atomic war. It will also serve as unimpeachable evidence that, in the light of the awesome atomic and hydrogen developments, men of good will and universal responsibility are reconsidering and reappraising all possible means of abolishing war.

I now come to my second suggestion, namely, that the United States propose to the United Nations that it devote its sessions in the fall of 1955 to a revision of the United Nations Charter along the following lines: (a) To grant it greater power to halt aggressions; (b) to control atomic materials; (c) to facilitate universal disarmament; (d) to give it

wider scope in undertaking projects to raise the standard of living in underdeveloped and semideveloped countries; (e) and to institute the enforcement of a limited degree of international law.

The United Nations is today the only medium for world peace, the only mission working for peace on a large international scale. But let us be frank about it: It has not been effective. Unfortunately, it has turned out to be little more than a debating society on the one hand and a forum for propaganda on the other hand. Each nation publicly is voicing the righteousness of its cause, but never yielding from its predetermined position or attempting to understand the viewpoints of other nations. No nation publicly will admit any weakness on its part. No diplomat publicly will agree to anything which might be interpreted adversely in his own country. This is understandable to students of foreign affairs. Still, the fact remains that this system of international give-and-take—which is mostly take and very little give—is gradually stiffling the United Nations and pulling it down to the level of ineffectiveness as the late and unlamented League of Nations.

Even the most ardent friends of the United Nations today admit that a revision of the U. N. Charter is badly needed. Gen. Carlos Romulo, one of the founders of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 and a former President of the U. N. General Assembly, stated recently that its charter is dangerously obsolete. Calling for an overhaul of the U. N. Charter, Romulo said that an enforceable world law is the only means to save the world from total destruction.

Sometimes I am not so sure but that the old-line form of private and secret negotiations between nations was much more productive in settling international disputes. The give-and-take bargaining was never aired in public. Only the final agreement was announced, with each participating nation stressing the advantages it had gained for its country. I am not advocating a return to secret diplomacy or an end to open international negotiations. Perhaps a middle course between the two might be advisable whereby these diplomatic meetings would result in greater accomplishments for world peace, instead of degenerating into propaganda platforms. The United Nations must take steps to assure specific achievements in international relations so that its progress can be measured by practical achievements and not by the scoring of propaganda points.

The Charter of the United Nations must be so amended that this international tribunal will be able to provide certain facilities and a proper atmosphere for private consultations among the nations. Just as we in Congress are given the opportunity to do part of our work in executive sessions of the respective committees, so a similar system should be adopted by the United Nations to provide conditions under which the diplomats can rationally discuss conflicting interests and seek to reach an understanding. Yet there will have to be certain assurances whereby the United Nations or the countries directly concerned will be able to keep the people informed of the progress made and the results accomplished.

There is a provision now in the U. N. Charter which states that a majority vote of the U. N. General Assembly is sufficient to call for a conference to review and amend the charter after a lapse of 10 years. It will be 10 years in June that the charter was completed at San Francisco: hence, the time for a revision is both timely and logical.

My third and final suggestion is to establish a mission for peace. This mission is to work independently of the United Nations and is to be a high-level group of elder statesmen. Each nation would select several of its outstanding men and women whose background indicates that they can be dedicated men and women to the cause of peace. In our own country I am thinking, for example, of people like our two former Presidents, Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman, of General MacArthur, Bernard Baruch, and others of their stature. Other countries should select persons similarly renowned for their leadership and prestige.

The United States peace mission would conduct private talks with the peace missions of other countries, perhaps separately at first and as a group later. It matters not how long these talks continue. They could possibly extend over many months. The main goal should always be to explore all possibilities leading toward peace until a final understanding is reached. Notwithstanding all developments and tensions, these dedicated men and women would go on with their search for peace. Eventually, it is hoped and prayed, they would come up with a plan for peace, agreeable to all concerned, which would accomplish two major tasks: First, bring about better understanding among the nations of the world; second, permit all nations to live securely in a world of abundance.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize my three suggestions or ideas which I am proposing to the Congress:

First, a resolution by both Houses of Congress stating that it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes.

Second, to revise the U. N. Charter by extending to the United Nations greater authority to halt aggressions, control atomic materials, facilitate universal disarmament, undertake projects to raise living standards, and enforce international law.

Third, to set up a mission for peace comprised of elder statesmen who would conduct private discussions leading toward peace.

I believe it is logical to assume that the people of Soviet Russia and their leaders are no less worried by the increasing destructiveness of atomic weapons than are the people of this country and of the whole world. I think also that the people of Russia do not like the present atomic race to achieve superiority of armaments, because it is retarding the economic progress of their country. They must surely be aware that they stand to gain greater economic benefits and a higher standard of living under conditions of improved international relations and world peace.

If this be the situation, then let us frankly say to Soviet Russia: If your objective is still world revolution, if you still persist in your policy of world conquest, if you still continue to point up all your efforts in that direction, then it will be well for you to keep in mind at all times that we are prepared to resist you and that we shall not hesitate to use all our might to destroy you. But if you really desire peace and will show the slightest indication in that direction, we shall be glad to meet you half way and to recognize any legitimate claims you may have.

Mr. Speaker, we must leave no stone unturned in our efforts to explore every possibility to avert a new world conflagration. We must extend our search for peace in every direction until we find the right path which will lead us to our ultimate objective.

I should like to conclude with the famous prayer for peace by St. Francis of Assisi:

Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace.
Where there is hatred, let me sow love.
Where there is injury, pardon.
Where there is doubt, faith.
Where there is despair, hope.
Where there is darkness, light.
Where there is sadness, joy.
O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek
To be consoled, as to console;
To be understood, as to understand;
To be loved, as to love;
For it is in giving, that we receive.
It is in pardoning, that we are pardoned.
It is in dying, that we are born to eternal life.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I want to compliment the gentleman on the splendid address he has given.

Mr. ANFUSO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York on his very splendid talk and associate myself with his remarks, especially with reference to the prayer he quoted at the end of his remarks, and to the revision of the United Nations Charter. I think this whole talk was very timely. The gentleman is certainly to be commended on the forethought, the wisdom, and the research he has placed into this very excellent speech.

Mr. ANFUSO. I thank the gentleman.

THE CRITICAL NEED FOR DISABILITY INSURANCE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few moments today to speak about H. R. 5057, the bill which I introduced in this House on March 18. H. R. 5057 is a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide disability insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, for their wives, and for their children.

This is not a new proposal. Its merits have been considered and debated at length by congressional, executive, and other authorities for a number of years. Unfortunately, no action has been taken to date to implement these discussions, and to meet a critical need, through the enactment of a sound, comprehensive, legislative program of disability insurance.

More than 2 years ago, I introduced in this House the bill H. R. 3554, 83d Congress, which proposed a disability insurance program. My current bill, H. R. 5057, represents a considerable measure of improvement over the earlier measure. Its contents have been carefully reviewed and revised on several occasions, and the bill incorporates various constructive suggestions received from our legislative counsel, from the people in the Social Security Administration, and from various other persons who have written or spoken to me about this legislation.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF H. R. 5057?

Under our present law, workers covered by social-security insurance can first begin receiving benefits when they reach age 65. This age limitation applies both to men and women. The law, as it stands today, has no provision for those insured workers who become totally disabled and lose their income-earning capacity before reaching age 65.

H. R. 5057 would remedy this situation, by providing regular primary benefits to insured workers who become totally disabled, after they have been so disabled for 6 months and have applied for these benefits.

In this manner, the bill would benefit two general categories of persons insured by the Social Security System: In the first place, it would aid those insured workers who may become totally disabled for a period of at least 7 months, but who eventually return to their gainful employment. In addition, the bill would benefit those who become totally and permanently disabled before reaching age 65.

This is the first major provision of H. R. 5057.

Secondly, H. R. 5057 would authorize the payment of secondary or supplemental benefits to the wife and the minor children of the totally disabled worker. These dependents would receive the same type of payments as those to which they would ordinarily become entiled upon the worker's retirement at age 65. This provision is included in the bill because the insured worker's primary benefits provide only for his own needs, and are insufficient to aid in the support of his family.

Thirdly, the bill would continue the provision of the social-security law, approved by Congress last year, which freezes the worker's earnings record during the period of his disability.

This needed provision states that periods of disability shall not be taken into account in determining insured status or average monthly wage for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. In this manner, it safeguards the worker's insurance benefits. Previously, long periods of disability, during which the worker was unable to earn any wage credits, reduced the amount of his retirement payments and in some instances could wipe them out altogether.

Fourthly, the bill would utilize the present procedure used by the Social Security Administration in determining disability status of insured workers. The services performed in this regard by the various State agencies would continue to be fully utilized for this purpose.

In other words, the bill retains the best provisions of the present law and supplements them by authorizing the payment of total disability insurance benefits regardless of the wage earner's age.

THE DIRE NEED FOR DISABILITY INSURANCE

The problem of total disability is a serious problem to the thousands of disabled persons all over the country who write to their Representatives in Congress for help that cannot be given to them under our present law.

Each year, many thousands of our workers meet with physical disasters which rob them of their earning capacity. The majority of those workers cannot depend on any income during the period of their disability. As a result, their families must suffer privation and hardship, and frequently look to local, State, and Federal agencies for relief dole.

For almost two decades, this problem has been noted in practically every serious study made of the problems of disability. These studies recognized the need for Government action to protect workers and their families against this risk—against the financial drain which is even more serious than that of unemployment, old age, and death.

As early as 1938, the Advisory Council on Social Security agreed unanimously on the desirability of providing social insurance for permanently and totally disabled persons, and for their dependents. By 1948, the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance recommended immediate incorporation of disability protection into the social-security system. The council said this:

> There can be no question concerning the need for such protection. On an average day the number of persons kept from gainful work by disabilities which have continued for more than 6 months is about 2 million. The economic hardship resulting from permanent and total disability is frequently even greater than that created by old age or death. The family must not only face the loss of the breadwinner's earnings, but must meet the cost of medical care. As a rule, savings and other personal resources are exhausted. The problem of the disabled younger worker is particularly difficult because he is likely to have young children and not to have had an opportunity to acquire any significant savings.

More recently, other groups and study commissions further stressed this need, recommending the enactment of legislation to provide social insurance against the hazard of permanent and total disability.

EXISTING PROVISIONS FOR THE DISABLED

At present, we have a multiplicity of programs which provide limited and selective insurance against the risk of disability.

The fact remains, however, that existing Government programs, industry, union, and private insurance plans protect only a minority of the working population. The majority of the people are still without protection—short of the ultimate resort to public relief—once prolonged disability has brought destitution and hardship to them and to their families.

This is due to the fact that the hodgepodge of programs in this field provides only partial and selective protection to given groups, and to the fact that our basic social-security system does not as yet provide for disability insurance for the population at large.

PERMANENT TOTAL DISABILITY AND RETIREMENT

It has long been widely recognized that physical old age is not always closely related to chronological age. While many workers may be able and willing to work past age 65, others are compelled to stop working at a much earlier age because of incurable diseases such as inoperable cancer, advanced heart condition, tuberculosis, arthritis, and so on. For all practical purposes, these individuals are prematurely retired from the labor market.

Unless disability insurance is provided for persons in this category, this lack may create pressures which may have serious effect on the old age and survivors insurance program. We may be gradually forced to adopt a considerable lowering of the retirement age. If this happens, it will not be because people in general wish to retire earlier, but due to the pressure of an increasing number of disabled persons—particularly those in the upper age group—who are in dire need of assistance.

If we try to meet this very real need by enabling all persons to retire at an early age, it will cost us much more than a direct approach of providing disability benefits only to those who are totally disabled and who can therefore qualify for them.

ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF DISABILITY

Many income studies conducted during recent years point out that disability and low income go hand in hand in many instances. These studies point out that among the urban families in the low-income class, one of the chief causes of poverty was traced to the disability of the head of the family.

Other studies also show that disability accounts for a very large portion of public relief expenditures. This also applies to private charity which helps an additional number of disabled persons.

By providing a systematic program of social insurance against disability—such

as the program outlined in H. R. 5057—it would be possible in time to reduce the need for relief and public dole.

THE DESIRABILITY OF SOCIAL INSURANCE APPROACH

The enactment of the proposals contained in H. R. 5057 will not eliminate the economic cost of disability. However, this proposal would provide a systematic contributory method for workers to help meet those costs before they occur. It would also sharply reduce the present financial burden of relief and public assistance.

The risks of disability can be made a budgetable expense for workers, just as the risks of old age and death have been made budgetable expense through the old age and survivors insurance program. This social insurance method is applicable to this problem, and should be adopted.

Social insurance, geared to the workers' earnings, would afford protection as a matter of right to those insured workers who become totally and perhaps permanently disabled. The benefits would make it possible for them to live on an income they had previously helped to purchase. It would prevent them from being forced into destitution, and from turning to charity and public relief.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to describe the serious need for a comprehensive disability insurance program, and how H. R. 5057 would meet this need.

I believe that the proposal contained in H. R. 5057 is sound and equitable, and that it merits prompt and thorough consideration. The estimated cost of this disability-insurance program would be reasonable; the level premium net increase in costs would be approximately 1.5 to 1.92 percent of covered payroll. For that modest increase in contributions to the social-security fund, it would be possible to provide monthly benefits for temporary-total and for permanent-total disabilities.

It is my intention to continue to work for early consideration of this legislation, and I earnestly hope that these efforts will merit the support of other Members of this body.

BLENNERHASSETT ISLAND NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire Blennerhassett Island in order to create the Blennerhassett Island National Monument. This project has received the endorsement of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia and was the subject of a communication from that body to the Congress on March 22, 1955. Likewise the proposal has the approval of the West Virginia Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you are familiar with the romantic history of this famous island. During a turbulent time of western expansion, Harman Blennerhassett settled there, building a mansion luxuriously furnished in the Old World tradition. To this showplace came Aaron Burr, with grandiose plans for his ill-fated conspiracy. There, he met in Harman Blennerhassett, a willing partner. In this stately setting, plans and arrangements for the western adventure were made. The island was the point of departure for that band of men, led by Burr, who were to carry out those plans.

Today the old house is no longer standing. Many of the landmarks of the Blennerhassett occupancy have disappeared. But Blennerhassett Island in the beautiful Ohio River Valley remains a lovely spot, a scenic attraction of major interest. It is ideally situated for a national monument not only because of its historical interest, but because of its geographical location and its excellent recreational possibilities.

The central Ohio Valley is a region of great promise. It looks forward to future industrial development and expansion, with consequent increases in population. No part of our national-parks system is now readily available or conveniently located to meet the recreational needs of the area. Certainly Blennerhassett Island, if properly developed, could satisfy those needs. Therefore, I sincerely hope that this bill will receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

INCREASE IN SUGAR MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the domestic sugar producers of this country are the victims of an extremely unfair set of circumstances. Our Nation is growing by leaps and bounds and is consuming more sugar each year. And yet, our domestic sugar producers are denied the right to grow and sell one single pound of this increased consumption. Today, I have introduced a bill which will correct this situation, and I urge the support of my colleagues.

In 1948, American sugar producers took an important step. In farsighted recognition of the necessity to give the Republic of Cuba an opportunity to reduce its sugar production from abnormally high wartime levels, the domestic producers temporarily relinquished their right to share in the growth of the domestic market. Under the 1948 act, domestic sugar producers can market no more than 2,300,000 tons in 1 year, while Cuba was given the right to market 95 percent of the amount by which the war damaged Philippine industry would fall short of its quota while rebuilding. At the same time, Cuba continued to share with domestic areas in making up deficits. Thus, Cuba has marketed some 5,250,000 extra tons of sugar in the United States, almost 30 percent more than its basic quota.

As I have stated, the domestic producers relinquished their own just rights to give Cuba an opportunity to reduce production. What has happened? Cuba not only did not reduce, but increased production, and in 1952, it produced 8 million tons, one-third more than could be marketed anywhere in the world.

Here at home, due to improved technology and better farming methods, sugar beet tonnage yield per acre has increased 20 percent since 1948. Last year, sugar beet acreage was 10 percent less than before the first sugar act went into effect, but production was 14 percent more. The fixed quota of 2,300,000 tons is forcing further acreage cuts of 10 to 15 percent by established growers. Hardly any other farmer will be permitted to plant sugar beets at all, and many of the latter are war veterans on newly opened reclamation projects of the West, where sugar beets are vitally needed in the crop rotation.

Mr. Speaker, if we now increase the 1955 marketing quotas for domestic beet and mainland cane areas, we do no more than to restore a just and basic right to a domestic farmer, that of sharing in the economic growth of his own country. Right now, in spite of the acreage cuts, production is exceeding marketing quotas, although the markets exist. The prime beneficiary, Cuba, has had ample opportunity to comply with the spirit of the 1948 Sugar Act by reducing production from wartime levels. In contravention of this spirit, Cuba has increased production. We now feel that the right to share in our own growth, which we temporarily relinquished, should be restored to our growers.

Passage of this bill will not be a repudiation of the historic rights of Cuba to market sugar in this country. It will only restore what has been the historic right of the American producer.

I sincerely urge your support of this bill.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of California, for the period from April 19 to April 26, 1955, inclusive, on account of official business.

Mr. LANKFORD, for the period from April 19 to April 22, 1955, inclusive, on account of official business (Board of Visitors of Naval Academy).

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 35. An act to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LONG and to include a radio address.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a speech.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CEDERBERG and to include an address.

Mr. SILER.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. WILSON of California in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

696. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the report on use and disposal of Federal surplus property, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 141); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

697. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Seventh Semiannual Report of the Department of Defense pertaining to the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records for the period July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 220, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report by the Bureau of Mines for the calendar year January 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, pursuant to sections 106 (a) and 212 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 692; Public Law 552, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

699. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on synthetic liquid fuels for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of April 5, 1944 (30 U. S. C. 321–325 as amended); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

700. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules of records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

701. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

702. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 7511 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide exemption for diplomatic officers and employees from payment of internal revenue taxes on imported articles"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MACDONALD: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1816. A bill to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4954. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 5594. A bill providing for the designation of a highway across the Continental Divide as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 5595. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5596. A bill to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall pay the premiums required of a guardian of any incompetent veteran by the court of jurisdiction or by the Administrator; to the Committee on Veterans' Administration.

By Mr. ENGLE (by request):

H. R. 5597. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 5598. A bill to provide that individuals enlisted into the Armed Forces of the United States shall take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 5599. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, in order to provide authority to allocate and establish priorities for Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5600. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 5601. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 5602. A bill to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5603. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 5604. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus personal property to certain institutions engaged in scientific research which are taking part in educational or public health programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 5605. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 5606. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus personal property to certain institutions engaged in scientific research which are taking part in educational or public health programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 5607. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5608. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 5609. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Blennerhassett Island National Monument on Blennerhassett Island in the Ohio River near Parkersburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5610. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to repeal the exemptions for retail and service establishments and for processors of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5611. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, in order to provide authority to allocate and establish priorities for Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5612. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 5613. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for monetary forfeitures in the case of violations of the Federal Communications Commission's rules and regulations relating to radio stations other than broadcast stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5614. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization with-

out hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 5615. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 5616. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on motorcycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 5617. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to extend certain survivors' benefits under such act to widowers of employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5618. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to certain survivors' benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5619. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 5620. A bill to regulate the hours and wages of Federal Government employees whose wages are established by wage boards and administrative authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5621. A bill to regulate the payment of overtime wages paid to Federal Government employees whose wages are established by wage boards and other administrative authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 5622. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5623. A bill to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 5624. A bill to grant career appointments to certain employees in positions under temporary or indefinite appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 5625. A bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Air Station, Houma, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. J. Res. 280. Joint resolution for the preservation of Rock Creek Park; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SILER:

H. J. Res. 281. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte, Luzon, and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. Res. 209. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 210. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to the Federal Open Market Committee, and other matters; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress endorsing the resolution calling for a $1,250,000 survey of the alarming mental-health problem in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG: Joint resolution of the State of Nevada Assembly, memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate funds to the United States Geological Survey to match State offerings for continuing the program of cooperative investigation of water resouces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Senate, memorializing the Congress of the United States and the congressional delegation from the State of Nevada to forbear any action leading to the termination of the Federal trusteeship over American Indian wards and properties held in trust for American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Senate, memorializing the Nevada congressional delegation to introduce and endeavor to pass legislation requiring the exploration of radioactive minerals in Nevada; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Assembly, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to facilitate national centennial celebrations in commemoration of the 1857 act of Congress allowing the creation of the Pacific Overland Mail Route; urging local agencies and groups to cooperate therein; commending the American Association for State and Local History; and other matters properly relating thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Senate, memorializing the Nevada congressional delegation to join in petitioning the Congress to amend present laws so as to enable a highway to be constructed as part of the interstate highway system between Utah and Colorado without regard to present mileage limitations; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, joint resolution of the State of Nevada Senate, memorializing the President of the United States, the Nevada congressional delegation and others to do their utmost to effectuate the construction of a four-lane highway over the Sierra Nevada Mountain Ranges as a matter of public defense and necessity; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the storage of surplus wheat in California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to payments in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to set aside the Veterans' Administration property at Fort Logan adjacent to Denver as a Veterans' Administration domiciliary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an act passed by the Nevada Legislature, designating the Honorable Patrick A. McCarran, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, to be honored by a statue to be placed in Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting a revision of the Federal defense manpower policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to aid the farmers, peach growers and other fruit growers of Spartanburg County and other counties in the State who have suffered so disastrously from the recent unseasonable cold weather; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide for annual regular sessions of the legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5626. A bill for the relief of Fred Mazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5627. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Demos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5628. A bill for the relief of Maria Alexandrina Martins Almeida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 5629. A bill for the relief of On Low Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 5630. A bill for the relief of Frederick P. Fulmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5631. A bill for the relief of Antonio Hernandez-Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 5632. A bill for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5633. A bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5634. A bill for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5635. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 5636. A bill for the relief of Luigi Valas (also known as Louis Rick); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5637. A bill for the relief of Kim Sung Il; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5638. A bill for the relief of Henry Luis Gilbert Labayen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5639. A bill for the relief of William Franklin Rollins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5640. A bill for the relief of Sister Philomena Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 5641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takayo Uota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 5642. A bill for the relief of Amado Martinez-Mora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5643. A bill for the relief of Tsutomu Fujinami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5644. A bill for the relief of Hermann Weyl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

200. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution in support of H. R. 4746, to permit broader Federal participation in protection of shore lands from erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

201. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the mayor, Chicago, Ill., requesting Congress to consider salary adjustments for post office employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

202. Also, petition of Clara Patalita vda de Rosanegro and other claimants Valladolid, Negros Occidental, Philippines, relative to claims of claimants composed of deceased veterans' dependent parents, widows, guardians, and veterans themselves, of Valladolid, Negros Occidental, Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address of the Honorable Daniel J. Flood to the General Assembly of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, April 17, 1955, at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, United Nations Plaza, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

This evening gives me an opportunity to speak to the exiles from central Europe who have come to my country to work for the restoration of liberty in their subjugated countries. I see here my friends from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Yugoslavia, and other central European countries.

All these countries have great political and cultural histories.

More than 1,000 years ago, the ancestors of the Czechs and Slovaks of present Czechoslovakia set up the great Moravian Empire that had its continuation in the ancient Kingdom of Bohemia known throughout the world for its famous rulers and statesmen, St. Venceslas, Charles IV, and George Podebrad, and for its warriors who braved the armies of all Europe.

Already in the 11th century the great Hungarian King Stephen introduced western Christianity and with it western civilization to his people. Hungary became the bulwark of this civilization and of Christian culture. Together with the other central European states she defended them against the invader until that moment in history when the great King of Poland stopped the invasion at the gates of Vienna.

The historical record of Poland goes back to the 10th century. From the 14th to the 17th century Poland was a great power which influenced the destinies of Europe for centuries. Poland's contribution to the formation of the ideology of national freedom was especially impressive. Torn asunder in the following centuries by three powers which stifled her national life, Poland never resigned herself to defeat and battled her way in repeated uprisings, through unfavorable conditions, to a new freedom and independence.

Yugoslavia, inhabited by the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes has a long, heroic history of struggle for freedom against foreign invaders. The defeat of Kosovo Polé in 1389 marked but the beginning of the centuries long struggles that fortified the peoples of Yugoslavia to supreme national heroism.

A cruel struggle for national survival and independence has been the fate of the Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians throughout the centuries. The position of these countries and nations was most difficult. There was no neighbor, who was not far more powerful and who did not covet the rich commercial centers on the Baltic Sea, and who did not attempt to break up the organized national life of the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Nevertheless, the peoples survived and lived to see their freedom restored.

The cultural contribution of your Central European states and nations is even more impressive. One hundred and fifty years before Columbus discovered America, the University of Prague was founded and soon after, the University of Cracow. Central Europe has given us such great pioneers of human progress like Jan Amos Comenius. Modern democracy also had its root in these countries. A Czech statute in 1579, which underlined the concept of the "due process of law", was the predecessor of the American Constitution.

American democracy is especially grateful to men like Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski who came to our country to help us win our independence. From their long suffering homeland they brought with them an enthusiasm for liberty and showed by their deeds and sacrifices that human freedom is indivisible.

After World War I the countries of Central Europe renewed at long last their national states. They built up their internal democracies and were highly successful in their cultural and economic development. They contributed to international cooperation by their sincere support of the League of Nations and the legal system of postwar Europe.

Thomas G. Masaryk and Dr. Eduard Benes from Czechoslovakia were helpful in laying the foundations to international compulsory arbitration, disarmament, and the executive power of the world organization. In cooperation with other statesmen from Central and Eastern European countries, they created a network of international treaties which, if observed, would have stabilized Europe and guaranteed peaceful development. Unfortunately, this favorable evolution was broken off by Nazi aggression. After Austria came Czechoslovakia whose dismemberment at Munich was soon followed by the destruction of Warsaw and Belgrade and by the subjugation of the Baltic States and, in fact, of Hungary as well.

The victory of the Allies in 1940 liberated the Central European countries from the yoke of Nazi German imperialism. But their liberation was a sham. In fact, one totalitarianism, imperalism, and dictatorship was exchanged for another. And in this way ancient historic countries, the cradles of culture, the friends and allies of Western democracies that had played such an important role in the family of free nations, became captives of Soviet Russia.

We often ask how this was possible; how could it happen; what were the real causes of this so unhappy and catastrophical development. Our Congress has even investigated the background and causes that had led to the takeover and enslavement of the Baltic and Central European countries.

As in every phenomenon, this new subjugation of Central Europe may be attributed to a number of causes both internal and external. We may, for instance, speak of the errors committed by the leading statesmen of the Western democracies. We may censure them for Europe's division into military zones, agreed upon in Teheran and Yalta. We may question the Western negotiators for not realizing fully that a military zone in Soviet terminology means also a political zone and that democracy in Soviet terminology means a "people's democracy," actually the dictatorship of the Communist Party.

In this way, the Central European countries, one by one, and finally Czechoslovakia became Communist captive states, the Baltic States were actually absorbed into the Soviet Union.

But it is not enough to stop at Teheran and Yalta. One must go much further in analyzing the past to discover the real cause of the subjugation of Central Europe. It lies deep in the past policy of world democracy. Long before Yalta and Teheran, I would say immediately after World War I, the cause was laid which molded the conditions as they are today in Central Europe. At that time, democratic Europe, born of the victory of the Western democracies over the feudalistic central powers, should have been defended in time. Instead, Hitler's aggression against Austria and Czechoslovakia was not resisted by the Western Powers. Even before that came to pass, the Western Powers should have made it clear that the clauses of the peace treaty were meant seriously. An effective world organization should have been set up and all democratic states should have defended the legal system of the world and the sanctity of international treaties. But complacency set in. The slogan "Peace in Our Time" weakened the determination of the democracies and led to such an inflation of Nazi power that it could be broken only with the assistance of the Soviet Union. This unhappy development brought the Red army into the very heart of Europe, to the Elbe and the Vltava (the Czech name for Moldau).

I think it not only fair but wise to let these errors in the past be a lesson to us. The lesson is obvious. The political life of a country should be something more than the pursuing of everyday interests; it should be the implementation of a general plan based on objective thinking and moral law.

Your platform of the Christian Democratic Union and the addresses of your officers emphasize this very important character of sound politics.

I am sure that if we stress logic and the moral law in political life we can avoid the errors of the past, those errors that led a considerable part of the world and within your countries to the present state of slavery. The demand for the liberation of Central and Eastern European countries will then be accepted as a logical consequence of a policy that is the result of both clear thinking and sound moral evaluation. For Americans this demand is Lincoln's creed on a world scale: That the world cannot be half free and half slave.

The liberation policy is, however, not only a logical conclusion of our American doctrine that the political life should be the implementation of a general moral principle, valid for all the nations and times. It is also in line with the political, economic, and strategic interests of the United States.

Our independence and our economy is closely connected with the conditions in Europe, I would say with a free Europe, in which a balance of power is maintained and economic prosperity is assured. Twice already in our generation we had to defend our political interests on the battlefields of Europe. For us it is obvious that a Europe subjugated by a dictatorship, aspiring to world domination, is tantamount to a constant danger to our shores. And an impoverished Europe is our concern, too. For such a Europe would be a spawning ground for social upheaval leading to a victory of negative and bellicose political trends.

I conclude that the liberation policy is the strength of democracy and the only guaranty to the free world against aggression and internal subversion from a totalitarian threat. We Americans have no other choice: We must be strong if we want to save peace and our freedom. And our strength is inseparably connected with the freedom of the world. Your Congress has for its guiding motto: "Freedom—a prerequisite of lasting peace." This motto is no less true for American foreign policy. We can be free only if our friends, too, enjoy freedom. Peace, like freedom, is indivisible.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before Indiana Republican Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address I delivered before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, in Indianapolis, Ind., on Saturday, April 16, 1955.

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

Mr. Chairman, Governor Craig, Senators Capehart and Jenner, and fellow Americans, in the 10 years since the Yalta Conference of February 4–11, 1945, great advances have been made by the Communist world.

At that time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today over 800 million people have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the lessons of history, the voices of appeasement appear to be growing at home and abroad. Some suggest that Quemoy and Matsu be allowed to pass into Communist hands. It is my strong belief that such an event will be looked upon as a great Communist victory and will undermine the remaining confidence the free anti-Communist nations of Asia have in the Government and the people of the United States.

Why is it that the voices of appeasement always urge that our friends and allies be the ones to give up territory or to yield up more people to communism? Why do they not suggest that it is time for the Iron Curtain to move backward rather than forward? The fact of the matter is that Quemoy and Matsu are as important to free China as Western Berlin is to free Germany.

What military or civilian official would try to maintain that Western Berlin, a metropolitan island completely surrounded by Soviet territory, is defensible in and of itself? The fact of the matter is that our garrison in Berlin, the wives and children who accompany them, are hostages to potential Soviet aggression.

We have felt it important, however, to maintain this island of freedom in the heart of Soviet territory despite the fact that it is aggravating to the Communists because it is important to the morale of the free German Republic and it is a beacon of hope to the Germans behind the Iron Curtain that some day they too may be free.

The reason that Western Berlin has not passed behind the Iron Curtain is the fact that the Soviet Union knows that any attempt to take over the area by force would immediately involve the western allies in military action.

Though we took some grave risks we broke the 1948 Communist blockade of Berlin by the airlift. There are now indications that the Communists are again attempting to strangle the economic life of that island of freedom.

Have they been encouraged in this new action by the voices of appeasement here and abroad? These have indicated that we must placate Communist countries when they get aggravated for otherwise we may be risking armed conflict.

Does history teach us that this is the way to a lasting peace? The answer, of course, is no.

At Munich Chamberlain and Deladier succumbed to the threats and pleadings of Hitler that if they would but agree to turn over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia to him that he would have no further territorial demands in Europe.

Without the consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia this sordid deal was made. To salve their conscience Great Britain and France agreed to guarantee the frontier of the reduced Czechoslovakian state.

Seven months later, Hitler's legions took over the balance of Czechoslovakia. The conscience of the two guarantors was disturbed and several speeches were made as to the immorality of such aggression.

The guarantee given 7 months before did not save the people of Czechoslovakia for by then they had lost their will to fight largely because they had lost their faith in the western allies to do anything more than to talk and to appease.

What deadly parallel does this furnish to the situation in the Formosa Straits today?

Quemoy and Matsu have never been Chinese Communist territory.

That these outposts have a military value no man can deny for they certainly make more difficult the launching of an amphibious assult out of the harbors of Amoy and Foochow as long as the free Chinese control these islands.

But equally important as their military value is their psychological value. Their loss by appeasement will bring as much despair to free China as the deal at Munich for the Sudetenland caused despair to the free people of Czechoslovakia.

It will also shake the confidence of our friends in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, and elsewhere where people understand the true brutal aggressive nature of communism.

I again want to emphasize that in my opinion the morale value of Quemoy and Matsu is as high for Free China as is that of Western Berlin for free Germany.

There are some who believe that you can distinguish between a Communist assault on Quemoy and Matsu in and of themselves and Quemoy and Matsu as stepping stones toward Formosa and the Pescadores. What nonsense is this? When the assault is underway, are we to inquire through the good offices of Mr. Hammarskjold, of Mao Tse Tung and Chou En-Lai in Peiping as to whether their assault is only for the possession of these outer ramparts?

If at such a time, with tongue in cheek, the Communist leaders believe that it would be to their advantage to prevent American support going to our ally, the Republic of China, and they reply that their temporary objective is only Quemoy and Matsu will we ask them to reinforce their statement by saying: "Do you guarantee this with a cross your heart and hope to die assurance?"

In the light of the bald-face violation of the Korean armistice and the Geneva agreement what would such an assurance be worth?

I was amazed and shocked by the speech of Adlai Stevenson on last Monday night. He not only appears to be giving the green light to the loss of Quemoy and Matsu, but he also cast reflection upon the future of the island of Formosa itself.

Less than 2 months after the Congress approved the Formosa resolution by a vote of 410 to 3 in the House and 85 to 3 in the Senate and after the ratification of our mutual defense pact with the Republic of China by a vote of 64 to 6, Mr. Stevenson stated that we should seek to get certain of our allies to line up with us in the defense of Formosa against any aggression "pending some final settlement of its status—by independence, neutralization, trusteeship, plebiscite, or whatever is wiser."

What a way to build confidence in our ally, with whom we have just entered into a mutual defense treaty.

There was no suggestion by Mr. Stevenson that there might be a plebiscite on the mainland of China to see if the Chinese are satisfied with their loss of freedom by Communist aggression supported by the Soviet Union.

Does not Mr. Stevenson know that the free people of China would look upon a United Nations trusteeship as only a form of multiple colonialism for such a trusteeship would undermine if not destroy the sovereignty of the Republic of China?

Certainly the Republic of China will not consent to a United Nations or any other type of a trusteeship over the island of Formosa.

What United Nations mouse is expected to "bell the cat"? In the first United Nations action against overt aggression in Korea only 17 members of the United Nations supplied any armed forces whatsoever. The 16 nations outside of the United States which made a contribution supplied only 45,000, whereas the United States of America contributed more than 450,000 and we rotated more than 1 million men through the Far Eastern theater during the Korean war.

Certainly neither Mr. Stevenson nor the members of the United Nations expect to have the United States of America supply the armed forces to disarm the defense forces of the Republic of China with whom we have just entered into a treaty of mutual security.

This would be such an obvious treachery that no responsible citizen of this country would tolerate it and no public official that advocated it would continue in office beyond the next election.

Would the trusteeship be established then by the United Nations members other than the United States of America? It could only be done by that organization committing an act of aggression against the Republic of China. Not only do we have a treaty of mutual assistance with free China, but does any responsible person believe that having only contributed 45,000 troops to resist Communist aggression in Korea that organization would now furnish a larger force to neutralize the approximately 400,000 who constitute the armed force of the Republic of China?

Or does Mr. Stevenson believe that India, which furnished only an ambulance unit in the Korean war, will be the one to do the job? Does he really believe that the free Chinese on Formosa would tolerate an Indian occupation of their island?

What sense does it make to on the one hand be building a collective security system in the Far Pacific and on the other giving consideration to the neutralization of one-third of the available non-Communist armed forces in that area of the world. During the early days of our Republic we had an expression "United we stand, divided we fall."

As a matter of national policy are we now to preach a doctrine for our friends abroad "Divided you stand until the Communists gain sufficient strength to make you fall?"

As one American, I get no satisfaction at all from a divided Korea, a divided Germany, or a divided Vietnam. I see nothing in either example that should want us to put our stamp of approval on a divided China which is the meaning of a so-called two China's policy.

Let's put ourselves in the unlikely position of facing the situation wherein Communist forces, by armed action supported by the Soviet Union, should be able to take over mainland America and our Government was temporarily forced to the Territory of Hawaii or Alaska. Would we accept a two-Americas policy? Would we give up the effort to restore constitutional government to our people and to our homeland? The answer is, of course, a resounding "No" on both counts.

There will never be an easy solution to the problems facing this country and the free world. Whenever a line is drawn there will be cogent reasons advanced for making it at some other time or place.

There are some who oppose the drawing of the line at Quemoy and Matsu who say that they would be willing to stand on the line of Formosa and the Pescadores, but would they really be willing to stand even there?

Will they not, like some of the British, Prime Minister Nehru, and Adlai Stevenson then being to throw doubt even upon the future of Formosa?

In a final desperate effort to avoid facing up to the realistic issue of Communist aggression, will they at that point urge that the problem be thrown into the United Nations?

There a combination of the Communist nations, neutralist powers, and some of our fair-weather friends presently tending toward a "peace at any price policy" could join forces in agreeing to a far eastern Munich that will give to the Communists at a conference another substantial victory at the expense of the Republic of China.

The smaller nations of the world should stop, look, and listen before they join their voices to those of the other appeasers. If the Republic of China, with 9½ million people, can be sold down the river at a far eastern Munich so then could the more than 30 independent nations having populations of less than that figure.

With the record of a quarter century of broken agreements by the Soviet Union, I have questioned the advisability of entering into another meeting of the heads of state until the Soviet Union has shown by deeds rather than words that they are prepared to respect agreements entered into.

Yalta should have been a warning signal to the American people that there is no moral right for large nations, including our own, to distribute the territory and the people of our allies such as was done with Poland and with China.

The rather dubious argument is advanced that the Soviet forces were already in occupation of Poland and would have been in a position to occupy much of China if we had not consented to their demands.

Since when has America come to subscribe to the strange new doctrine that if the bandit is in possession of the loot he should be given a clean bill of health morally and a legal title to the same?

Have we allowed international morals to fall so low that we now are prepared to accept the doctrine that might makes right?

I think not. Any public officials who in the future, regardless of the party in power, try to shackle the moral position of the American people in such chains will, in my judgment, be overwhelmingly repudiated.

Do we have a right to be concerned with the revelations of the Yalta papers? I believe we do from a constitutional viewpoint. The facts of the Yalta agreement were misrepresented to the Congress of the United States, a coequal branch of the Government, by President Roosevelt when he said in his official report to the Congress on March 1, 1945, regarding the Yalta Conference:

"Quite naturally this Conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war."

This was a false official report.

Do we have a right to be concerned with what went on at Yalta?

The record clearly shows that the Government of the United States was first advised regarding the connections of Alger Hiss with a Soviet espionage ring as early as the fall of 1939 and at several subsequent times before the Yalta Conference of February 1945.

Those who had some share of the responsibility in permitting Alger Hiss to go to Yalta have tried to cover up their dereliction by claiming that he had little more than office-boy status and at most limited his activities to United Nations affairs.

Now for the first time in the 1945 official papers of the Government of the United States, on page 91 of the Yalta papers, we learn that:

"At the Secretary's staff committee meeting of January 10, the Secretary asked that all memoranda for the President on topics to be discussed at the meeting of the Big Three should be in the hands of Mr. Alger Hiss not later than Monday, January 15."

Does this even demonstrate a reasonable degree of caution for protecting the vital interests of this country? It was not necessary for Alger Hiss to carry on negotiations at a high level to do great damage to this Nation and to our allies. It was only necessary for the Soviet Union to have advance information as to the agreed policy positions that this Government would take, where we would stand firm, where we would be prepared to yield, and what agreements we would seek to get.

I see by the papers that former President Truman is in Washington tonight where he is scheduled to join in the attack on the Republican administration of President Eisenhower.

Perhaps he will clarify why he termed the congressional investigation of the Hiss case a "red herring."

Perhaps he will state why he wrote a letter of commendation for Harry Dexter White, another member of the conspiracy who played an important part in the pre-Yalta decisions.

Perhaps he will tell why his Secretary of State Dean Acheson in January of 1950 drew a defense line in the Pacific leaving Korea and Formosa on the outside. Many believe the Communists then determined they could take Korea without great risk.

Perhaps he will tell why his Secretary of his administration in 1945 and 1946 was to put pressure on President Chiang Kai-shek urging him to accept Communists into his government when coalition with communism has been fatal wherever tried.

Perhaps he will explain why, contrary to the advice of his commanders in the field, MacArthur, Van Fleet, Clark, and Stratemeyer, he permitted the hands of our Armed Forces to be tied and the Communists to have the advantage of the Yalu River sanctuary.

Perhaps he may even explain on whose advice and why he neutralized the Formosa Straits and made it possible for the Communist coast defense troops to be safely moved to Manchuria and then to Korea where they were used against our own forces there.

Perhaps he will, but I doubt it.

Just recently I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. Frankly, I would much rather take his view on the dangers we face than I would the views of the 1952 Democratic candidate for President of the United States. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances, as well as those of my country and the entire free world, rest with the firm stop the Communist march movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain one island or one small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

This Nation was not born nor did it grow to its position of greatness based on a policy of fear, but rather one of faith and courage.

As an American citizen and as a Senator of the United States, I am convinced that if we will only use the same faith and courage that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe to have been divine guidance, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve, and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Watch Bandung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Carlos P.

Romulo printed in the Sunday Washington Star magazine This Week, under date of April 17, 1955.

I hope that every Member of this Congress has read this article. It contains statements of facts and a very penetrating analysis of what could happen at the conference of Asian and African nations at Bandung, Indonesia.

It is extremely important to the United States and to the free world that Mr. Romulo is a delegate to this conference. Those of us who have served in the House with Mr. Romulo know of his thorough understanding that our country has no desire whatever to promote colonialism, directly or indirectly, which was conclusively indicated when in 1946 we passed the law liberating the Philippines and thereby making them a free nation.

Because of his vast experience as a member of the United Nations and influence wielded as President of the United Nations Assembly, he has a deep understanding of the problems and the outlook of the verious peoples of Asia. Very important also is that he is an Asian who has a profound understanding of the United States and its policies. He knows that we are determined to bring world peace, if possible, not only for our own welfare but for the good of all the peoples of the world. He can talk the language of and understand the viewpoint of the Asians. He understands thoroughly that communism must be checked if we are to have world peace. He also knows that the colonial system is what developed hatred in the minds of Asians and Africans against the western democracies. As he says, nothing could be more terrible and ruinous than a war between whites and nonwhites.

He could be a key figure at this conference that might bring the understanding and mutual respect between the Americans and the Asians that is needed to weld the world together in respect and understanding. The small and explosive world of today cannot take another war without consequences that are terrible to contemplate.

The article referred to follows:

This Monday my country, the Philippines, will take its seat at a high-level diplomatic conference which some of our closest friends in the West initially urged us to boycott.

Thirty Asian and African nations, Communist China among them, have been invited to Bandung, Indonesia, ostensibly to promote peace and cooperation. While this may sound like a fairly routine get-together, it actually can shift the course of history. Its effects a generation from now may be catastrophic.

Why is this meeting so ominous? For two reasons:

1. Here are the makings of a dynamic new alignment of political forces—an alignment which, if it solidifies, must make more and more difficult the free world's struggle to stay the advance of communism.

2. Here, too, are the makings of a broad racial alignment—more dangerous in the long run than the political. The roster of nations invited to Bandung is pointedly overbalanced with nonwhites. The meeting may prove to be the first important manifestation of a conscious, deliberate banding together of the nonwhite world against the white. And nothing would be more terrible than wars between whites and nonwhites.

Now Bandung—a city of elegant hotels, European-style residences and native shacks in the hills of West Java—is thousands of miles from Boston and Bakersfield. And though this is exclusively an Asian-African gathering, called by the Colombo powers (India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia), it is of tremendous importance to America.

It is because of my deep concern that the import of the Bandung meeting—the political and racial dangers it raises—may not have received sufficient notice that I have sought this chance to speak to you.

Our Filipino delegation, which President Magsaysay has asked me to head, is likely to be a minority pro-Western voice at Bandung. The reason my government was advised at first not to attend was that, since we were allies of the United States and vigorously anti-Communist, we would be embarrassed at a meeting bound to be largely dominated by the Communists from Peiping, not to mention the neutralists from New Delhi.

But we in the Philippines don't look at the situation that way. We are in Asia and of Asia. Not to attend a meeting of our fellow Asians, no matter how we may differ with some of them, is to make of ourselves outcasts in Asia. Also our belief in democracy is not timid. We welcome the chance to express our views to our fellow Asians, including the delegates sent by Mao Tse-tung.

WHAT THE FILIPINOS WILL DO

We expect to be outvoted at times. But we have hopes of exercising enough influence on the proceedings to prevent, at least for the time being, the solidification of the political and racial tendencies we feel would constitute a terrible threat to peace.

Meetings of Asians and Africans are nothing new, of course. The nations of these two huge, restless, underprivileged continents have been joining forces with growing frequency in recent years to promote a variety of causes, some good, some questionable. Asian and African nations took steps in 1948 for the worthwhile purpose of helping Indonesia shake itself loose from Dutch colonialism.

At the United Nations, the Asian-African group has occasionally played a useful role in spotlighting colonial and racial oppression in Africa. But more and more, of late, a core of influential members of the group has shown a disposition to take a neutralist stand in the East-West struggle.

Now at Bandung this group is being joined by Red China—the trophy of the Indochina deal dangling from its belt, its ego inflated by the Hammarskjold visit to seek release of United States flyers, its propagandists demanding liberation of Formosa. Consequently, the former neutralist coloration takes on an anti-Western tinge.

It is India's Premier, Jawaharlal Nehru, of course, who has been the apostle of Asian-African neutralism, though he shuns the label and argues that he merely opposes the creation of blocs on grounds that they lead to war. It is Nehru, too, who engineered the invitation to Peiping to come to Bandung.

In this respect, it is easy to go along with him in rejecting the label of "neutralist." On the other hand, he would probably dispute a charge that he has been unneutral. It would be politically naive, though, to imagine that it is neutral to invite one—and only one—of the protagonists of the cold war to a conference whose avowed purpose is to promote peace. Ironically, any increase in Red China's leadership in Asia must certainly be at New Delhi's expense.

What are the main issues that trouble our fellow Asians and the Africans?

1. COLONIALISM: ASIANS HATE IT

Last fall, I wrote in This Week that, as a free Asian, I was gravely worried that what was left of free Asia might soon follow north Vietnam into the Communist orbit. I argued that the basic reason some Asians were so cold to the propaganda of democracy and so vulnerable to Communist blandishments was that the so-called democracies, in times past, had brought them, for the most part, not democracy but colonialism. Not democracy but 5-cents-a-day wages and racial barriers. I have spoken to audiences in scores of American communities, and I find that a most difficult point to put across is the intensity of the Afro-Asian hatred of colonialism.

The United States, instead of exploiting territories over which it exercised sovereignty, has generally guided them peacefully toward self-government or outright independence. When the United States governed the Philippines, it dealt with a population that was basically content because it was being openly prepared to assume sovereign control of its affairs. There is a genuine friendship between Filipino and American, and Manila is considered by the fleet probably the most hospitable port of call in all Asia.

Nowhere has the United States dealt as a nation with its population grudgingly, bitterly submitting to the yoke of empire.

The American people have not grasped the real nature of anticolonial emotionalism. But it must be grasped. Otherwise, the United States cannot formulate workable policies to keep former colonial areas from being overwhelmed by communism's new and more ruthless colonialism.

Remember this: while it is true that the colonial powers have only shreds of their old influence left in Asia, the old bitterness remains. Urged by the Western Powers to join in resisting further Communist advance, many Asian nations are understandably wary. They are not sure it is to their interest to choose sides; they are not sure they have anything to gain by lining up with the West; and they would certainly have to make sure first that their former oppressors had really reformed.

It is the Asians' sensitivity to colonialism that makes Communist prattling about American imperialism in Formosa—false as it is—logical propaganda. Asians and Africans are watching to see if the powers controlling colonies in Africa follow a more enlightened policy there than in Asia.

Britain's bold experiment in speeding self-government in the Gold Coast is a plus mark for the West. There are reassuring signs in Nigeria. But Britain wins no confidence with its nineteenth-century repression in Kenya, home of the Mau Mau. A French premier tries to put across a policy of autonomy for North Africa and—for this and other reasons—he is overthrown.

2. RACISM: "CHINESE NOT ALLOWED"

Hatred of the white man is colonialism's legacy in vast areas of the world. Starvation wages would have been reason enough for hatred of the colonial powers, if that is all colonialism had meant. But it also meant signs in Shanghai parks: "Dogs and Chinese not allowed here." It meant rules barring all natives from admission to the white man's club. Racial scars left by discrimination take years, decades, generations to fade. Most of the nations gathering at Bandung bear still-fresh scars. Racial resentment is common ground for the fashioning of alliances.

Significantly, the invitation list for the conference emphasizes the racial aspect of the meeting. South Africa, carrying policies of race discrimination to especially revolting extremes, was not invited. The Arabs are coming, but they made sure Israel did not get an invitation. It may even be significant that Russia, an Asian as well as a European power, was not asked to come.

Armageddon between whites and nonwhites is not an immediate prospect. But limited, local racial wars are going on today. The struggle in Kenya is largely racial. How long will it be before South Africa explodes? In a generation or two, if current trends are

not reversed, race war on a vast scale could shake the earth.

3. ECONOMICS: WHO'LL HELP?

The masses of Asia and Africa are impoverished. They are looking desperately for help from more fortunate nations. Whoever eases their misery—democracy, communism, the political system doesn't matter—will have their friendship and their trade.

4. PEACE: NO MORE BOMBS!

At a meeting of the five Colombo powers last year, a resolution was approved calling for an end to hydrogen-bomb and atom-bomb tests. Passage of the resolution was understandable. The injury to the Japanese fishermen (one of whom later died) by the radioactive fallout from an H-bomb explosion terrified masses of people in Asia.

But while the resolution to ban tests theoretically applied equally to East and West, it unintentionally reinforced Communist propaganda. The Communists, with their superiority in manpower, have been trying for years to eliminate atomic weapons from the world's arsenals. With the West's atomic deterrent neutralized, the Communists would be ready to march. Neutral resolutions are not always so neutral as they sound.

My fellow Asians and the Africans may adopt so-called neutral policies in hopes of staving off world war or staying out if it should erupt. But protestations of neutrality will not stop Communist imperialism. The only way to insure that the Communists dare not move is to help the free world build an unchallengeable defense.

At Bandung, the Filipino delegation will urge our Asian and African colleagues—those still uncommitted—to take that course. We will do what we can to expose the fallacy of neutralism. And, taking the longer view, we will try to prevent the nurturing of a racial alliance which could develop into an enormity that would convulse the earth.

We have been working hard in recent weeks readying ourselves to answer the Communists, and the neutralists, point by point; to counter their resolutions with constructive resolutions of our own. We fully appreciate the intensity of Asian-African suspicion of the West. But we are working on the assumption that the West intends to follow through on its promises, that it will share its knowledge and wealth with the world's less fortunate people, that it will hasten the day when all people will be truly independent.

Many specific projects to counter the dangerous drift in Asia and Africa have been blueprinted. But programs do not take hold unless the people who must put them into operation are made to realize with painful clarity how urgent they are.

The Bandung conference is a measure of that urgency. It will not get the news coverage of a Tachens evacuation or a congressional resolution on Formosa. But the free world would do well to watch it with as much attention—and guide itself by what it sees.

Treasures Money Cannot Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has set an example for our people by his regular church attendance and by his devotion to religious principles. Furthermore, he has surrounded himself with devout men and women of various faiths.

Visitors to Washington who have had contact with members of the Cabinet and other top officials have been impressed with the religious atmosphere prevailing here.

Faith in God is something that is beyond politics. No political party nor particular sect can lay claim to a monopoly on a faith in the Almighty. Devout leaders can stimulate that faith in the hearts of others by their example. By their daily lives they can create an atmosphere that will draw their associates and their fellow men to a closer walk with the Creator.

Recently while returning to California from Washington by airplane, Arthur S. Maxwell, editor of the Signs of the Times, a widely read religious journal, found himself seated beside a charming lady who, on learning he was a minister, readily discussed "many things pertaining to the kingdom of God," as the editor put it.

That lady was Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States. Impressed with her deep religious devotion, Editor Maxwell told Mrs. Priest he felt sure an article setting forth the spiritual treasures that money cannot buy might be a source of great inspiration to millions, especially if written by the Treasurer of the United States.

Treasures Money Cannot Buy is the title assigned to Mrs. Priest's article, which appears in the current issue of Signs of the Times, and I commend it to your reading. It follows:

TREASURES MONEY CANNOT BUY

(By Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States)

All the dollars in the United States Treasury taken together could not buy the dedication and devotion of people to the principles of freedom.

The irresistible, relentless progress that has given the United States the highest standard of living in the world was not purchased with money.

Money cannot buy patriotism, progress, or security. These are primarily spiritual things that live in the hearts of a people and cannot accrue to a government because of money or any material objects it gathers around it.

The price of our heritage was not money, but the ceaseless toil and prodigious efforts of those courageous pioneers who settled this land, tilled the soil, blazed the trails, extracted the minerals from the bounteous earth, and pushed the frontiers from the Atlantic to the far reaches of the Pacific. Then in their great generosity they bequeathed to the generations that followed, to us, the freedom that they purchased so dearly, the precious liberty which money could not buy.

Our American way is more than a treasure, indeed it is a treasure chest of treasures, for in truth it is composed of not one, but a multitude of related rights and freedoms, the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience, the freedom to experiment, to change, to seek knowledge wherever research leads.

By material standards our system has succeeded. It is giving the greatest outpouring of material wealth that the world has ever seen and is providing the most equitable distribution system yet attained.

By spiritual standards it is an even greater success, surpassing any philosophy of government ever put into practice. The spiritual power of our way of life is derived from the Bible. Faith in God's wisdom and in our own abilities to work out our problems with divine help are deeply embedded in the great American tradition.

Belief in God gives an inner peace and contentment that is beyond the power of money to buy. Faith in the precepts and commands of God nurtures faith in man and leads to fair dealing, inegrity, honesty, and understanding among all. Understanding lays the groundwork of confidence and cooperation and encourages a striving to help those less fortunate. It gives us the humility to learn from others, and stamina and strength to make our own decisions. It teaches us patience in the face of obstacles and encourages us to be generous enough to share our good wealth with others. It enables us to turn a smiling face to cares, to preserve a buoyant, hopeful, youthful spirit, to abide by rules of virtue, to shun folly, and keep uppermost in our thoughts the eternal things of life.

Money cannot buy education or character for growing youngsters; it cannot give them a wholesome assurance, a confident ability in their capacity to meet life. Character can only be built when the aspirations of youth are lifted beyond worldly goods to lofty ideals that challenge them to be and do their best.

Money cannot buy progress, which comes from asking, seeking, knocking at all doors before us, sometimes evolving slowly from plodding, patient research into the mysteries of the unknown, and sometimes leaping into life from flashing, brilliant insights.

Truth cannot be bought with dollars. Money cannot buy the peace and contentment that come from an understanding heart. Happy homes, education, character, confidence, self-respect, kindness, generosity, and peace—these different forms of worthwhile treasures money cannot buy.

Nor can they come to those sufficient unto themselves. These treasures come only to those who look to God for leadership, who tap the inexhaustible sources of strength in the Bible.

It is because we as a people have placed our faith in God's wisdom that we are strong.

The motto, "In God we trust," long engraved on American coins, and recently engraved on postage stamps, has always been deeply engraved in our hearts. It has enabled our forefathers to stand, figuratively, on their own two feet and pull their solid weight.

If we but resolve to rededicate our lives to Christan living, the treasures money cannot buy will continue to multiply and America will be invincible and secure.

The Late William Sebastian Jacobsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, while on a short visit to Arkansas I was grieved to learn that a close, dear friend of mine—and a friend of the Congress—former Representative William Sebastian Jacobsen, of Iowa, had passed on.

Only the week before I left to visit in Arkansas I had received the tragic news of the passing of his sainted mother, and I had written to Bill expressing the sorrow of my family at his loss. Bill had continued to correspond with me after he had retired to Iowa from the Congress

to resume his work as owner and operator of a radio station along with other extensive business enterprises.

When Representative Jacobsen came to the Congress for the first time, I had the pleasure of meeting him. He was familiar with the workings of the Congress because his father, the late Bernard M. Jacobsen, had served in the Congress. Indeed, Bill took his father's seat in the Congress.

Thus, through many sessions of the Congress, the fine people of the Second District of Iowa were represented by noble men of the Jacobsen family. Both gentlemen made outstanding records of public service.

Those of us who had the honor and privilege of serving with Bill Jacobsen will miss his friendship and his counsel. He was a fine man and one whose friendship I was proud to have. Iowa has been most fortunate in the fine men who have represented her interests in the Halls of the Congress, and Bill Jacobsen will take his honored place in the ranks of those whom Iowa will long remember.

To the present delegation who represent Iowa in these Halls, may I express my sorrow and sympathy in your loss.

Misrepresentations in Billions, Blunders, and Baloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a great deal about Mr. Castle's book, Billions, Blunders, and Baloney in which he strongly criticizes United States foreign policy generally and the foreign assistance and overseas information programs particularly. Mr. Castle has made a lot of noise about this book; he has promoted it through a lavish advertising campaign, and, at this opportune time, when USIA appropriations are being considered, he has sent a self-serving circular about his book to the the Members of the Congress.

Unfortunately, the charges in Mr. Castle's book have received some attention, although they are little more than an indiscriminate collection of epithets and invective. The overseas information program is just crackpot, and incredible baloney to him. The Voice of America is yackety-yak-yak; and the film program flicker foolishness. In passing Mr. Castle criticizes just about every feature of American foreign policy from both the Democratic and Republican administrations. He condemns the Democrats for losing China and the Republicans for giving away Korea with an equal hand.

Mr. Castle is against almost everything but he is mostly against the United States Information Agency. In his book he makes charge after charge to show that our information functions are ineffective, wasteful, and mismanaged and he urges that they be stringently curtailed. Mr. Castle's opinions would be worthy of more respect if he were more careful with his facts. Wherever I have been able to test the accuracy of Mr. Castle's charges I have found them wanting. Let me give a few examples.

Right at the beginning of his book Mr. Castle tells of a conversation with two Arab publishers named Amin, in Egypt. He sets forth what purport to be actual quotations of their remarks, all of which are highly critical of the USIA program in Egypt. Now, almost nothing that Mr. Castle said was accurate. First of all, he didn't even get the names of the Arab publishers right. Secondly, he said the Voice of America broadcast to Egypt comes in during the early morning so that nobody listens to it when in fact it has always come in during the best evening hours. Although Mr. Castle was ostensibly quoting actual remarks, he admitted to the Appropriations Committee that he had lost his notes of the conversation with the publishers and was relying on his memory.

And, finally, at the request of the appropriations subcommittee, a letter was obtained from the publishers in which they state flatly that Mr. Castle not only misspelled their names but their ideas, and they asked expressly that the distortion of the facts about their views be set straight.

Mr. Castle also took the United States Information Agency apart for the elaborate quarters it occupies in Europe. Yet when the charges are examined against actual facts very little remains. In Paris, for example, Mr. Castle accused the Information Agency of occupying three swank buildings—the Rothschild Mansion, the Cafe des Ambassadeurs and the Hotel Astoria. What are the facts? The Hotel Astoria is a seven-story building. The USIA library occupies a part of the ground floor. That is the only space in the building occupied by the USIA and that space is being vacated this summer. As for the Cafe des Ambassadeurs—the Agency does not now occupy this building and did so only for long enough to close down the operations housed there before it took over the information program. Except for the library, then, USIA operations in Paris are entirely housed in one building, the Rothschild house, and not three separate buildings as Mr. Castle would have it. As for the Rothschild building, it was purchased by the State Department a long time ago and was simply inherited by the USIA, which has been trying to get out of it ever since.

Another sample of Mr. Castle's charges is in his discussion of the USIA film program. Mr. Castle has some claim to being an expert on motion pictures and his opinions on the USIA film program would, therefore, seem to command respect. Mr. Castle inveighed in the strongest terms against the "flicker foolishness" engaged in by USIA and flatly asserts the ineffectiveness of this "movie madness." Yet in the recent hearing before the appropriations subcommittee Mr. Castle had to admit that he had only seen 1 out of some 12 or 13 of the pictures recently made by the United States Information Agency and which he had presumed to criticize so harshly in his book. Hard-hitting anti-Communist movies like Poles Are Stubborn People, Dance to Freedom, Rape of the Baltic, and My Latvia were dismissed by him as worthless with the same easy disregard for fact which caused him to dismiss Mr. Cecil B. DeMille's opinion on the brilliant and costly propaganda films being made by the Soviet Union. Members of the subcommittee who saw the Soviet film entitled "The Doomed Vilage" can testify to the need for a hard-hitting film program to combat effective Soviet propaganda of this kind.

In my opinion a good many of the charges in Mr. Castle's book are reckless and not founded on fact. I feel that it has been harmful to the interests of the United States.

AKHBAR EL YOM,
SHARIA EL SAHAFA,
Cairo, March 7, 1955.

DEAR MR. WEATHERSBY: We were surprised that Mr. Eugene Castle in his recently published book claimed he had interviewed us about the USIA in Cairo. He not only misspelled our names but also mispelled our ideas. The fact is that this gentleman met us for a few minutes before a luncheon given by Mr. Saba Habach in the Mena House Hotel. All what he attributed to us is what he said himself. We disagreed with him, but he insisted he was right. He said he had come to Cairo and have visited many capitals to prove what he actually was convinced of before starting off from the States.

Will you please try to use your influence and correct this distortion of facts.

Yours sincerely,

MOSTAFA AMIN.
ALI AMIN.

Family Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by delegates attending the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange in St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955.

The Farmers Union Central Exchange, I wish to point out, is a cooperative wholesale organization serving 350,000 farmers in six Northwest States.

There has been long a feeling on the part of the Nation's family-type farmers that the Congress of the United States should adopt a statement of policy with respect to family-type farmers. Bills have been introduced on this matter. The resolution adopted by the Farmers Union Central Exchange delegates expresses the views of farmers on the need for such legislation.

Following is the full text of the resolution which I recommend to my colleagues:

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives by Representative JOHNSON of Wisconsin (H. R. 2000) and sponsored in the Senate by Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and MURRAY,

of Montana, entitled the Family Farm Policy Act which sets forth the family farmers' bill of rights as a guide and standard for farm legislation and agricultural policy. This bill of rights embodies and enumerates the principles of the family-size farm and security, opportunity, and parity of living for farm families: Therefore be it

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

Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following address titled "Our National Security" was delivered by Adm. Arthur Radford, United States Navy, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the annual meeting of the Macon (Ga.) Chamber of Commerce, April 6, 1955:

Tonight, I should like to discuss with you one matter that is most important to all of us: The security of our country. I hope that you will join with me in considering some of the important problems of security—and some of our hopes for the future.

First of all, why do we want security? The answer is: We want to live in freedom and truth. Such an answer goes back to the ideas brought to the eastern seaboard by our adventurous forefathers—and to the principles upon which our country was founded.

Later, these ideas were set forth for all to know, in our Declaration of Independence. The purpose of the Declaration, said Thomas Jefferson, was "not to find out new principles * * * but to place before mankind the commonsense of the subject."

Then, once the shooting phase of the American Revolution ended, General Washington and the Congress set about building the Nation and providing for its future safety. There seemed to be two fundamental ambitions in their hearts and minds:

First, they wanted to perpetuate freedom and preserve a large degree of individual liberty.

Second, they wanted to build a strong nation, able to withstand aggression from outside and factionalism from inside.

This Nation lives today as a testimonial to the foresight and wisdom of those early American patriots who realize that freedom and strength would have to march hand in hand if our Nation were to long endure.

Today, we have strength—great national strength. The President outlined some strengths in his state of the Union message at the beginning of the year—natural resources, a growing economy, good health, and national defense.

The President also pointed out in this same report to the Congress, that foremost among the broad purposes of government is our support of freedom, justice, and peace.

Yes; our overall national purpose is to provide for the welfare and security of the United States through peace—not war. This is a national decision, based on our entire national experience, and is worthy of our best national efforts.

Everything we are doing—our treaties with other nations, our current defense program, our assistance to other countries—is the result of our determination to work for peace and security.

But it is harder and more dangerous than we would like it to be because of the apparent refusal by two large nations to carry out the spirit and principles which must underwrite a real and lasting peace.

One is the Soviet Union. It is abundantly clear that Moscow schemes to create one Communist world with all that it means—one giant Red world with slavery and subordination for all.

The other is Red China. Red China wants one completely Red Asia, one which includes Formosa and the Pescadores. They have so stated, not once, but many times.

And the danger is made more acute because of the alliance these two countries have with one another.

This danger of which we speak is not theoretical. It occupies space and derives its power from the resources of that space.

From the military viewpoint, the spectacular aspect of Communist strength is its combination of a vast land area, a huge supply of people, and very large armed forces—including an increasing strength in air forces and nuclear weapons. Their massive military machine is an important part of their continuing effort to dominate and intimidate free nations on their periphery.

This in no way, however, describes the full scope of the Communist threat. Subversion, infiltration, persuasion, indoctrination, and nonviolent techniques of control also are important tools of the Kremlin. These more silent weapons can be just as lethal as cannon.

The result is that free nations are faced with a very real threat. The threat is many-sided. It is clearly a global problem. And because of the provocative attitude of the Chinese Communists, it seems somewhat more threatening than in previous years.

All in all, their evil forces have applied great internal and external pressures against all things we hold right. In 1949, the Chinese Communists conquered China. In 1950, they openly invaded North Korea with large forces; and in 1951, they seized Tibet. For years, they have supported guerrilla operations and sabotage in Indochina and Malaya, and have sworn to seize Formosa. And they may be expected to try to infiltrate other countries in Southeast Asia.

It is useful, I think, to remind ourselves that the major purpose of Communist strategy appears to be to break apart ties with allies, isolate free nations from each other, and prevent us from moving ahead to build collective strength on which our safety depends.

Communists like to pick off free nations, one by one. They do that to build up the idea that the march of communism is irresistible. They think if they can spread fright and hopelessness, then we will become rattled, and some free nations will move in one direction while we move in another.

As it has happened before, so can it happen again. The creeping militant expansion of communism backed by guns and bombs and several millions of troops—unrestrained by a solemn agreement, or moral restraint—is the primary long-term challenge to every one of us.

Now, in such a world, there is much that we in the United States can do to meet the challenge. The conduct of foreign affairs is of course a civilian responsibility, and the role of the military is to give advice on defense matters. However, our foreign policy and our military policy have certain common basic undertakings.

First, and this is our foremost line of action—we can protect and maintain our freedom, our form of government, and our way of life against any challenge. On this point, we recognize no limitation of expenditures or exertion.

Why do I put a strong defense of freedom first in priority? Because in my judgment, it is fundamental to our way of life. All other lines of action flow from it. Our natural resources, our prosperous economy, and our way of life could go for naught if we did not have the burning, fighting faith to protect them from danger.

Francis Bacon said this rather well in his essay on the Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates:

"Walled towns, stored arsenals and armories, Goodly Rases of Horses, Charriots of Warre, Elephants. * * * Artillery and the Like. All this is but a Sheep in Lion's skin except the Breed and Disposition of the people be stout."

I wish it were possible for me to tell you whether or not another shooting war will be forced upon us; and if one is, exactly where, when, how, and in what form it would take place. If I knew—my own job would be less difficult.

Obviously, our country does not want war, as our enormous patience clearly attests. We will not provoke a war against anyone. And we will not wage a so-called preventive war—even against an enemy. But neither will we surrender the principles which made our country great.

Unfortunately, another aggression could be initiated secretly almost any place, anytime—by a handful of men whose only allegiance is to themselves, and who have no Christian standards to govern their actions.

This being the case, then what should be the pattern for our Armed Forces?

Well—we do not pretend to have all the answers, but it certainly looks as if we must have Armed Forces which are ready for tremendous counteroffensive blows in event of a global war; and also ready for lesser military actions when and as directed by our Government.

Accordingly, based on these requirements, and the current world situation, the President decided that our defense program should be geared to the provision of a flexible but sturdy military posture—one which could be maintained over an extended period of time—and one which would take advantage of technological developments.

If we should be confronted by hostile aggression, naturally it would not make sense to let the enemy pick only those battle conditions and weapons which are best suited to him.

Consequently, in defense planning, we consider it important to have a capacity to retaliate—to counter an aggression—at the proper place by whatever military means are best suited to the situation at the time. One of the best safeguards for peace is the possession of such power that a would-be aggressor knows his aggression will be countered, and that he will receive far more devastation than he gives.

This is not a new defense policy this year. Nor is it a policy that commits us to atomic retaliation against all forms of aggression. It is not a "solve-all" nor is it a "do-everything" answer to the Communist menace. Nor has it ever been.

Sometimes one hears the question: Are we concentrating unduly on a certain weapon or type of warfare?

Here, I might take just a moment to emphasize, as I did in an address a year ago this month, that: Our military planning does not subscribe to the thinking that we can rely exclusively on one weapon, or one service, or that we can anticipate just one kind of war.

Actually, undue reliance on one weapon or preparation for only one kind of warfare simply invites an enemy to resort to some other. No one form of military action could be considered sufficient to meet all our modern security needs.

As time passes, changes do take place in our Armed Forces. We would not prepare to fight a next war with exactly the same weapons and methods as the last. Nor would

we prepare to fight a next war with "wonder" weapons alone. We cannot base our defense on pushing a button, and then dreaming that the menace has vanished.

Instead, our program for defense is based on a realistic and continuous assessment of the world situation. It is based on the maintenance of forces which could be used in a variety of situations whenever and wherever required. And should there be some fundamental change in the situation, for better or for worse, then military requirements for security probably would change too.

It is my personal conviction that our present defense program—the one submitted by the President to the Congress—provides the right combination of forces and facilities. The program maintains a flexible combination of land, sea, and air forces with a wide variety of weapons and capabilities, including nuclear.

Today, we have strategic air forces and carrier task forces which are unmatched by any other nation, and we are going to keep them strong. Our country is particularly well suited for providing these two vital elements of the free world's capacity to counter an aggression.

We also have modern jet tactical air forces which can carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending upon what the target requires. We have naval forces which can clear the sea lanes, and Army and Marine Corps forces which can do their part toward the accomplishment of military decisions when and where required. We have armored, airborne, amphibious, and other modern forces, all of which are important to our national defense.

In fact, the United States forces we plan to maintain are the most powerful forces, individually by service and collectively as a team, that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war. The fact that we have these ready forces, and that we have them with flexible nuclear capacities, should make it possible for free peoples everywhere to sleep a little safer at night.

At the same time, accelerated emphasis is being given to continental defense measures, to improving the readiness of our Reserve forces, and to continuing close cooperation with our friends to strengthen collective allied defense arrangements overseas.

Speaking of allied strength, it would be the greatest folly for us to drift back into weakness and disunity. Now is the time to pull together. Our great American poet, Mr. Longfellow, once wrote:

> "All your strength is in your union
> All your danger is in discord."

These words are true today; for when bound together in a pact, individual nations gain strength from close ties.

Gentlemen, just as in many aspects of business, we never seem to reach a point where we can feel sure we have all the answers. We do know, however, that the basic ideas of freedom are right and they are definitely worth defending.

The crux of the problem for free nations is that we are confronted with a large Communist menace whose aggressions should not be rewarded, ignored, or appeased. Communism would control all of us if it could.

Therefore, collectively we must have an inner strength and unity, and with this must go unselfish solidarity. We must never be afraid to fight intelligently and purposefully for life and honor against the vicious, ruthless enemies of freedom.

When all is said and done, one unassailable fact remains: Now, as never before, real preparedness is vital.

Speech by Hon. George S. Long, Member of Congress, Eighth District of Louisiana, Over Radio Station KSYL, Alexandria, La., April 4, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Friends, this is your Congressman, GEORGE S. LONG, speaking. I would like to thank this station for making it possible for me to bring you this message at this time.

I have been your Congressman for almost 3 years. I feel that I can say with pardonable pride that I have done a good job. I have one of the best voting records of any Member of Congress of the United States House of Representatives.

The record of my first session was 99 percent. During the second session I had to make a campaign and that voting record was not so good, but it was better than 85 percent. This time I expect to make it 100 percent.

May I say that I am on the job all of the time; that you have no trouble reaching me at any time, either at my office or at home. I have a telephone at home and can be reached there during the night if anyone cares to call me. I earnestly invite each and every one of you, if and when you come to Washington, to call me, come by and give me the benefit of your advice. If it is at night, do not hesitate to call me at home. I am always glad to hear from anyone from my district.

Many years ago the Congress wisely provided its Members with the franking privilege. One important reason for this was to afford Members of Congress a measure of protection against those who would mislead the public regarding their activities in Congress. Another reason was to insure that the public had correct information on activities and issues of interest and of importance to the people.

By distorting statements, twisting meanings, omitting pertinent parts, etc., it is possible to change the meaning of a comment or statement into something it was not intended to be. Some newspapers, either through carelessness or through deliberate intent, all too often present misleading and distorted information to the public. After all, it is well to remember that the voice of a newspaper is actually the voice of a single individual and not the infallible consensus of an informed group. The issues of a newspaper are just as much subject to personal and individual opinion, to bias, to display of that individual's likes and dislikes as the views of any individual. The main difference is that they have the advantage of using their newspaper to serve as their personal sounding board—to circulate their personal views.

As pointed out above, the Congress wisely afforded the public a measure of protection against those who misrepresent and distort the views and policies of Members of Congress, which are issued for the information and enlightenment of their constituents. No apologies are necessary in connection with the franking privilege for by its use can we more completely insure real freedom of speech and a well informed public. By use of a Member's frank his position on matters affecting the welfare and best interests of his constituents can be presented without distortion and misrepresentation.

The Alexandria evening newspaper complained of my sending out so many speeches under my franking privilege. Had I not mailed out these speeches to you, you would not have had the truth because this newspaper so distorted what I had to say that you could hardly recognize it.

I am only sorry that I have not been able to send you more speeches and official information about the doings of Congress, but my secretarial staff only permits me to send a limited number each year. But you may rest assured that I promised you when I went to Congress that you would hear from me and when you receive one of my speeches or information from my office, it means that I am carrying out the promise I made—that you would hear from me.

This same newspaper carried an article recently branding as socialistic prospective Government participation in a hoped-for project which would be of immeasurable benefit to many of our citizens. Is the effort to secure a fair share of Government benefits for our taxpayers to be branded socialistic? Would it brand as socialistic the policy of the Government to help the aged and the needy through our fine and humanitarian welfare program? Would it brand as socialistic the participation of the Government in our highway program, our agricultural conservation program, our flood control and drainage program, and the many other useful and beneficial programs which return to the people something worthwhile for the taxes paid? The possible utilization of portions of Kitsatchie National Forest for worthwhile purposes has merit and fits into land development and reclamation which are important to our citizens and to our Nation.

That same article was critical of a delayed-payment plan. Is the financing of your home or automobile or electrical appliances in any way un-American? Such installment-plan financing makes possible many necessities and conveniences which otherwise would be financially impossible to many.

Further, that writer, who has the earmarks of being antisocial and contrary to the betterment of the individual, appears opposed to a realistic tax reduction which would reach every taxpayer. About taxes there has been much said, and the load has increased through the years. The relief so far afforded has gone to the big man. The proposed $20-per-person exemption is exactly what it says—it will provide $20 relief for every person. Thus a family of 5 would benefit by $100 tax relief. Most of us consider $20 to be $20, and $100 to be $100. If that much relief can be obtained from the tax load, it will help all by that sum.

The public should understand that through the years everything changes. For example, insofar as a Member of Congress is concerned, the scope of his activities has broadened to the extent that he is called upon to perform many functions beyond the field of legislation. This is as it should be, and in order for a Member to do a creditable job certain expansions and improvements must be worked out.

Outlined below are certain items which accrue to every Member of the United States House of Representatives, 435 Members in all. Recently the evening newspaper criticized me because of what they called the trimmings I am receiving. These extras do not accrue to your Representative alone, as this newspaper would have you believe. They said, if I remember rightly, that I get 2,700 minutes per year for long-distance telephone calls in order that I may talk to my constituents on official business, if necessary. That is right. That I get 1,800 words per year for telegraph service; that is true. That I get $900 per year district

office rent. I do. That I get $1,200 yearly for stationery allowance. That is right. That I receive $200 per year airmail and special-delivery stamp allowance. That is so. An office is furnished each Member, with sufficient furniture and equipment to enable his office to function properly. Your Representative maintains a staff of competent employees, both in Washington and his district, to enable him to fully care for your requests and interests. But, my friends, all this they complain about does not increase my salary or the money that I take home one dime. Nor will it increase any of the salaries of the 435 other Members. All Members of Congress receive exactly the same salary and benefits that this newspaper has complained that I receive.

It is my aim to always fight for progress and reform; never to tolerate injustice or corruption; to always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers; to never lose sympathy with the poor; always to remain devoted to public welfare; never to be satisfied with merely printed news; always to be drastically independent; never to be afraid to attack wrong.

I have said in many of my speeches and I repeat here that I wanted to be elected to Congress, and it was my purpose to speak on the floor of the Congress and elsewhere when opportunity permitted for those who have no one to speak for them. This pledge I am carrying out to the best of my ability.

Problems of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a copy of a United States Information Agency magazine that is practically unknown in this country, but overseas, in the past 2 years, it has gained tremendous prestige.

The magazine is called Problems of Communism. It is published bimonthly in English, French, and Spanish, and monthly in Japanese.

Recent editions include articles such as:

Collectivization in China: A Story of Betrayal, by Richard L. Walker, No. 1, 1955.

Soviet Cinema: A History and an Elegy, by Dwight Macdonald, No. 1, 1955.

Poland After the Death of Stalin, by Jean Malara, No. 2, 1955.

Of this publication, Ost Europa, a magazine published in Stuttgart, recently said that it has "acquired a distinguished position among organs concerned with East European affairs," proving that "political orientation is compatable with factual treatment and high scholarly standards." In other words, the increasing prestige of Problems of Communism is proof that a highbrow magazine can have tremendous political weight if it adheres strictly to facts.

In further tribute to this United States Information Agency publication, several members of the French and British Parliaments recently requested that their names be put on the mailing list. Government officials throughout the free world have commented on its value in the fight against international communism. This little publication is proving important ammunition in the fight freemen everywhere are making to keep freedom alive in the world.

Incidentally, Problems of Communism is beginning to win recognition in the United States. Herbert A. Philbrick, of the New York Herald Tribune, recently congratulated the editors, declaring that "of all the material which I read and study concerning communism, problems of Communism is one of the most valuable sources of information available today."

In a letter to the editor, Fortune magazine called it "a most impressive set of documents from an impressive panel of authors."

The United States Information Agency, of course, has not made any effort in this country to build up circulation for the magazine. It is, however, available through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, at 35 cents a copy or $1.50 per yearly subscription. As Theodore Streibert, Director of the Agency, sees its job, it is strictly an overseas operation. The purpose of the entire program is to make friends of overseas for the United States and to influence people in other lands, not the United States.

Problems of Communism illustrates another point seen as important by the Agency. The Agency does not have, and does not expect to have the resources to compete with the Communists in volume of operation. It must concentrate on targets where its efforts will be the most effective. Problems of Communism, which numbers among its contributors scholars, specialists, topnotch political analysts and journalists, both American and foreign, that is, Lazar Volin, Soviet specialist at the Department of Agriculture; Merle Fainsod, famous Harvard University authority on Russia; Hugh Seton-Watson, British authority on Eastern Europe; Raymond Aron, distinguished French political analyst, and so forth, is written for opinion molders. It goes to Government officials, writers, educators, and, yes, students. This, as I see it, is intelligent. Unless we plan to put billions into our overseas information program we must operate on this theory.

I might add that the coeditor of Problems of Communism, Abraham Brumberg, writes with firsthand knowledge of his subject. In 1941, he fled from the Soviet occupied city of Vilma, Poland. Coming to the United States, he served first in the Army. Later, he studied at Yale University, where he received an M. A. in Russian studies. Mr. Brumberg has edited the magazine, in cooperation with Miss Therese Thompson, for the past 3 years. The lady is an expert in the field of Communist affairs and in stylisitic editing.

Speaking of his work with the United States Information Agency, Mr. Brumberg told me:

I believe that there are many people throughout the world who have been misled by the promises and appeals communism has been offering over a period of years. It is our aim to reach these people with facts and irrefutable evidence, to point the gap between Communist promises and performances, myth and reality.

Mr. Brumberg came to Washington in 1952. Problems of Communism was then only an infant. It was taking its first faltering steps. It took the new coeditor only about a year to put the publication on its feet. Today, it is going places.

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before Society of Business Magazine Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me before the Society of Business Magazine Editors in Washington, D. C., on April 7, 1955.

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

Gentlemen, tonight with your kind indulgence, I should like to talk about the American economic way of life—and the deadly peril it faces.

Before I conclude, I hope to arouse in each of you the evangelistic fervor so badly needed to persuade millions of Americans their greatest hope for the Good Life lies in our competitive private enterprise system.

It is a marvelous machinery when you stop to think of it—delicate and sensitive to change—yet remarkably strong and sturdy. It is not perfect by any means, but it is far superior to any other system yet devised by man to satisfy his wants and needs and still allow him to call his soul his own.

You and I already know all this—or we wouldn't work where we do. We'd be with the ADA'ers and the Walter Reuthers, and with the rest of the left-wing pack now hotly fighting tooth and nail to destroy the very system which has made America at once the marvel and the envy of the world.

Whether we like it or not, those who would build a new social order based on the iron fist of Big Government have gained considerable ground through a calculated campaign of deceit and demagoguery. Already they have enlisted millions of gullible folks in the battle to overthrow the economic freedom we all enjoy and the political freedom that goes with it.

Make no mistake, gentlemen, this is a life-and-death struggle between two ways of economic life as different as night and day.

Under the private competitive system, the amount and kinds of goods produced are determined in the marketplace by the decrees of fluctuating consumer prices. Countless individuals decide what they will buy and what they will pay. Government acts as referee to prevent excesses on the part of any one group at the expense of other groups. Government itself avoids excesses of power.

Under the Reuther-Keyserling system, Government decrees determine the amount and kinds of goods produced. Herein consumers are economic captives—and likewise political prisoners. Government no longer is the referee. Government is the boss.

In essence, this is what the battle today is about.

Old stuff, you say?

Gentlemen, I submit that it is as new as tomorrow's headlines. And the consequences of the proposed social reforms are as potentially devastating as the hydrogen bomb.

As a matter of cold reality, the battle is already upon us. Enemy snipers man the firing lines 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Only a few weeks ago, they came close to winning a major contest. I refer to the recent tax fight in Congress.

There is no neutral ground in this battle. There are no innocent bystanders.

If you sincerely believe—as I do, with all my heart—in the fundamental rightness of the private competitive system, you must be willing to fight for it.

You may recall that following the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin was questioned about the results. "What have you given us?" someone asked.

"A Republic," he replied, "if you can keep it."

Gentlemen, we of this generation were given another precious inheritance—the private competitive system. The question is, "Can we keep it?"

Before we can launch a counterattack to keep our way of life, we must first size up our enemies.

Strong in numbers, they are firmly entrenched in powerful associations—political parties, some labor organizations, some farm groups, the egghead clans, and in the press. They are well-financed and even now are fattening their war chests. Clever and unscrupulous, they wage relentless war—day and night, Sundays and holidays—under the rules of jungle warfare: No holds barred and no quarter given.

Nevertheless, there is one thing in our favor—they telegraph their punches. We have advance notice of their intentions.

Less than a month ago in Washington, D. C., Americans for Democratic Action penciled out their blueprint for America. After much clackety-clack about preserving the free-enterprise system, they outlined their domestic policy recommendations, which, if actuated, of course, would torpedo the free-enterprise system.

Less than 1 week ago the United Automobile Workers, under Walter Reuther, convened in Cleveland and went down the line for a program that is a dead ringer for the ADA plan.

What the Keyserling-Reuther boys advocate is prosperity through greater Government spending, coupled with lower personal-income taxes for the poor, and higher taxes for the rich. They demand heavier taxes on so-called excess profits and surplus savings of business and people.

They want more Federal ownership, more Federal development, more Federal operation, more Federal bureaucracy, more Federal debts and taxes, and more Federal controls.

This is the same eyewash that was peddled to the country in the thirties and forties. It wasn't good for us then, and, I submit, it isn't good for us now.

Starting in 1932 the New Deal spent billions of dollars to increase purchasing power, and Federal bureaucrats pulled the strings in every major field of endeavor. Yet in 1937 the country was down to 1932 levels. In 1939 there were 9 million unemployed. And that doesn't count the part-time unemployment, which Mr. Keyserling now insists on using to exaggerate present unemployment.

The butterfly economists struck out time and again. But they are still in the game pitching, anticipating another turn at bat.

They, and their political-empire-building brethren, have just staged a grandstand play in the Congress. The Reuther-Keyserling wing of the Democratic Party tried for a double play, votes for Democrats at $20 a head and a black eye for Republicans who opposed that kind of tax relief at this time. It was a close play, but the majority umpires in Congress called them out.

This is not ancient history, gentlemen, this is now.

On the floors of Congress, the Nation was told that the way to economic health was to increase purchasing power of low-income people, who in turn would spend most of the tax cut. This would stimulate demand for consumer goods, which would increase production and employment and eventually factories would expand and new jobs would open up.

This was called the percolate-up theory.

The trouble with the percolate-up theory is that you keep adding water to the bottom of the pot, but you don't put coffee in the top.

At the same time, we were urged to kill off tax policies which encouraged people to risk their savings in business investments so production can expand and new jobs result.

The policies that would prevail should the Reuther-Keyserling crowd run the Government were never more clearly revealed than in the political, hypocritical tax proposals submitted to the Congress this year.

Despite the existing Federal debt, despite an anticipated deficit for the current fiscal year, despite the danger of inflation, per capita tax cuts were proposed without offsetting revenues to pay for them.

To make up the loss in revenue, the Government would have to borrow money and pay the interest charges.

So what the Democrats really proposed was increased purchasing power for consumers achieved with borrowed money, printing press money.

Well, if this is valid for a small increase in purchasing power, why not let the Government borrow without limitation, print a lot of money and increase consumption even more?

Obviously, no nation can long endure by this process. Yet this is what the left-wingers proposed.

The per capita tax cuts were not only unsound and irresponsible, they were vicious in their impact. Instead of being based on ability to pay, they were across-the-board reductions. Had the proposal been to increase taxes by a flat amount, there would have been howls of anguish heard around the world.

Incitement to class warfare marked the impassioned speeches of tax-cut sponsors. "Soak the rich" was an underlying theme. But elementary arithmetic shows it can no longer be done. Taxes have already squeezed all but the last remaining drops of juice out of this source. The Tax Foundation says that if Uncle Sam grabbed 100 percent of everyone's income over $10,000, he would collect less than $5 billion—not enough to run the Government for a month.

No, the great middle-income class in this country is the only remaining source for substantial tax revenues. And that is already heavily tapped.

Certainly, no one today will argue that our tax laws have not whittled down the upper-income classes.

Are the middle-income classes to be likewise whittled down and eventually destroyed through oppressive taxes?

In these wonderful United States, we have managed to avoid division of our people into two income groups—the very rich and the very poor—a characteristic of many other nations of the world and one which we do not wish to acquire here.

Instead of yawning chasm between the immensely rich and the poverty-stricken in the United States of America there is a strong, broad bridge of middle-income families. The Commerce Department tells us more than 40 percent of American families earn over $5,000 a year. Fifty-five percent of the families in the United States have incomes of $4,000 or more a year.

These are the people who keep this country going—who run the factories, who till the soil, who sell the goods—who buy what is produced—and who pay the taxes that support the Government.

And these are the people—the Reuthers and Keyserlings notwithstanding—who own shares in American business.

Available studies disclose some 6 to 7 million individuals hold stocks in publicly owned corporations; some 3 million individuals, in personal holding corporations. How many own both types, we do not know, but undoubtedly there is some overlapping.

In addition to individual stock ownership, institutions also hold shares. The extent of institutional stock ownership is not available, but there are at least 1,000 such institutions. Through them, untold millions of Americans have an interest in stocks as a result of their equities in life insurance policies, pension plans, and the like.

What happens when the power to tax is used to wipe out the middle class? The wheels of industry stop turning, and Government steps in to manage the economy.

This is not idle speculation. Just a few years ago Mr. Truman seized the steel mills, claiming he had inherent power to grab private property. If the Government can seize business property, it can also take individual property. The social reformers have shown their hand—there can be no doubt as to their intentions should they regain power.

Socialism never worked in other countries and was a miserable flop when tested in the United States.

Why then can the Reuthers and the Keyserlings continue to capture ground with this proposition?

Why indeed?

In the first place, of course, they disguise their proposals in sheep's clothing. The wolf fangs don't show to the uninitiated.

And that's where you and I, and everybody else who recognizes the Reuther-Keyserling scheme for the hoax that it is—have fallen down on the job.

We have failed even to get this simple message across. If it is true that Government should have more responsibility—in other words, more control—over the economy so people can have more freedom, then those pitiful masses of humanity behind the Iron Curtain should be the freest in the entire world.

We have failed to convince the workers of America of their personal stake in our system of private ownership and production where opportunity beckons to those willing to work to progress.

We have failed to rally our forces in every walk of life to spread the golden gospel of opportunity for all.

Opinion Research Corp., at Princeton, N. J., conducted a poll of high-school seniors in 86 communities throughout the country. When asked "Is the theory 'from each according to his ability, to each according to need' a valid basis for an economic system?", 55 percent replied "Yes."

Over half the high school seniors—the citizens of tomorrow—accepted the very theory that is the basis of Marxism.

Sixty-one percent said the profit motive is unnecessary to the survival of our system. Think of that.

Sixty percent said owners get too much of the profits.

Eighty-two percent of the pupils said we do not have competition in business. Do you people here in this room think there is no competition in your business?

Seventy-six percent believed that owners get most of the gains from new machinery.

Sixty percent said a worker should not produce all he can.

This, gentlemen, gives an idea of what we are up against.

How fertile is the soil for the Reuther-Keyserling propaganda.

Well, how shall we counterattack?

Let's steal a page from the enemy's book. Let's live our convictions in everyday life. The enemies of freedom seize every opportunity to discredit our sytem—let us seize every opportunity to lambaste theirs.

We can begin in our own homes with our own children to extol the virtues of private ownership of property and to explain the benefits of competition. There are countless examples of everyday products and services used in the home which, because of competition, have increased in quality while dropping in price. Television is an outstanding example.

In our daily work we can spread the gospel and at the same time expose the Reuther-Keyserling hokum that is bewitching and bewildering our people. We should constantly show up the concept of more personal freedom under more Government control as a hoax—a snare and a delusion.

Every day in every way we should cite chapter and verse where socialism—the real name for the Reuther-Keyserling program—has failed.

The greatest socialist experiment in world history is Soviet Russia. It is a gold mine of examples to turn our people away from the honey-poison ideas of the Reuthers and Keyserlings and the other leftwing Socialists. Russia is first and foremost the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It should be so identified to our people who think of it only as a Communist political government.

Should the Reuther-Keyserling Socialist movement win out in the United States, business editors would soon go the way of Russian writers—urging the poor devils on the production line to greater efforts, rationalizing the inevitable failures under the socialist system, and rewriting history to suit the purposes of political ruling bosses.

We can bend every effort to get business people to set aside a portion of their advertising budgets to preach the gospel of the free, competitive way of life.

Enlightened management is already moving in that direction. Every now and then I notice an advertisement in a national magazine dedicated to informing workers and consumers how the profit system benefits them. But so far we are using only BB guns—when the battle demands heavy artillery.

We need spokesmen who understand our system and can explain it to the man on the street. At the same time, they must also counteract the Reuther-Keyserling poison that has already infected a great body of people. We need advocates for our cause on radio and television programs, on discussion panels in church and educational groups. We need writers in our newspapers and magazines who will help us carry the ball. We must make meaningful to various groups in the country—the teachers—the miners—the farmers—the factory workers—the college students—the big stake they have in the private economic system—and what they stand to lose under Socialist schemes so ardently and artfully peddled by enemies of economic freedom. How many union members realize that when Government operates business, the right to strike evaporates. By law Government employees are forbidden to strike.

It is not enough just to talk with each other. We must reach those who are falling for the Socialist line because they know not what they do.

The big showdown will come in November 1956.

What will be decided is not just the future of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party.

The free way of life as we have known it is at stake. The system which offers the greatest opportunity for individual advancement according to ability and the greatest rewards for effort is under attack by enemies who are playing for keeps. Their burning arrows have already set the house afire.

I for one am not going to stand idly by and let it burn to the ground.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on last evening, April 17, I made a broadcast over station WMCA, of New York City, on 2 subjects which in my opinion are of the utmost importance to the people of the United States. First and foremost is the question of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands, the question of war or peace. Second is the case of Edward Corsi. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The past month, since I last reported to you, has been another eventful one. There has been no great activity here in Congress. We had a 10-day recess for Easter. But there has been no recess on the world front—no recess in the Formosa Straits. And there has been no recess in developments of national political interest.

Two subjects have been the main objects of attention in Washington: First and foremost, the question of Formosa, of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands—the question of war and peace, and second, the case of Edward Corsi.

President Eisenhower has often referred to his administration and to his Cabinet as a team. If they are a team, it is the strangest team in history because it seems to make plays which have no relationship to the signals being called, in public, by the quarterback. President Eisenhower makes fine public statements, with many of which I agree, but his team continues to act as if they had never heard these statements. The Eisenhower team seems to be playing on a different field, in a different game, under a different set of rules, than President Eisenhower himself. For this he must be credited with full responsibility. It is his team.

The 1A test example of incredible conduct on the part of the Eisenhower administration is the case of Ed Corsi, former industrial commissioner of the State of New York, former Republican candidate for the United States Senate, and until very recently, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State on Immigration Matters.

As everybody knows, Mr. Corsi was fired by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles—kicked out of his job—because we was trying to do a job—the job he was assigned to do.

Mr. Corsi took the job at the request of the White House, to try to unsnarl the red-tape and to clean up the mess involving the refugee relief program. Under this program, enacted in 1953, the United States was going to admit 209,000 escapees and refugees from Europe and elsewhere into the United States. Well, to date, almost 2 years later, about 1,000 actual escapees and refugees have been admitted, along with a number of relatives. The entire program has turned out to be a fraud and a failure.

So the White House called in Mr. Corsi, who has a considerable reputation as an administrator, and who is known as a friend of immigration. Corsi's job was to break the administrative logjam. He was to see to it that as many refugees and escapees as possible were admitted into the United States in the remaining months during which the Refugee Relief Act is still in effect.

But in Washington, Mr. Corsi made a critical mistake. He took his job seriously. He pushed, he scolded, he insisted that the red-tape be cut and that refugees be admitted into the United States. He even spoke out against the racist and discriminatory McCarran-Walter Act and urged its drastic amendment.

In Congress, powerful elements committed to the discriminatory principles of the McCarran-Walter Act attacked Mr. Corsi. They went over his past with a fine-toothed comb. They made veiled allusions to vague organizations he had belonged to 20 or 30 years ago. The witch hunt was on.

Secretary Dulles, Mr. Corsi's boss, reacted to the attack against his subordinate by beating an inglorious, shameless retreat. He announced publicly that Mr. Corsi was being investigated for security, and that anyway, Mr. Corsi was in Washington on a temporary 90-day appointment only.

This was news to Mr. Corsi, who had come to Washington prepared to stay and see the refugee program through.

Secretary Dulles had more news for Mr. Corsi. He announced subsequently that Mr. Corsi was no longer to be special assistant for immigration problems. In short, he was fired.

It was not a question of Mr. Corsi's loyalty, Secretary Dulles said. It was just that Mr. Corsi was such a poor administrator.

Mr. Corsi has accused Secretary Dulles of lying. Secretary Dulles has suggested that Mr. Corsi is not telling the truth.

In the light of this development, and of these charges and countercharges, I felt a congressional investigation would be a good thing. I urged that such an investigation be instituted. It is now in progress. I trust and hope that the facts will be brought out.

There is one fact, however, which is perfectly clear without further investigation. That is the fact that the refugee relief program has been a tragic disappointment and a dreadful failure.

You may be interested to know that I am preparing to introduce a set of amendments to the Refugee Relief Act. Those amendments would eliminate the unwise and unsupportable provisions of the present refugee law. My amendments would make the refugee relief program easier to administer. My amendments, if enacted, would make it possible to admit most, if not all, of the 209,000 refugees and escapees authorized to be admitted under the basic terms of that law.

But, no matter how good a law, its purposes can be totally frustrated by unsympathetic and obstructive administration of the law. In reverse, even a bad law can be made to work by liberal, sympathetic, and intelligent administration of it.

I do not know whether we can get this kind of administration of the Refugee Relief Act from the present regime in Washington, even if my amendments to the law are adopted. Mr. Corsi tried, and you know what happened to him.

The question of Mr. Corsi is not the only one troubling Secretary Dulles and the Eisenhower administration these days.

There is a far more explosive problem to be dealt with—and far more important for the United States. That is the question of Formosa, of Quemoy, and Matsu.

Quemoy and Matsu are, of course, those little islands directly off the coast of China, within the very tidewaters of the Chinese mainland. The administration has half-committed the United States to defend those islands, which are now occupied by Chiang Kai-shek, if the Red Chinese attack them.

Maybe we will defend those islands. Maybe we won't. One week we hear in Washington that the administration is prepared to go to war over those islands. The next week we hear that the administration definitely will not go to war over those islands. It is a war of nerves. The chief victims of this war, however, are the American people and the people of the free world.

The chief of naval operations, Admiral Carney, is reported to have predicted that Red China would attack Quemoy and Matsu by April 15, and that by that date we would be in war.

Admiral Carney has denied that he made the prediction. It was another incident in the war of nerves.

But make no mistake about it. The experts in and out of Washington are agreed—they have no doubt—that the Red Chinese are planning to attack Quemoy and Matsu, and are only waiting for the most opportune moment.

What will we do then, when and if an attack is launched, against these islands which have always belonged to the Chinese mainland and are part of the Chinese mainland?

Military experts tell me that there is no way to defend these islands except by bombing the Chinese mainland. There is little question of what would happen then. That would mean all-out war with China. Would it be an atomic war? I do not know. I suspect it would. Red China may not have atomic bombs, but Red Russia has. Are we going to risk atomic war, with all its frightful, world-shattering implications, for the defense of islands which we have no legal right to defend under international law?

Let us not deceive ourselves. In such a war we would fight alone. Alone in the world, with not a single major ally at our side.

We are, of course, committed—I do not question that commitment for a moment—to defend Formosa against a Communist attack. That is what we should be concentrating on—the building up of strength and free-world solidarity for the defense of Formosa. We should be trying, with all the means at our disposal, to associate as many allies as possible with ourselves for the defense of Formosa against aggression. We cannot, and should not, try to do it or go it alone.

A united world front in defense of Formosa against aggression will surely deter the Red Chinese, if anything can deter Red China.

Let us ask ourselves: What is Red China really after? Is it Quemoy and Matsu or Formosa? No; these are only tidbits—means to an end. What Red China really wants is the domination and control of all Asia.

Quemoy and Matsu offer Red China such an opportunity, if we defend them. The masses of the people of Asia are convinced that Quemoy and Matsu should belong to Red China. They believe Red China would be justified in taking possession of these islands by force if necessary. And this same view is held by the vast majority of the peoples and governments of Europe, too.

If we, the United States, undertake to defend these islands against a Red Chinese attack, and thus initiate a war with Red China, and possibly with Russia, too, it will be a war under the best conditions for the Communists, and the worst for us. If we make it an atomic war, we may win temporarily in China, but we will lose permanently in the rest of the world.

We dare not contemplate this prospect. On the contrary, we should make clear, immediately, that we have no such thought in mind. We must make clear that we not only seek peace, but we seek to avoid war.

Formosa represents a point where we can rally the free world; yes, even the peoples of Asia.

I am not trying to run the foreign policy of the United States. That is President Eisenhower's responsibility. But he shall have my views when I honestly differ with him, as I do now, and my support when he is following what I consider the right road.

This is an obligation I owe to you, the people of New York State, whom I represent in the Senate, and to my country. It is an obligation I owe to my conscience.

Thank you, my friends, for listening to my latest report from Washington.

A Great Democratic American and a Great American Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege to join with many thousands of fellow citizens and fellow Democrats last Saturday night in paying a well deserved tribute to a really great man, the Speaker of this House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

It is now my privilege to make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made on that occasion by former President Harry S. Truman as follows:

TRUMAN SPEECH

I assume that it is no longer "top secret" that I am an early riser. It runs in the family. My father was always out of bed at about 4 a. m. My mother used to sing a song to my brother, sister, and me about the sluggard who liked to lie abed and what awful things happened to him. Solomon and Ben Franklin, too, had things to say about late sleepers.

Anyway—the other morning a neighbor caught up with me on one of my regular walks. There was a touch of spring in the air, and I was up earlier than usual. I missed some of the neighbors who usually join me on my walks and who talk with me about everything under the sun.

These good people are so typical of Americans throughout this wonderful land. They are friendly, alert, and inquiring and vigorous in their questions.

On this particular morning, my walking companion said: "I hear you are going to Washington to make a speech. What are you going to talk about?"

I said: "No, I am not going to make a speech. I am making this trip to join in the honoring of a great American, my friend and former colleague, SAM RAYBURN."

RECALLS ROOSEVELT'S DEATH

No doubt you remember, Sam, that meeting which took place in your office on the 12th day of April, 10 years ago last Tuesday. I came to see you to get an agreement between the Speaker and the Vice President on certain legislation and to discuss the domestic and world situation generally.

While I was in your office, I received a telephone call to come to the White House as soon as possible. When I arrived at the White House, Mrs. Roosevelt informed me that the President was dead.

Just 10 years ago last Tuesday one of the greatest of the Presidents of the United States passed away.

Mr. Roosevelt, in my opinion, was one of the few great men of the ages whose interest and life were devoted to the welfare of the everyday man. You and I, Sam, missed him very much at the time. The country and the whole free world missed him. And we will continue to miss him as long as it is necessary for someone to look after the interests of the common people who make up the population of this country and the world. I did my best to continue the policies he advocated for the welfare of this country and for world peace.

Sam, you have set an example for conduct and leadership in the Congress and in political life that has earned you the affection and the respect of the entire Nation, regardless of party. Your place in history is secure, not only because you have served longest as Speaker of the House of Representatives, but because you never yield to partisanship on the basic issues affecting the welfare of the Nation.

So, it is well that we remind ourselves tonight that if the United States is a world leader among the nations today, you will find that SAM RAYBURN played a large part in helping our country to achieve this leadership. If the United States today is a leader in democracy for its enlightened social legislation, you will find that SAM RAYBURN in Congress had a large role in shaping that legislation. I know of few Americans who symbolize the good deeds of this country so much as SAM RAYBURN. It took something more than ordinary talent and courage to look over the horizon beyond the interests of his own district and his own State to the broader view of this country and the world.

CRITICIZES PRESS

That is why I am so glad to be here tonight. (You know I have been working hard lately to put together the important facts about our own administration so as to set the record straight.)

In paying tribute to SAM RAYBURN we are taking this opportunity also to remind ourselves and the world of the reasons for America's great achievements and leadership. At this time, when many of us are worried, and even fearful, about what is happening in this country and abroad, let us not forget how soundly and securely we have built this country so that it has even been able to withstand some pretty bad management of the Government during the last 2 years.

A most remarkable display of publicity and cooperation from the newspapers has tried to keep much of this bad management from the people. There has been no parallel in our history to the cloak of protection thrown about this administration by so much of the press.

You know, we have heard a good deal about a slogan intended to impress our enemy—and that slogan is: massive retaliation. Well, the Democrats know something about massive retaliation. It's the kind of press the Democrats get everywhere, all the time.

Future historians will be puzzled when they come to judge our times, when they see how so much of the press distorted the facts so that no Democratic administration could do right and no Republican administration could do wrong.

What the press and radio commentators said about me never worried me personally. But I have always felt that there is no sense in having a free press under the Constitution and yet not have it free in fact. The people should not be limited to what the publishers choose to tell them. The people are entitled to all the facts and all the news.

There is only one rightful purpose for a government to use publicity, and that is to inform the public of all the facts and the

whole truth. But publicity is no substitute for performance. Yet never in the peacetime history of this Nation has there been such a vast volume of persistent publicity to praise and extol an administration.

We know that in certain sections of the world this is an automatic practice.

I ask you, why the big buildup in this free country? Why?

I, for one, am glad that SAM RAYBURN is again Speaker of the House. Sam is an old and experienced hand in sensing what the real issues are. He knows what is best for all the people and how to attend to their interests in Congress. He is not easily deceived by ballyhoo. And when the security of the Nation is involved, he always rises above partisan politics.

He is a remarkable example of that courageous statesmanship which this Republican administration would do well to emulate. For this administration has been playing partisan politics with our security, with our foreign policy, with our civil service, and with our Nation's resources.

I regret to say that we have not seen such cynical political behavior in any administration since the early twenties. The price of compromise with the extremists within the Republican party has led this administration to surrender on basic principles on foreign policy. It has resulted in confusion and disturbing the American people and in frightening our friends and allies.

The administration has talked about an "agonizing reappraisal" of foreign policy. I can well understand their agony. After repeatedly getting into trouble with their own policy, it must be agonizing indeed to realize that sooner or later they must reverse themselves and return to the sound policies of the Democratic administration.

There is no room for partisan bickering over the great issues of national survival. Our foreign policy ought to be the foreign policy of the United States and not the foreign policy of 1 Senator, or 1 general, or 1 admiral, or 1 party. The Democratic Party understands this.

The Republican administration has repeatedly played political tricks with the grave and serious issues of both foreign and domestic policies.

CITES MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

The state of the Union address by the Republican administration in 1953 launched this business of conducting foreign affairs for domestic political advantage. It was in this address that the administration announced it was unleashing Chiang Kai-shek to attack the mainland of China. They announced they were moving the Seventh Fleet, which was there only to protect Chiang. Anyway, it was a serious blunder, and they had to put the fleet back.

The Republican administration must have known that the picture of an unleashed Chiang Kai-shek invading China was a barefaced political fraud. But the idea behind all this was to attempt to discredit the sound policy of the Democratic administration which was carefully designed to limit the conflict in the Far East.

And now the Republican administration is desperately trying not only to limit the conflict in Asia but to get a permanent cease-fire there. I fervently hope they do. But the administration, by this unfortunate political maneuver in its state of the Union message, has enabled the Communists to picture us as instigating and preparing an attack on China and has embroiled us in controversies with almost all our allies in Asia and in Europe.

If we are face to face in Asia with the prospect of war, a war which the administration says may have to be fought with atomic weapons, nobody is going to get any political advantage out of it. If we are pushed into the abyss of a new war, the whole world may tumble into that abyss with us.

I suggest that as Americans, working together in good faith, we ought to back a national bipartisan foreign policy with these simple fundamental aims:

First, let us keep the free nations together for a common purpose, and that is to defend our common freedom.

Second, to uphold the principles of international peace and order, the principles that are embodied in the United Nations.

Third, to strengthen in every way we can the weaker members of the free nations of the world and to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world so that all may have enough to eat, enough to wear and a decent place in which to live. Our aim is not to make people fight for us, but to win them over to freedom and to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Fourth, we must keep our country strong in every way, militarily and economically.

ATTACKS SERVICE CUTS

And we cannot keep the country strong militarily by cutting the Army and the Navy. We must keep our Armed Forces in line with our military commitments. Important as atomic weapons are, there is as yet no substitute for men. It takes men in the Armed Forces to make even a pushbutton war work. In fact, in atomic warfare, it takes more men, better-educated men and better-trained men than in preatomic warfare.

These are the basic elements of a foreign policy on which the whole nation could unite. We ought to be giving all our attention to this task instead of trying to make political capital out of the dangers and difficulties of world affairs.

The Republicans ought to know that the best hope of avoiding ultimate tragedy depends upon the full and free cooperation of the Democratic majority in Congress and the majority of the people in the country.

The times are critical, and we face serious decisions. They demand the best that is in us. They require leadership of the highest order.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you many more years of life and good fortune and of service to the Nation. And my best wishes to you, Senator JOHNSON, and to your colleagues in the Senate and the House.

The Department of Commerce and the Alleged Defense Essentiality of the Watch Industry

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a letter which I addressed to Secretary of Commerce Weeks some 10 days ago:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. April 15, 1955.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This morning, I read newspaper reports of your press conference and was very much surprised to learn that you told newsmen you had never seen the report prepared last year by the Defense Department concerning the jeweled watch industry.

It was particularly disturbing to me that you were unaware of the contents of this report in view of the fact that: (1) Your Department took the lead in persuading ODM last year that the domestic jeweled watch industry was essential to national defense; (2) you and other Commerce officials have frequently testified before congressional committees concerning the vital role which the four jeweled watch companies supposedly play in our defense production, and (3) at the present time, the Commerce Department is sponsoring an exhibit by the domestic watch industry emphasizing the unique importance of these firms in the defense procurement picture.

I think you will agree with me that the Defense Department is in an excellent position to evaluate whether the skills and facilities of the watch industry are truly vital to national security. Certainly, it would have been advisable for you and other Commerce officials to have studied the Defense Department's report on this subject—which was made available to you although it was suppressed from the public and the Congress for obvious reasons.

For your information, I am attaching a copy of the Defense Department report, which was recently declassified. You will note that the report can hardly be considered as obsolete since it was prepared less than a year ago after the most exhaustive study. Mr. C. S. Thomas, who was then Assistant Secretary of Defense and is now Secretary of the Navy, emphasized that "the report has had the benefit of the most thorough examination by technical experts of the three military departments. The conclusions have been reached after careful consideration by cognizant officials of the Department." Certainly, nothing has happened within the past year which would give the Defense Department a valid excuse for changing the findings and recommendations in this report.

The conclusions reached by the Defense Department were as follows:

(1) "The timing devices used in the ammunition program were produced by the jeweled watch manufacturers, nonjeweled watch and clock manufacturers, and others completely outside the horological group. There does not appear to be any part of the manufacture or assembly of mechanical time fuses that is peculiar only to the jeweled watch industry."

(2) "Only 11 percent of the total mobilization requirement (for all timing devices) planned with industry, is with the jeweled watch industry."

(3) "There is in no way a unique requirement for it (the jeweled watch industry) in the fuse program." Many manufacturers outside the jeweled watch industry "are capable of producing mechanical time fuses and rear fitting safety devices. Every part is being produced by some company other than a jeweled watch firm."

(4) Mobilization requirements of the Defense Department for jeweled watches and chronometers are "nominal," far below World War II levels. Sufficient capacity "will remain and can be used for current procurement needs and be the basis for supplying the mobilization requirements. If, in the future, it should become apparent that sufficient capacity will not be maintained and available, the Defense Department can then procure all of its requirements of jeweled movements for the mobilization reserve"—i. e., can easily be stockpiled.

(5) The needs of the Defense Department for industrial capacity clearly demonstrate that "no special nor preferential treatment for the jeweled watch industry is essential."

I hope that you and other Commerce Department officials will study this document carefully. In view of this authoritative report by the Department of Defense, it seems hard to understand why the Commerce Department continues to insist upon further

Government protection for the domestic watch industry—particularly in view of the current prosperity of these firms and the hardships which have been imposed upon American watch importer-assembler firms, United States exporters, and milions of watch customers who now must pay higher prices.

Actions by the administration to curtail watch imports have a direct result on the ability of the Swiss to purchase American agricultural and industrial products. The farm population in my district is keenly aware of the fact that their market for cotton, rice, and other commodities is sharply reduced when other nations are deprived of the dollars they need to trade with the United States.

In view of the fact that the Defense Department has conclusively stated that there is no need for special Government action to protect the domestic watch industry, the administration should immediately reconsider its moves which have been so destructive of international trade and friendship with the Swiss.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Refugee Relief Act of 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, despite the smoke screen created by the Corsi affair and other attempts to discredit our immigration program, the Eisenhower administration will allow almost four times as many Italians to enter the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, than are normally allowed under the immigration quota. This is a little known fact which has been deliberately obscured by certain elements who for political purposes are attempting to sabotage a great humanitarian undertaking.

The refugee relief program is designed to bring 209,000 deserving aliens to America by December 31, 1956. Under the act Italy is far in the lead with some 21,000 visas expected to be issued by June 30. This is in addition to the normal Italian quota of 5,645 visas per year.

The refugee program is now operating so well that there can be issued by December 31, 1956, sufficient visas for all who can qualify under the act and for whom there are required assurances. Those who are sincerely interested in the success of the refugee program can perform a great service by fostering the granting of assurances for the benefit of those who desire to come to America. An assurance, of course, is a guaranty that the alien will not become a public charge.

The refugee relief program is now at the half way point in its 40-month life. Some 108,000 persons have entered the pipeline—those are the applicants who have been notified of documents required to speed their cases toward a visa. Remember that the act calls for 209,000 admissions. Consequently, there is no reason why all qualified applicants cannot be processed in due course. The Department of State, starting from scratch in 1953, has established a worldwide visa issuing organization to administer the law.

Booze Broadcasting Is a Beast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 4627, which is a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages. It is my hope and desire that my colleagues will study this bill carefully and then act favorably upon it for the sake of a more spiritual citizenship, a more stabilized American home, and a more serious-minded youth of tomorrow.

There are some things that should be strictly regulated while they exist or else put in complete subjugation among civilized peoples, for example, the rattlesnake, the brothel, the stalking murderer, the insidious thief, the troublemaker at home or abroad, and the nice, genteel advertisement of booze in whatever form may be best calculated to make strongest appeal to our boys and girls. You say it is a legal subject matter. So is the rattlesnake. You say freedom of speech and of press are inviolable. Yes; but under exercise of police power we do not allow the free-speech man to use indecent language in the public square nor do we allow the free-press man to publish obscene pictures in the Daily Times. Morals, health, and welfare may be, ought to be, and must be closely and firmly regulated under the police power concept breathed into our Constitution by our Founding Fathers more than a century and a half ago.

In the dusty annals of bygone history, there once lived a king named Belshazzar. He was "a man of distinction." So much so that one night he had a great feast and invited 1,000 of his lords, not to speak of many princes, wives and concubines that also came along in great numbers. Now it looked like everybody wanted to be a man of distinction and get on a big binge on that occasion. I suppose the 1,000 lords about all got tanked up and doubtless we have derived our current expression, "drunk as a lord," from the unseemly condition of Belshazzar's own lords at that famous festival when wine flowed like a mountain stream after a hard shower in the springtime. Strange handwriting suddenly appeared on the plastered wall, old Belshazzar took a bad case of delirium tremens and on that very night the drunken king was killed and a new and sober administration came into power under King Darius. Of course, the Belshazzar wine was perfectly legal. None whatever thought it should be regulated. "Let it flow freely," said everyone from the king on down. "Let it come into the very home of the king and let its free intercourse be unmolested in the name of complete liberty." But before that fateful night was over, there was some free writing on the wall, some free delirium tremens among the men of distinction, some free rigor mortis on the regal throne of Babylon.

In 1871 the Chicago fire raged over the city unregulated and caused $196 million in damages.

In 1889 the Johnstown flood surged down the valley unregulated and cost 2,200 lives.

And now, unrestrained and uninhibited, alcoholic advertising may well, in my humble opinion, cost much more than all the damage and loss of life of both the Chicago fire and Johnstown flood combined and then multiplied by two.

During my own lifetime my good State of Kentucky has continuously stood at the top of the list of alcohol producers and has frequently bragged about this, and yet during that same lifetime span I notice that whereas Kentucky once stood 11th in population among the States, it now stands 19th in the list of States. Cause and effect? Well you be the judge. The same handwriting that was once on the plastered wall of Belshazzar may now be appearing on the plastered wall of Kentucky or on that of America if we persist in going ahead with our total indifference toward the harmful influences that come within our homes and about our hearthsides in the form of alcoholic advertisements.

Twenty million people in America are offended every day by the alcoholic advertising that comes to their homes consistently and continually without even knocking at their doors, entering the very impressionable minds of boys and girls with the obvious purpose of making more customers for an industry that destroys, dooms, and damns human personality as it rolls along.

We would not think of allowing an offending beast to come into the American home unrestrained and uninhibited. Yet, booze broadcasting by TV, radio, or publication is a beast and it sorely offends millions every day in the American home. It is now time to illegalize it in interstate commerce. It may be later than we think.

State of Israel Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 2, our able and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] made a speech at a trade-union dinner in the interest of the Israel bond drive. It was a most interesting and thought-provoking speech. It was a heartening speech to those interested in the welfare of Israel. I feel that the Senator's speech should be widely read. It should certainly be made a part of the RECORD of the United States Senate. Therefore, I

ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATE OF ISRAEL BOND SPEECH AT TRADE UNION DINNER BY HON. PAT MCNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., APRIL 2, 1955

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, officers, brothers, and sisters in the trade-union movement, fellow Americans, this is the first time since the voters of Michigan decided the time had arrived to send a member of organized labor to the United States Senate that I have had the pleasure of addressing a large gathering of the representatives of labor—A. F. of L., CIO, and independent unions—all together in one place. It is a very great privilege indeed to be here and to know that this meeting is symbolic of the unification of organized labor that is now in process.

This gathering is of special interest to me, for if it had not been for the strongly concerted efforts of practically all groups of organized labor, I would not be addressing you tonight as the Senator from Michigan. Let me point out that I am only the third Democrat in the history of Michigan to be elected to the United States Senate. It is clear that the allegiance to the GOP of that rock-ribbed Republican State is crumbling.

How did this happen? It happened because Michigan has become an industrial as well as an agricultural State; it happened because the workers of Michigan rebelled against the reactionary policies of the Republican Party; it happened because the working people of Michigan joined with the disillusioned farmers and the disappointed business people to send to the Congress a Senator who would do his best for all the people. They had become tired of seeing their State represented by Senators who consistently voted wrong. Today, they have at least one Senator who tries to see their problems as a whole and who votes according to his conscience in what he sees as the best interests of the entire State.

I must confess that there are times in Washington when I feel somewhat frustrated. But this is part of the process of democracy; many times we must make haste slowly. But we must make sure that we are going forward, not backward. I see it as my job to keep trying for better things for all our people, and that's what I am endeavoring to do.

You will forgive me, I hope, for discussing politics a little in my remarks, because, I am sure, you have wondered how it happened that PAT MCNAMARA, from the pipefitting trade, reached the United States Senate. It was improbable, but it happened—not because of the particular merits of myself, but because the times are changing, and people are changing with them.

In addition, I can say honestly that my campaign for election was, in my belief, one of the cleanest campaigns in the Nation. There were no personalities. My opponent, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, ran on his record, and I attacked his and his party's record up and down the State. We fought it out on the issues, and the Democrats won.

I have a Jewish friend back in Michigan who used to say he had his own definition of a Jew. He told me: "Pat, I'm going to give you an answer that an Irishman will understand. The Jews are that branch of the human race who just won't take 'no' for an answer." The more I hear about Israel and its people, the more I can see the truth in my friend's remark.

I want to tell you a little about the story of Israel, not just because I want you, as Americans, to further the sale of Israeli bonds, but because I want you, as Americans, to understand how I see this business of refusing to take no for an aswer.

Here we are gathered, you and I, in this important meeting of organized labor. I am here because of my position as a Senator of the United States—but my position as a Senator of the United States is due to a lifetime in the ranks of organized labor. You and I know why we are here. We are here because all along the line of bitter opposition to labor unionism, there were men who wouldn't take no for an answer. I think that almost every man is here because in the battle for human dignity and workers' rights each of us refused to take no for an answer. That refusal to take no for an answer built America; it brought the workers who built America into a movement that will build America into something far greater than anyone has ever dreamed.

If there is one place in the world where that same spirit exists and permeates the life of the country and its people to an even greater degree than in the United States, that place is the land of Israel.

It took us generations of struggle and education to forge the mighty organizations which are our labor unions. It took determined effort and bitter conflict to gain for organized labor its rightful place in this country, and this is the remarkable thing about Israel that should make each of us feel a sense of partnership with that country and its people—they founded their country on the principles that we still are struggling for in America. Their labor organizations are the dominant economic and political forces of Israel, operating through the great Histadruth, their central labor organization. They have proven that the desert can be made to bloom, that the swamp can be drained, that men can accomplish the impossible where men have the will and faith to accomplish the impossible. Believe me, my friends, if Israel had the resources that America has, in the same proportion, there would not have to be the struggle or the threat of struggle to achieve the reasonable aims of its people.

What they have accomplished in Israel and what they are now accomplishing in the face of great hardship must arouse the admiration of every man who knows the meaning of struggle against odds. Even if we were not informed Americans, recognizing our kinship with them for their democratic ideals; for their indomitable courage; for their role in history past, present, and future; we would, just as good sports who like to see a man get an even shake, rise and cheer them on.

My friends, that is just what we are being asked to do. Israel is small, a little guy, fighting nature, fighting enemies, racing against time to build up an economy based on equity, learning his job while he is producing, welcoming the stranger and sharing his crust with him—such a guy needs friends. He needs friends as America needed friends during the Revolution. This little guy saw 6 million of his brothers and sisters wiped out in the world. He has memories of his people burned and stabbed and plundered in many parts of the Old World. Without allies, he has only himself and his eternal faith in God. He must do today at all costs what dare not be left for tomorrow. I tell you, my fellow Americans, it would be a poor kind of American who wouldn't admire that little guy and who wouldn't be cheering him on in his fight against such odds.

We are being asked to lend him some of our strength. America was in that same position during the Revolution. Abroad, we went to France for help. At home, that great American Jewish patriot, Haym Salomon, a Philadelphia banker, bankrupted himself in the cause of the independence of the United States. In our own wars, we go to our own people for assistance to our country through bond purchases. Israel, with its limited resources, must have outside help. I do know this: Every American who, whether through sentiment or for hardheaded business reasons, invests in State of Israel bonds has a fine, sound investment. Whether you are investing in a private business or in a country, your investment is safest when it is made with people who won't take no for an answer. And you are asked to invest—not in war bonds—these are bonds for peace. Jews are not a warring people.

Imagine a little country with half a million people at the end of a struggle for independence absorbing over a million refugees within a few short years. It was impossible—but they did it. Imagine a tiny nation having to break the soil and establish industries while fighting for independence. It was impossible—but they did it. So now you have a million and a half people, today neither at war nor at peace, building frantically because they know that events in the world may soon make it necessary to bring in another million refugees whose very lives are at stake in other parts of the world. It seems impossible—but they are doing it. Whole new industries are springing up. A vast chemical industry, construction, cement, plastics, machinery, roadbuilding, consumer goods, agriculture, shipping, aviation—these and many more are making the land of Israel throb with the urgent vitality that is so characteristic of America. It is only a question of time before their example revitalizes the whole Middle East and helps millions of the Arab peoples make progress in the civilized world.

But time is on the side of the people of Israel only if we give the people of Israel what they need to work with—right now and in adequate measure. The chemical and other industries which are needed cannot be built on a piecemeal basis; you cannot build part of a chemical plant today and another part the year after next. If you are going to build at all, you must build that plant all at one time. The same thing goes for all the other industries that have to be created right from the ground up. The people of Israel must have the tools they need—now. Otherwise, the year after next may find them worse off than they are today.

We are told that it took 6 days for the creation of the world, and only after it was all done were man and woman created to inhabit it. But in Israel the people are already there, and a new world is being created around them while they must be fed, clothed, and educated. It is this new miracle of creation under most difficult conditions that has earned the awe and respect of the other people of the world. It is in this miracle that we are being asked to invest.

You see, my friends, it is not just Israel you are investing in. You are making an investment in civilization itself. You are investing in the human spirit. The same people who, a thousand years ago, carried to the rude medieval Christian countries of Europe the first philosophy and learning and devotion to democracy and freedom nurtured in the Eastern World, have now returned to the East, bearing with them the science and the productive arts of living of the 20th century West.

These are not just bonds for Israel—they are our bonds with Israel. One could not understand America without understanding the part that the Jewish idea of one God, through the teachings of Christianity, has played in the founding and the history of America. Ours is not just a debt to repay, not just an acknowledgement of spiritual kinship. This is an act by which the common man in America declares to Israel and to all peoples of the whole world: "Wherever men fight the good fight for political and economic democracy; wherever men struggle to raise the levels of living and dignity of the common man; wherever

men, against whatever odds, refuse to take no for an answer—to that place and to those men the people of America will send their private help, their personal encouragement, their ringing message of the unity of all good men in a good cause."

In conclusion, my friends, let me say that there could be no more fitting group than this to give emphasis and leadership in the bonds for Israel campaign. You represent the working people of the San Francisco area. You are asking your people and your friends to make possible the success of a democratic working community far away in the Middle East—so that from their toil and their sweat they may make for themselves a prosperous and free homeland; and so that their success may shine as a beacon and an ideal for all the oppressed and poverty-stricken and disease-ridden and hopeless people who are their neighbors—as well as creating in that vast desert country an oasis of democracy, with kinship for all the freedom-loving nations of the world.

So, the beachhead is well established. I am sure you here tonight will want to see it expand, not only that a great people may find refuge from oppression but also that future generations will, with God's help, have a chance for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which is man's rightful heritage.

Addresses Delivered Before Annual Meeting of Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on February 22, in Philadelphia, Pa., the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association was held. At that meeting addresses were delivered by my distinguished colleague [Mr. DUFF] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; by the dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation, Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, and by the distinguished Member of the House from Indiana, Mr. CHARLES A. HALLECK, as well as an address delivered by myself. I ask unanimous consent that these addresses may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

I was thrilled, as I know you were, when the young man who just spoke to us created a picture of the businessman of the immediate future. I could not help but think of how this young man has been favored above many others who are in colleges today and who are getting their learning out of books only. He has been privileged to get some learning by practical experience with businessmen, and he expressed it so nicely when he said that he learned in effect that businessmen are not ogres, but on the contrary do try to get along with their employees.

And I say to you, young man, you have come to a group of Pennsylvanians who have made it a business for many years to provide jobs in Pennsylvania and they have done that by helping to create a healthy atmosphere in which business might thrive, and only as business thrives are there jobs for your neighbors and mine.

In Washington we have been told for some time that the Democrats and the Republicans would get along very nicely, be highly cooperative and bipartisan, and that the day had come when it didn't make a great deal of difference—this was after the election—whether the Republicans controlled the House and the Senate or not. Before that date we urged the election of Republican Congressmen, and if we had them we would not be in the mess we are today. But we didn't get them.

Then we began to listen to the will-of-the-wisp, the people who told us, "Well, the Democrats are pretty good guys anyway," and you could take their word and they would cooperate with us and give our great President the kind of legislation he wants and the cooperation he needs.

Not being on the inside, I cannot speak conclusively, but having read the newspapers and having listened to the Democrats talk, I know that the Democrats did come offering honey gifts and words, seeking to tie the hands of the Republicans and to pretend a close cooperation for Mr. Eisenhower's program. And what are we getting? Has the Democratic Party changed its spots and is it today any more willing to cooperate with Republicans than it has been in the past? Well, we have thus far had at least two instances in Washington which belie any such claim.

One was a bill purported to be the same as the administration had requested a year ago when the Republicans were in the majority of the Congress, a bill dealing with the foreign trade. It was handed to Mr. COOPER of the Ways and Means Committee for introduction. Between the time the bill left our party's leadership in Washington and the time it was introduced, it was changed, and things were written into it which were not in the administration bill a year ago, a bill based upon the Randall Commission report.

Now, the bill had been sold to the country on the basis of cooperation, on the basis of an agreement made with the Democrats because this was an international matter and it was believed that the legislation would go through unanimously. But the Democratic Party breached the faith that our party had placed in it even in that international field and only confirmed what I have said frequently and what I repeat: You cannot trust the Democratic Party in Washington to help us make a good record for our President. Certainly you cannot trust the Democrats in this year immediately preceding a Presidential election, for they are out to lick Dwight Eisenhower and elect their own man as President. I hope that we won't fall into their trap again.

CITES SECOND DECEPTION

The other instance became apparent only a day or two ago—and both of these examples involved the committee upon which I serve, the Ways and Means Committee. Less than 10 days ago the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said to all the members: Can we get an agreement that there will be no hearings held in connection with the bill providing for continuation of the present corporate tax rate and extension of the present rates on certain of excises due to expire in April? The matter was discussed by our committee and I said, "I assume this means that there will be no amendments made to the bill." An equivocal answer was given and I became suspicious, but inasmuch as the Democrats have a majority of 15 to 10 upon the committee, we did not argue because we didn't have the votes, and it was decided not to have hearings.

Well, you recall how last week, after disposing of the trade extension bill in the House without warning, and frankly without much careful thought on the part of the Democrats, they suddenly announced that they were going to amend the tax bill by a proviso that every taxpayer might deduct $20 for himself and his dependents from the tax which he figured he owed the Government.

We challenged them in the committee as to why they had told us one thing and done another and received an answer to this effect: "Well, we fooled you fellows; you'd better make the best of it."

A DISHONEST PROPOSAL

It is a dishonest proposal. It comes at a time when the President has assured us that if we continue with the very sound financial policies that we have been following for the past year or two, we will be able to next year make a tax reduction, in the absence of war, which will be sound, of a greater amount in my opinion, and a kind of a tax reduction which will not have to be replaced by a new tax in the immediate future for it won't tend to increase the national debt.

The Republican Party under President Eisenhower has given this country something we have not had for a generation, a sound Government, a Government in which we are endeavoring to make the outgo and the income match, a Government in which we have stabilized the value of the dollar so that the dollar you pay today for your social security, or for your life insurance will, if we maintain our policies, be, when you get it back, worth at least as much as it is today. That is what the Republican Party stands for, a country where a businessman can look ahead 1, 2, or 3 years and know that, if these policies are continued under a Republican administration, there will be a healthy climate under which his business can prosper and grow. That is what we stand for. That is why I am proud to tell them in Washington that I believe with Dwight Eisenhower as our nominee for the President, Pennsylvania will get back in the Republican column, and for another generation at least will stay there.

You businessmen owe an obligation not only to your business, but to your country and to the Republican Party, which is the medium through which you can express yourself. I would like to call upon each of you as you go into your respective counties to persuade others to get out and work the Republican ticket, and endeavor to get others who should be in politics as candidates to become candidates, and to sponsor in every way you can good government through the Republican Party.

If you do that in the next 2 years, there is no doubt but that Dwight Eisenhower will be our President for another 4 years and the Republican Party will again be in the ascendancy here in Pennsylvania.

Thank you.

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

Mason and Dick, my colleagues of the Congress, members of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, and friends, I am happy to be here and I would like to say that as a Republican from Indiana I haven't any allergy for men who are successes in business. It would be good for the country, for everybody, if people in business had no allergy for us who are in politics, because politics, my friends, is getting to be a right important business.

As I say, I come from Indiana and am a Republican, but this is going to be a nonpartisan Republican speech. We take our politics pretty seriously out there in Indiana. They say the first words spoken by every child born in the State are these: "I am not a candidate for any public office, but I promise if nominated and elected I shall serve to the best of my ability." And that is really the way we work at it.

Mason, you said I have been your longtime friend. I have. You had me come to

Tioga County in 1936, I think it was, to speak to a Republican meeting, and I was glad to come up there from Washington, but the opposition darned near wrecked the meeting. We had it out in the ballpark at Mansfield, and darned if the WPA didn't move in and put brand-new green paint on all the seats in the grandstand the day before we were to hold the meeting. But we went ahead and held the meeting anyway.

Mason, you have been a stalwart fighter in our cause for a long time.

DICK SIMPSON, I just want to say to you in the presence of these people from Pennsylvania that I have never ceased to be happy for what little I did to bring about your election. I have been happy to play and work on your team because you are the great kind of a fellow that we need.

I was at the White House this morning for our conference. It was stepped up by the reason of certain developments, principally this $20 deal. And are they going to give a mule with that or not? I don't know. I got out a copy of the Corrupt Practices Act. You know it says in there if you spend money to buy somebody's vote, that is a violation of the criminal law. I don't know whether technically this is such a violation, but certainly it is a violation of the spirit of the Corrupt Practices Act.

They also stepped up the meeting a little so that I could come up here, and the President was happy to do it. And as I left he said, "Good luck, Charlie. I am glad you are going up there to Philadelphia to talk to those folks."

If you could have been with me this morning and heard the President's expression on some of the problems that immediately beset us, why, there wouldn't be one of you who would not go out of there and say, "I am willing to go down the line on that program."

Now, I do want to say a few things about this program. First of all, folks, I don't care whether you are running a business or whether you have an association like this, you have got to have managers to run it.

NEW SET OF MANAGERS

A little more than 2 years ago the people of this country called for a new set of managers to operate their Federal Government. This change in political leadership resulted from a growing public discontent with the manner in which the country was being run. Not the least of the reasons for this discontent was a deep-seated conviction that America was being pushed toward socialism. Progressively bigger Federal spending programs, higher taxes, controls, competition with private enterprise, grandiose schemes for public power, and attempts to regiment medicine and agriculture were all part of the socialistic pattern.

The trend toward centralized government, with emphasis on the authority of Executive at the expense of Congress, was another alarming feature of the campaign to substitute government "over" the people for government "of" the people. Inflation and the illusion of "free money" from Washington were devices designed to perpetuate a political dynasty. Scandals and corruption were a natural byproduct of cynicism in high places. Even foreign relations were used as a tool to accomplish radical ends. Employing a "crisis psychology," previous administrations were quick to seize on events in the international picture as an excuse for new controls and regulations, new spending, and greater taxes.

No new management could have done a better job of giving the American people the kind of Government they wanted than has the Republican administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower. In spite of inherited commitments involving upward of $80 billion, for which no provision to pay had been made by the old set of managers, we have succeeded in achieving substantial budget reductions. Economies in the Federal household have made possible the largest tax-cutting program in the Nation's history, amounting to $7.4 billion on an annual basis.

Controls were ended as one of the first orders of business.

Sound fiscal policies have halted ruinous inflation.

The Ewing plan for socialized medicine and the Brannan plan to do the same thing to agriculture have both been sunk without a trace.

RESTORING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

The new managers on the Washington scene are restoring public confidence in private enterprise as the best system mankind has yet devised for steady progress toward better living for all Americans. Two years ago that confidence was at low ebb because for two decades business had served as a convenient whipping boy for radicals. The climate has been changed from one of hostility toward important segments of our economy to one of friendly cooperation and fair treatment for all segments. This change results from a fundamental belief in our system on the part of this new political management, in contrast to the attitude of hot-eyed extremists who hoped they could make America over into something completely foreign.

The trumped-up Dixon-Yates controversy betrays the anguish of public-power advocates, especially in the Tennessee Valley area, who are afraid the gravy train is running out. The basic issue at stake is whether this Government is going to enter into a fair and equitable contract with private enterprise or soak the taxpayers of this Nation $100 million to build another steam generating plant to subsidize low-cost power. The contract itself confirms this administration's respect for the principle that Government should encourage private enterprise wherever possible and practicable.

This administration is further demonstrating its faith in private enterprise by moving to get Government out of business activities where it has no right to be.

President Eisenhower's respect for constitutional processes is reflected in his cooperative attitude toward the Congress, which he considers a partner in the business of Government operation.

We are also moving steadily toward the restoration of rights and responsibilities to States and communities with carefully considered aid programs that call for greater participation at the local level and less control at the Federal level.

We are getting more government back home, where it belongs.

The farm program adopted by the Republican 83d Congress marks a sure-footed approach to the problem of getting agriculture out from under the staggering burden of unmanageable surpluses which had built up under the rigid parity system. It is a major move toward the release of American farmers from the bondage of ever-tightening controls and restrictions and brings agriculture closer to the goal of 100 percent parity in the market place.

Handling of the Formosa incident is in striking contrast to the manner in which a previous administration met a situation in Korea. In the case of Korea, members of the Congress learned that American troops had been committed to armed conflict by reading the news in the Nation's press. In the case of Formosa, President Eisenhower called on the Congress for support of his policy in advance of action. Instead of the confusion and misunderstanding at home and abroad which characterized United States policy toward Korea, the American people, as well as our friends and potential enemies, know exactly where we stand on the issue of defending Formosa.

Beyond that, the calmness with which the Eisenhower administration has pursued its foreign policy, the absence of alarms and fanfare, has resulted in a quiet confidence on the part of our citizens that we now have managers at the helm who know what they are doing. This consistent and courageous policy may well prove to be one of our most effective weapons for safeguarding the peace of the world. Certainly the manner in which it has been developed, with forthright debate in and overwhelming support by the Congress of the United States, is our best guarantee of national unity.

GOALS OF ADMINISTRATION

The goals of the Eisenhower administration during the next 2 years will be to continue the gains we have made toward the establishment of a sound prosperity based on a just and lasting peace. Avoiding extremes of political philosophy, we are charting a course to which an overwhelming majority of Americans can subscribe. It is a course that calls for conservative policies where the people's money is concerned, but for sympathetic attention to the problems of human needs, where the public good requires Federal action. It is a course that minimizes Government interference in matters properly the concern of private enterprise or of States and communities. It is a course which emphasizes the responsibility of the individual to do those things for himself which are the traditional responsibilities of free American citizens.

This new set of managers strongly believes that incentive is the great motivating force in the American economy and that honest interpretation of the law, together with fair and impartial treatment for everyone, are foundation stones of good Government.

Pursuit of such policies and principles during the past 2 years has created a wholesome attitude of public trust in Government leadership. This faith, together with sound, forward-looking management of the Federal operation, has brought the Nation through a difficult transition period with a minimum of dislocations and adjustment. The prophets of gloom who were so loud in their predictions of a serious recession not so long ago have been shamed into silence by accumulating evidence that ours is a vigorous and expanding Nation.

Those who think the battle has been easy, or that it is won for all time, should be forewarned:

The radicals, the spenders, the socializers, the crisis-manufacturers are no longer in power, but they have not given up hope of returning. They are waiting in the wings. They are ready to come in. And believe me, they will come in if we don't win.

I can't believe the people of this country want that to happen. It won't happen if citizens in all walks of life who believe in our system and who want to help make it work better than ever before will take a continuing interest in Government at all levels. As manufacturers, you well know that any quality product starts with quality materials. By the same token, good Government in America is the end product of good citizenship. Good citizenship begins here—in this room—with you.

That is the way I feel about it. And if you feel about it the way I do, believe me you are going to do something about it. And if you do, then I am very, very sure that we are going to win through to the greatest period of peace and happiness and prosperity that this Nation ever saw.

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES H. DUFF

This is a magnificent audience and it is a great privilege to be here.

I would like to tell you of an experience I had at noon today at Independence Hall during a meeting on the Voice of Freedom. There was a young man there every one of you would have been pleased beyond measure to hear: Polish Lieutenant Jerecki, who

had joined the Communist Party in Poland because he thought that was his best opportunity for service.

He happened to be the son of a Polish officer who had been executed when the Russians took over. Had they known that, he said, he would not have been trained for the air force in Russian Poland but would have been sent to Siberia.

Only 21 at the time, he became flight commander of a crack squadron of MIG's under Russian control in the land where his own government had been destroyed, where personal property had been confiscated, where the women had been violated, and where the people had been deprived of their civil and religious liberties.

He risked all for freedom, fleeing from behind the Iron Curtain so he could tell the people of America what it was like to be under the iron foot of communism.

As everyone here knows, and as he pointed out, the experience of Poland will be the experience of the world unless something is done about it.

I think that the challenge to our generation was never greater than it is today, with this country the sole roadblock between freedom and the overrunning of the world by the most vicious and evil and godless force that has ever attempted to conquer a country.

At such a time, we are favored beyond imagination in having as President one of the great diplomats of our time and one of the greatest soldiers in the history of America—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

And finally, as a Republican, believing in Republicanism and believing that the control of this Government by Republicans is necessary to keep it on the track and to guide our destinies in the most serious period of our history, I am confident that Dwight D. Eisenhower will again respond to the call of the people of this country and next year will be reelected President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD MARTIN

It is an inspiration to come to this historic center of patriotism on the birthday anniversary of George Washington.

Here, in the city of William Penn, freedom of the individual took root and flourished for the first time in the world. Here American Independence was proclaimed and the world's greatest charter of freedom, the Constitution of the United States, was framed and adopted.

With that great tradition in mind I would like to discuss briefly our duty to our country and the dangers we must overcome to preserve our sacred heritage of liberty and independence.

I have in mind also the great good that can be accomplished by the influence and example of the distinguished group of leaders in business and industry assembled here tonight.

The stability of our Government, the economic strength of the Nation, and the continuance of the American way of life depend upon men and women like you.

The Founding Fathers, meeting here in Philadelphia, erected a great landmark in world progress when they proclaimed that the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are divine endowments bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the universe. They framed a new concept of self-government by free men.

Their plan embraced the fundamental proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. They established the principle that government has no power over the individual beyond that granted by the people themselves.

The knew from their profound study of history that great democracies of the past had failed because the moral fiber of the people had become undermined by greed and corruption. They knew that tyranny and dictatorship have always overwhelmed free people who ignored the sound principle that government has nothing to give except that which it first takes from the people.

I would like to direct your attention to three great dangers that threaten America.

First. Big Government and Government doing things that we should do for ourselves.

The vast expansion in the size and cost of Government at all levels is leading us away from the ideals of the Founding Fathers. The people are constantly demanding more and more services. Under that pressure Government has become involved in too many functions in which it does not properly belong. The result has always been excessive taxation and the steady flow of power from the hands of the people into centralized, bureaucratic authority and Government control.

Second. Too much private and public debt. Too many of our people do not seem to be concerned with the ever increasing burden of debt which is growing bigger and bigger at a sickening rate.

Never before in the history of the world have any people owed so much as we owe today. It should be a matter of deep concern to every one of us that the American people now owe a total of more than $600 billion, three times as much as the debt 15 years ago.

Twenty years ago, when we were fighting the worst depression we ever had, the Federal debt was less than $20 billion. Today it is $278 billion, an increase of $20 billion since the end of World War II.

The debts of State and local governments have increased 16 percent in one year alone, reaching a total of $38 billion on June 30, 1954.

If for any reason we should be forced into a decline—even a slight decline in business activity, jobs and income—this staggering burden of public and private debt could prove too much for our economy to sustain and could bring us to disaster.

Please bear in mind that more nations have been destroyed by debt and taxes than by invading armies.

Third. Too little interest in Government. It is unfortunate that so many of our people have forgotten that taking part in Government is a patriotic duty. We cannot expect clean and economical Government unless we take a real part in it.

There will be disloyalty and communism in Government unless the people really demand loyalty. Greed, corruption, and disloyalty can destroy the strongest nation.

We must know our Government. It was President Woodrow Wilson who said, and I quote:

"Freedom and free institutions cannot long be maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their government."

Our people should be taught in schoolrooms, in our colleges, in union halls, and in business meetings, from the lecture platform, the pulpit, the legislative halls, and the courts, the difference between our republican form of government and the communistic system of Soviet Russia. The blessings of individual freedom and human dignity should be compared with the terror and tyranny under which millions of people are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain of godless communism.

We must emphasize that freedom of the individual as ordained by God is the firm foundation of our national strength. It is our responsibility to keep alive for future generations the freedoms and the opportunities that made the United States the greatest nation on earth.

It is a great honor to have as our guest the brilliant and forceful Senator from Illinois.

He is a great American statesman. He has deep patriotic and religious convictions. He knows and loves America. He is proud to be an American.

In World War I he enlisted as a private in the Army and was commissioned second lieutenant in the field. He served overseas for 17 months.

He came to the Senate after eight consecutive terms of outstanding service in the House.

It is an honor to present to this fine Pennsylvania audience the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

ADDRESS OF HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

I am delighted to be your guest and I trust you will settle yourselves comfortably in those comfortable chairs. I have just been advised that the train doesn't go until 11:20, so we have lots of time. [Laughter.]

I have come frequently to this great municipality and you have treated me with the utmost courtesy and hospitality, and on each recurring occasion I feel a good deal like the two Army Chaplains who were lost on the Western Front when I was a soldier in World War I. They had become detached from their respective military organizations and were floundering around in the mud and water of the shellholes in the darkness. After hours of fruitless wandering they heard a rich voice from an invalided friend say, "Who in the devil led the Ace of Spades?" They got up and embraced each other and said, "Thank goodness we are among Christians."

That is the way I feel when I come to your great commonwealth.

I want to say first of all that as I get around the country I find some confusion. I find some bewilderment in the minds of people and bewilderment and confusion so easily lead to frustration. And frustration in turn often develops a sense of misdirection. Frequently, then, we must get back to a solid orientation as citizens of the greatest Republic on earth.

When Lincoln was in the Legislature in Illinois long ago, they had a judge over across the way in Kentucky who had a fondness for corn liquor. He would sit on the bench all day and dispense equity and justice and puff on a pipe that never had any smoke curling from the bowl. But in the afternoon he was in what they call down in Kentucky a slightly mellow condition. That is where you fall on the ground and hold on to keep from rolling off.

It so happened that he had a rubber tube going from a bottle in his inside pocket up to his pipe. And that was the reason for his condition. He came out of the courthouse in the afternoon and threw the saddle on his horse and unfortunately he got the saddle on backward. A young lawyer observed it and he said, "Hey, Judge, you got the saddle on backward." And the Judge looked at him with that withering contempt that only our judicial friends know and said, "Well, how in the devil do you know in what direction I am going?"

THE CITADEL OF TRADITION

So we have got to have a sense of direction and know where we are going. And in an hour of misdirection and bewilderment there is no better place to go than the citadel of American tradition.

Now, that is a lovely mouth-filling word, but when all is said and done tradition is the great tapestry of America; it consists of individuals, great achievements and incidents, sweet things and little things and noble things.

Who can think of this country and not think of the Pilgrims, or the men who stood at Valley Forge, or Thomas Paine, or Samuel Adams, or Thomas Jefferson, or Abraham Lincoln? And all those other hallowed personalities who are a part of the cavalcade.

When we think of great events in the panorama, there come quickly to mind the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution,

the Monroe Doctrine, the Emancipation Proclamation.

When we think of great men, we think of George Washington.

In my judgment, there is nobody in the whole history of mankind whose record of achievement can even approximate that of Washington. That is not a statement out of a story book. I think it can be established. For if we look at Washington's 3 great accomplishments and then at the accomplishments of Caesar, Napoleon, Bismarck, and Alexander, we find that theirs do not begin to approximate Washington's quality, in dimension, and in durability.

First, we think of independence when we think of Washington. He was 43 when he assumed command. He had a great farm situated on many lovely acres of land. He could have commanded preferment from the King. He had a family. He could have lived in ease and luxury. Why did he assume the responsibility and the unquenchable devotion to independence when life could have been so lush and easy for him? He had a bickering and reluctant Congress that would not provide supplies and munitions and equipment. He had the knife of conspiracy in his back as he looked upon trusted officers who tried to displace him. He had to listen to criticism.

What a load he carried. What frustrations must have stricken his heart at times. But, with unfailing fidelity to the cause, he remained with it until the sword went back into the scabbard. And to Washington more than to any other individual we can ascribe the freedom which we as legatees and beneficiaries are privileged to enjoy in this, the one great free remaining country on God's footstool.

His second achievement came here in your great city. What an amazing convention it was that started in May of 1787. What an outstanding complexion it had. The youngest man was 33 and the oldest man was 81. Every kind of diverse temperament was represented there, and it was Washington's restraint, his wisdom, and his patience, his capacity to inject cooling periods that finally resulted in an organic document which is the oldest writen Constitution in the whole wide world.

His third achievement was to breathe life into a new government, the first great experiment in free government on the face of the earth. He gave it form. For 8 years his steady hand was upon the helm and guided it through those days when the British were still fomenting Indian uprisings, when there was much caustic criticism because we were not on the side of the French in their war with the British, and when there were many other problems.

A LEGACY AND A CHALLENGE

So Washington, by his wisdom and kindly counsel and by his firmness, gave this organism of government the life necessary to have it march from infancy into the sunlight and achieve a majesty unmatched in any time or generation.

Those were the accomplishments. But out of the accomplishments he left us an inheritance. He left us a problem. And he left us a challenge.

The problem in this feverish and tumultuous age is, can a country conceived in liberty endure? That is it. Very simple. Why, it seemed academic 20 years ago. People would scoff at the idea, then. I say to you tonight that in my considered judgment the endurance of this country is no longer an academic matter.

We must clarify that. I don't mean that it is going to disintegrate. Not even the mightiest cobalt bomb can do more than destroy a portion of the physical substance of this Republic. The mightiest bomb might smite and kill a few million people, but there will be others, scores of millions remaining. When I speak of survival and the endurance of the country, I am speaking of a concept. I am speaking of a mode of existence under which we are still free to pick and choose, under which we are still free to buy and sell, under which we are still free to reject or accept, under which people are the masters and not Government, a mode of life that is a spiritual adventure and not merely a project. That is the thing that is in danger.

What are the dangers? At the very top of the list I would write socialism.

What is socialism? Control. Harold Laski, the late great British Socialist, put it simply: "The essence is control, not ownership." And we had better remember that, because when government moves beyond the lines of reasonable regulation into the field of control, look out for the freedom of your country. You cannot have socialism and freedom in the same land.

I think the second danger is what I call a delusion of form. Isn't it astonishing that a President of the United States could seize the steel industry and get three Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to concur in that action? But the fact of the matter is that the due process clause is still in the Constitution.

Isn't it amazing that a Secretary of State should send a message to the Congress some years ago and say—and I quote him accurately—"Constitutional doctrine is molded largely by practical necessity. For example, the power of Congress to declare war has fallen into abeyance because wars are no longer declared in advance." The exclusive power to put this country into war has been vested in the Congress by the Constitution. The form is there, but carry out that doctrine by a Secretary of State and what happens to the substance of this document? You see, we may be deluded by the form while the substance is being torpedoed.

I ask you very simply, how long can this blessed freedom last under circumstances like that?

There are people who do not regard communism as a particular menace. Frankly, ladies and gentleman, I do.

Remember Lenin's premise of conquest: "First, we shall dominate Eastern Europe. Then we shall dominate the masses of Asia. And then (and I quote Lenin accurately) we shall encircle the last bastion of capitalism in the United States, and, like overripe fruit, it will fall in the basket."

He has come pretty close to his timetable, with Eastern Europe behind the Iron Curtain and this brutal ideology moving in the Orient and elsewhere. And if it were not so, our warships and air carriers would not be in the Pacific tonight, and brows would not be furrowed, and brains would not be agitated at the dangers that are inherent.

Again we can be grateful to a President for firmness in this rather critical hour, because it is easier to drift into war than to go into it with your eyes open.

But let us not discount this force that has been moving across the world since 1917.

Malenkov, Khrushchev, and Bulganin are interested in only one thing, and that is to destroy the concept that has ennobled America and brought it to its present high state. There has been no retraction from that thesis. It is a grave danger.

THERE'S FISCAL DANGER, TOO

Senator MARTIN alluded to the fiscal danger. Nearly every country that actually lost its freedom went down the fiscal drain first. It is the hardest thing in the world to dramatize, and I am afraid we have gotten rather accustomed to a deficit situation. Your Government and mine has been in a deficit position for 23 years out of the last 26.

I think of a young man who filled out an application for an insurance policy. One of the questions was, "How old was your father when he died and of what did he die?" His father had been hanged. The son didn't like that. So he wrote, "My father was 65 when he died. He came to his end while participating in a public function when the platform gave way." [Laughter.] A wonderful way to say it—you disarm the severity of the circumstance.

So you speak about deficit financing. It means going in the hole. And when you go in the hole you toy with the inflationary fever that has destroyed so many countries. Oh, for the power of somebody or other to dramatize it and to bring home to people the necessity for the solvency of their Government under every circumstance, because when solvency goes out the window, it takes a frightful toll. It means that freedom goes out with it.

Let me allude to one other force, and that is indifference. There are 100 million potential voters in the United States. In November 1954—and mind you, I am not talking as a partisan—in November 1954 roughly 75 million were registered and qualified. How many voted on election day? Just a little fewer than 42 million. What happened to the other 33 million? They weren't interested enough.

The ballot is the symbol of freedom. And the way to lose freedom is not to use it.

Our hope of survival lies within ourselves and our hope of progress lies in preserving freedom.

I have said that on the 16th of July 1945, two ages were born when that bomb exploded in New Mexico. The atom age was born and the age of fear was born. But fear is a poor substitute for reason. And whenever it transcends reason there has been generated another force that can jeopardize and destroy the freedom of the country.

One thing will save freedom: when free men speak up, no matter what the sacrifice.

When the Apostle Paul was being prepared to be scourged, even though he had not yet been condemned, he said to the centurion: "How is it that I, a Roman citizen, uncondemned, could be scourged?"

Then the centurion asked: "Are you a Roman citizen?"

And Paul replied: "Yea."

And the chief captain answered: "With a great sum obtained I this freedom."

And Paul said: "But I was free born."

This freedom that we enjoy is no academic thing. It came at a great price. Those men without shoes at Valley Forge, this man Washington, whose heart must have been broken at times by the frustrations that were attendant upon his task; this man Lincoln who could see 3,500 crosses from where he stood on the speakers' platform in Gettysburg in 1863—they are just a few of those who helped to pay the price for what we have. And as successor trustees in these long, endless generations of Americans we too must pay the price in proportion.

SPEAK OUT FOR FREEDOM

The spirit of freedom expects us to talk up so that we can be found, found in a critical hour of the history of our country.

When I was campaigning in Illinois in 1950, I heard of a man who went down to a pet shop and bought a parrot. The proprietor said, "This is a fine, healthy, smart bird; speaks eight languages." The man said, "I will take him." He paid $35 for the bird and cage and said, "Send him out to my house and be sure he is there when I get home from work tonight." And when he got home he bounded up the steps and the door opened and there was his beloved wife, Mary. He said, "Mary, did the bird come?"

She said, "Yes, he did."

"Where is he?"

"In the oven."

When the husband regained his composure he said, "In Heaven's name, woman, that was a smart bird and could speak eight languages."

And Mary said, "Well, why didn't he speak up?"

Speak up for freedom.