



# Congressional Record

United States  
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

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

O thou God of our salvation, eternal, immortal, invisible, for whose presence our restless spirits ever yearn—we would hush our busy thoughts to silence as we wait for Thy word and seek to discern Thy will.

"Mid all the traffic of the ways,  
Turmoils without, within,  
Make in our hearts a quiet place,  
And come and dwell therein."

For void of Thee, all is vanity, and life itself barren, joyless, robbed of its wonder, its dignity, and its beauty.

Even as draining duties, tied to the Nation's welfare, demand the utmost in time and energy of Thy servants here, in the fellowship of the world unseen more real than the tangible things about us, may there come to our questing spirits light out of darkness, peace out of discord, strength out of struggle, forgiveness out of guilt, and faith out of fear. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 17, 1956, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 18, 1956:

S. 1261. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point Terminal and Ammunition Loading Pier, N. J., to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority; and

S. 2624. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, N. J., and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, as amended.

On February 20, 1956:

S. 1352. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; and

S. 1584. An act for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lulu Stanley Beckner.

CII—178

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura reclamation project, California;

H. R. 8787. An act to provide for a pro rated stationery allowance in the case of a Member of the House of Representatives elected for a portion of a term;

H. R. 8796. An act to increase the amount of telephone and telegraph service furnished to Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; and

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for an indefinite period because of a death in his family.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet on Friday next during the session of the Senate.

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

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

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

### EXPENSES OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the fourth quarter of 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO COINAGE OF SUBSIDIARY SILVER COINS, ETC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### IMPROVEMENT OF CHILD WELFARE PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and improve the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, to authorize special project grants to institutions of higher education or research in connection with maternal and child health and crippled children's services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

### TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FUNDS RELATING TO UN- CLAIMED PAYMENTS ON SAVINGS BONDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer to the fund for the payment of Government losses in shipment of certain amounts representing

unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education, dated June 30, 1955, on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Resolution 11

"Resolution requesting the President of the United States to veto the gas bill

"Whereas the Congress of the United States recently has passed the Harris-Fulbright bill, more generally referred to as the gas bill, for the purpose of exempting natural-gas producers from direct Federal regulation; and

"Whereas the enactment of this bill would be definitely prejudicial to the best interest of the people of the State of Maryland; and

"Whereas in the judgment of the members of the House of Delegates of Maryland, the bill should be promptly vetoed by the President: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That President Dwight D. Eisenhower be respectfully urged and requested promptly to veto the Harris-Fulbright bill for the exemption of natural-gas producers from direct Federal regulation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"By the house of delegates, February 10, 1956.

"JOHN C. LUEBE,

"Speaker of the House of Delegates."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Adolfin Skudzinskis, Miami, Fla., relating to Lithuanian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., relating to the activities of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Mrs. A. R. Todd, and sundry other citizens of Eunice, La., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by LaSalle Council No. 454, Knights of Columbus, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and Mother Cabrini Council No. 2655, of Long Island, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Oceanside-Carlsbad Realty Board, California, favoring the enactment of legislation to protect against beach erosion at Oceanside, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Oceanside, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, favoring the rehabilitation of the Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Boat Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to restore the 90-percent rigid price support on certain farm products

"Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina is vitally interested in the economic welfare of the farmers of this country; and

"Whereas the discontinuance of the 90-percent rigid price support on certain farm products is threatening the livelihood of the farmers of this and other States; and

"Whereas the entire Nation is dependent on the farmers for food and other essential products; and

"Whereas it is not only important to the farmers but to the Nation as a whole that their standards of living are not lowered: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to restore the 90-percent rigid price support on all farm products which were formerly supported by 90-percent rigid price support; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of Congress from South Carolina."

#### UKRAINE INDEPENDENCE RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on January 22, 1956, resolutions were adopted at the Minneapolis, Minn., annual celebration commemorating the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Ukraine. The Very Reverend Stephen Bilak, of the St. Michael's Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Minneapolis, has just furnished me with a copy of the resolutions. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred. I commend the resolutions to the reading and attention of the Members of Congress, from whom I know they will receive a sympathetic reception. Certainly the observations made are deserving of the most thoughtful consideration of every citizen of our free land.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED IN MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., ON JANUARY 22, 1956, BY THE AMERICANS OF UKRAINIAN DESCENT AT THE ANNUAL CELEBRATION, COMMEMORATING THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, residing in the State of Minnesota, who have assembled today under the auspices of the local branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for the purpose of observing the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian national republic by our kinsmen on January 22, 1918, have unanimously passed the following declarations:

"We all, sincerely and deeply, without any reservation, respect and adhere to the Constitution of the United States and to the principles of democracy of our new homeland, to which we are loyal and faithful citizens. At the same time, we desire and we are morally obligated to help the Ukrainian people, our kinsmen, in their unabated and courageous struggle for regaining the lost national statehood and democratic liberties on the Ukrainian ethnic territories, which now are under the aggressive military occupation by Soviet Russia.

"We confirm that the historic acts of January 22, 1918, and January 22, 1919, which respectively declared the independence of Ukraine and united all of the ethnic Ukrainian lands into the United Sovereign Ukrainian National Republic, took place by the deeply seated will of the Ukrainian nation, as expressed by its duly and legally elected representatives from all of the ethnographic provinces of Ukraine.

"We declare, that no one has any legal basis to deny or to minimize the full measure of the importance of the content or the meaning of these two great historic acts, or the inherent rights of the Ukrainian nation to its completely sovereign and independent Ukrainian state. As such, it has full rights to belong, with privileges and responsibilities to the United Nations Organization, as its charter member, and to have duly designated representatives, by the will of the Ukrainian people, as their rightful spokesman in Washington, the capital of a truly democratic state, toward which, at this time, the peoples of the entire world, regardless whether they are free or subjugated, look upon with hope and faith for dynamic leadership and maintenance of national security, whether large or small, strong or weak national states.

"We have undeniable facts and proof that the Ukrainian people, as historic inhabitants of their ethnic lands, were the first to offer heroic resistance to the Red Russian colonial imperialism, and even though the freedom-loving Ukrainian forces were overpowered by the numerically stronger Russian Communist hordes, the Ukrainian people were not silenced, conquered, or subdued in this uneven struggle by their historic foe. Ukraine fights on now, as she did yesterday, and will continue to fight for her state sovereignty and freedom by all her means, using passive and active resistance, including the underground or open armed struggle against the Russian Communist regime which was forced upon Ukraine by military occupation. This struggle will continue against any usurper upon the Ukrainian ethnic lands until the establishment of the completely sovereign and independent Ukrainian state.

"We appeal to the American people, to their representatives, and to the Government of the United States of America to give long awaited aid to the Ukrainian people in their valiant struggle and efforts for the rebirth of the Ukrainian state, without which no peace in the world is possible, neither the security of the United States nor other democratic states.

"We believe that when the free nations of the world will understand the importance and the meaning of the Ukrainian problem, they will extend their friendly aid for the rightful solution in the interest of the principles of human freedom and in the interest of the national independence of the peoples of the globe. The Ukrainian people have only one determined desire—to live free in their own national state in friendly cooperation with the rest of the peoples of the world.

"We stress again that the Russian Empire, regardless of her rulers, always was, is now, and will always be the standard bearer of the imperialistic aggressive tendencies with colonial designs and policies for the conquest of the world. For that reason we warn the



American people not to trust the deluding Russian smiles, for behind them is hidden unchanged Russian imperialism, the basic ground for the colonial policies of the Moscow regime, using ruthless ideology of Russian communism as an expedient tool with the zest of fanatical religion.

"We are grateful to the freedom-loving American people, the Government, and the President of the United States for all of the privileges, freedom, opportunities, with responsibilities, which we enjoy as legal citizens of this free land. We are also grateful for the apparently growing, better understanding, by the leading men of America, of the meaning and value of the Ukrainian problem. Free and independent Ukraine in Eastern Europe is absolutely essential in the interest of peace and security of the entire world. The struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States may continue for centuries, and free Ukraine is essential in the interest of the United States of America, against which the Soviet Union directs all of its destructive efforts.

"Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Minneapolis Branch; Very Rev. Stephen Bilak, President; Mykola Derbush, Secretary; Prof. A. A. Granovsky; Hilari Papish; Gen. Constantine Smowsky; Peter Anderson; Anton Romanenko; Dmytro Danylenko; Paul Fedorciw, Resolutions Committee."

#### RESOLUTIONS OF WILLISTON (N. DAK.) COOPERATIVE CREDIT UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the Williston (N. Dak.) Cooperative Credit Union.

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

I

We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, request our Congressmen to keep the control of gas within the Interstate Commerce Commission, in order to protect the consumer.

II

We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, do hereby believe our economy may be likened to a poker game. When all the stakes of a poker game get into one hand the game is over.

In our economy when huge holdings get into the hands of a few there is not enough left for the common people to buy the production of the masses, creating the present surplus.

Therefore, we recommend a tax exemption of \$1,000. An additional exemption of \$400 for 160 million people would be a buying power of \$64 billion. That in itself would take care of much of the expensive surplus on hand, as well as raise the standard of living of low-income groups.

III

We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled in this 28th day of January 1956, oppose the soil-bank plan proposed by the present administration and are in favor of 100 percent of parity price for all farm commodities actually produced on the farm up to the limit of the family farm production. Parity formula should be designed to maintain a purchasing power of farm commodities at a level equal to that 1910-14 with a goal of full parity farm income.

IV

We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, favor ever-normal storehouse. Our Nation, and indeed all the governments of the world, should develop an ever-normal storehouse of storable farm commodities and products equal to at least one full year's domestic consumption and exports. A copy of this resolution to be sent to our Congressmen and Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator MORSE, of Oregon.

V

We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, favor the compensatory or production payments as the preferable method for carrying out price support or income programs. We believe such payments should be limited to the production of the family type farms and such payments be limited to \$2,500 for any single family farm unit.

VII

Whereas the present Federal administration has demonstrated repeatedly and continuously an attitude of utter disregard for the welfare and best interests of the American public through an unprecedented giveaway program, of giving our Nation's resources away for personal gain of a few individuals, as evidenced by the tidelands oil giveaway, timber resources giveaway, dam site giveaways such as Hells Canyon and others, power development giveaways or attempts thereof such as Dixon-Yates, Clark Hill Dam in Georgia and others, to cite only a few; and

Whereas we believe that any administration has a sacred trust to safeguard and to develop the Nation's resources for the fullest benefit of the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, urge all candidates for national office in the coming election to take a clear public stand on this issue.

VIII

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture, headed by Secretary Ezra T. Benson, has publicly endorsed and approved magazine articles which hold the American farmers up to public ridicule, calling them "country slickers" and making other derogatory remarks about them; and

Whereas this is but further and additional evidence that Mr. Benson is woefully lacking in the qualifications necessary to properly administer the office of the Secretary of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 28th day of January 1956, respectfully request the administration and Congress to remove Mr. Benson from his position as Secretary of Agriculture forthwith.

#### PAYMENT OF SUBSIDY CHECKS TO FARMERS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Ransom County, N. Dak., Farmers' Union relating to the payment of subsidy checks to farmers.

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

Whereas the cost-price situation for agriculture is getting so severe that more and more farmers are finding it difficult to finance

their production operations for the year of 1956; and

Whereas the sliding scale and the Department of Agricultural Economics is promising still further decline in agricultural prices and still higher operating costs in 1956, which will drive hundreds of thousands of farmers to the brink of bankruptcy; and

Whereas all of society and the President of the United States have repeatedly acknowledged that farmers are entitled to and, for the good of all economic segments of society, and with no ifs, ands, or buts, must have their full 100 percent of parity income; and

Whereas the present situation and outlook for agriculture in the coming years is getting desperate for the Nation's farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Ransom County Farmers' Union, assembled this 19th day of January 1956, do petition and demand that Congress immediately enact emergency legislation and make available appropriation of funds to pay farmers subsidy checks representing the difference between the prices received in the market place and 100 percent of parity, such emergency payments to be made retroactive for all farm commodities sold since May 1, 1955, and to be effective until such time as Congress can enact permanent legislation that will provide security for farmers at 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities; be it further

Resolved, That we will welcome marketing quotas and production and marketing controls if and when it becomes necessary to keep production in line with consumption but not to a point of scarcity; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the congressional Committees on Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President of the United States.

RANSOM COUNTY FARMERS' UNION,  
PETER FOG, Meeting Secretary.

#### ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the petition of R. H. Power, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the road construction program.

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

JANUARY 28, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR: In consideration of the road-building program, here are a few salient facts to remember:

First. Who is responsible for the breakdown of our roads? Ninety percent of those who have studied this problem say heavy freight is the sinner and they refer to the Maryland test as proof.

Second. Cost of construction: It costs three times as much to build a road to support 20 tons of freight as it would to build roads for the average automobile.

Third. Method of taxing freight loads the weight plus distance.

With these results:

1. Save our roads from unnecessary breakdown.

2. Freer flow of traffic, separating freight and passenger traffic, long since done by the railroads.

3. Safety: Avoid numerous accidents between the slow-moving truck and the fast-moving auto.

4. Shift heavy freight from road to rail: Making popular the piggy-back system now used in many States.

Freight is the lifeblood of both trucks and the railroads. The truck business has become big business employing more men than

the railroads. They are both essential carriers and they both need regulation and the Federal Government is the only system so situated to do the job.

Sincerely yours,

R. H. POWER.

Who should pay the bill, and how?

### COMPLETION OF FORT YATES HIGH SCHOOL, NORTH DAKOTA—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from J. Dan Howard, chairman, Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council, Fort Yates, N. Dak., enclosing a resolution adopted by that council, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the completion of the Fort Yates High School. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

STANDING ROCK SIOUX TRIBAL COUNCIL,  
Fort Yates, N. Dak., February 13, 1956.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is tribal resolution No. 4-56 for your review and consideration. The education facilities described in our resolution are badly needed at Standing Rock. The business council are now in the process of working out an educational grant program for our Standing Rock children who graduate from high school this spring.

These grants will be paid from rehabilitation funds. We need your help. Without the needed additions to our school the educational career of many of our children will be badly hindered.

Every year counts and we cannot afford to lose any time. We hope you will be able to favorably recommend the awarding of the requested funds for the construction of school facilities at Standing Rock. We also wish you would give this matter favorable recommendation to the proper committees.

The Standing Rock Sioux and Tribal Council and

Most sincerely,

J. DAN HOWARD,

Chairman, Standing Rock Sioux  
Tribal Council.

#### RESOLUTION No. 4-56

Whereas the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe is an unincorporated tribe of Indians having accepted the Indian Reorganization Act of June 1934, and the recognized governing body of the tribe is known as the Standing Rock Sioux Business Council; and

Whereas it is recognized by members of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe that the education and health of their children provides the soundest approach to a successful economic and social future of the Standing Rock Tribe; and

Whereas it is the plans of the business council to provide on a grant basis an opportunity for the eligible and qualified high school graduates of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe to obtain a higher education in the colleges and universities of the United States with funds set aside for that purpose under the terms of congressional legislation for payment of claims arising from the construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir; and

Whereas the present educational facilities at the Fort Yates community schools are inadequate to provide the desired type of elementary and high school education for the students in attendance; and

Whereas the Fort Yates Community High School is located near the center of the reservation and attended by students of North and South Dakota; and

Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs have requested the Congress of the United States to provide \$285,000 for the purpose of adding four extra classrooms, an assembly or study hall, a science laboratory, home economics kitchen, dining and sewing room, school cafeteria, gymnasium complete with showers, lockers and dressingroom facilities; and

Whereas without these essential additions to the school plant it will not be possible to provide the high school students with the education needs as generally required by most State institutions of higher learning: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the business committee acting for and in behalf of the future of the children of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe do request the Members of Congress from North and South Dakota, the honorable governors and members of their staff from North and South Dakota to contact the Budget and Appropriation Committees of Congress recommending favorable consideration of an appropriation in the amount of \$285,000, which is the amount necessary to complete the additions to the Fort Yates High School as needed; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the chairman and secretary of the business council be authorized and directed to sign this resolution.

Dated this 1st day of February 1956.

ARTHUR BYINGTON,  
Secretary, Standing Rock  
Sioux Tribal Council.

Attest:

J. DAN HOWARD,  
Chairman, Standing Rock  
Sioux Tribal Council.

### BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received from W. E. Cole, commandant, Department of North Dakota, the American Legion, a letter enclosing a resolution adopted that that Department, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1643) to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed services who suffer disability or death incident to active duty, active duty for training, or inactive-duty training, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

NORTH DAKOTA SOLDIERS HOME,

Lisbon, N. Dak., February 15, 1956.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I am enclosing herewith a resolution which was adopted at the Midwinter Conference of the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, held at Fargo, February 12-14, 1956. I thought this might be helpful to you in your work in connection with these companion bills, S. 1643 and H. R. 6408.

The primary effort in connection with the passage of these bills is being made in the Senate and pending action taken by the Senate, intensive work will be instituted in the House.

I feel sure that you will lend every effort toward passage of these bills and I wish to take this opportunity of thanking you for any and all activities you may take in connection with the successful passage of this legislation, which, of course, is aimed at

fairness and justice to Reserve and National Guard officers who were in our armed services during World War I. The estimated expense of this legislation is approximately \$8 million per annum, which will rapidly decrease, as most of us have reached a point where we cannot expect many more years of survival.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

W. E. COLE,

Commandant, Colonel, USAR, retired.

Whereas the American Legion has long supported the principle of equalization of rights and benefits for the Reserve components of the various services as compared with the Regulars of those services; and

Whereas S. 1643 and its companion bill, H. R. 6408, introduced by Senator SPARKMAN and Representative HUDDLESTON, respectively, incorporate the substance of the most needed readjustments in law to accomplish this long-established congressional intent to grant equal treatment as to retirement and other benefits to both Regulars and Reserves under comparable circumstances; and

Whereas these twin measures have received the wholehearted support of our last national convention, meeting at Miami, Fla.: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the Department Executive Committee of the North Dakota Department of the American Legion, meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., this 12th day of February 1956, That we vigorously support Senate bill 1643 and H. R. 6408 in full, to the end of achieving full parity of treatment for Regular and Reserve officers of the various services, having particularly in mind the desirability of enactment of section 8 of those bills, embodying the principle of equalization of benefits as applied to retired officers with World War I service; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senator SPARKMAN and Representative HUDDLESTON, to the Senators and Congressmen from this State, and to the Members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees of the National Congress.

### FEDERAL BUILDING AT WILLISTON, N. DAK.—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Williams County Bar Association, of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2971, to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building in Williston, N. Dak.

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

*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Williams County Bar Association be directed to extend thanks to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER and the Honorable MILTON YOUNG for their action in introducing Senate bill S. 2971; further

*Resolved*, That a request also be made to the Honorable Congressman USHER L. BURDICK and the Honorable OTTO KRUEGER to introduce into the United States House of Representatives a companion bill to Senate bill S. 2971, and to press for its passage with all possible vigor; and further

*Resolved*, That copies of the resolution be forwarded to the United States congressional delegation from North Dakota, and to the Federal judges of North Dakota.

A. T. HACKENBERG,  
Secretary, Williams County Bar Association, Williston, N. Dak.



## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 4376. A bill to exempt from duty the importation of certain handwoven fabrics when used in the making of religious vestments (Rept. No. 1487).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H. R. 3653. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite (Rept. No. 1488).

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

S. 885. A bill for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks (Rept. No. 1489);

S. 1111. A bill for the relief of Eric A. Cummings (Rept. No. 1490);

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of Jose Arriaga-Marin (Rept. No. 1491);

S. 1525. A bill for the relief of Serojini Dongre Harris (Rept. No. 1492);

S. 1552. A bill for the relief of Mikie Woodard (Rept. No. 1493);

S. 1560. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Joon Sik Chung (Rept. No. 1494);

S. 1619. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Ventura (Rept. No. 1495);

S. 1814. A bill for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Giuseppe Corrado Cilli (Rept. No. 1496);

S. 1831. A bill for the relief of Panteles Kerkos (Rept. No. 1497);

S. 1833. A bill for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin (Rept. No. 1498);

S. 1950. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fu-Chuan Chao (also known as Fuk Kun Chiu) and his wife, Chul Lai Yuk (also known as Lai Yuk Chao) (Rept. No. 1499);

S. 1953. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Mary Florescu (Sister John Baptist) (Rept. No. 1500);

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Kim Boksoon (Rept. No. 1501);

S. 2035. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Hernandez-Valencia (Rept. No. 1502);

S. 2037. A bill for the relief of Adele Knoff and her minor child, Hans Knoff (Rept. No. 1503);

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Demetrios K. Georgaras (Rept. No. 1504);

S. 2077. A bill for the relief of Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim (Rept. No. 1505);

S. 2104. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Muhlefeldt (Rept. No. 1506);

S. 2138. A bill for the relief of Dorothy May Ackermann (Rept. No. 1507);

S. 2155. A bill for the relief of Jose Torres (Rept. No. 1508);

S. 2156. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. Ros (Rept. No. 1509);

S. 2201. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wei-Chi Liu (Rept. No. 1510);

S. 2249. A bill for the relief of Pil Nyl Kwak (Rept. No. 1511);

S. 2264. A bill for the relief of Yu Heng Gee (Rept. No. 1512);

S. 2284. A bill for the relief of Domingo Lim (also known as Lim Eng Kok and Domingo Lim Chay Seng) (Rept. No. 1513);

S. 2349. A bill for the relief of Miss Pilar A. Garcia (Rept. No. 1514);

S. 2358. A bill for the relief of Renate Karolina Horky (Rept. No. 1515);

S. 2445. A bill for the relief of Knar Carmen Ives (Rept. No. 1516);

S. 2590. A bill for the relief of Paula Edith Reynolds (Rept. No. 1517);

H. R. 930. A bill for the relief of John Daniel Popa (Rept. No. 1519);

H. R. 1014. A bill for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung (Rept. No. 1520);

H. R. 1074. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee) (Rept. No. 1521);

H. R. 1097. A bill for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane (Rept. No. 1522);

H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Guenther Kaschner (Rept. No. 1523);

H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of Harry John Wilson (Rept. No. 1524);

H. R. 1209. A bill for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay (Rept. No. 1525);

H. R. 1323. A bill for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo) (Rept. No. 1526);

H. R. 1544. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Molo (Mall) Sobel (Rept. No. 1527);

H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Jose Canencia-Castaneda (Rept. No. 1528);

H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich (Rept. No. 1529);

H. R. 1923. A bill for the relief of Kevin Murphy (Rept. No. 1530);

H. R. 2054. A bill for the relief of Induk Pakk (Rept. No. 1531);

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak) (Rept. No. 1532);

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur (Rept. No. 1533);

H. R. 2285. A bill for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien (Rept. No. 1534);

H. R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet (Rept. No. 1535);

H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang (Rept. No. 1536);

H. R. 3057. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido L. Balingit (Rept. No. 1537);

H. R. 3201. A bill for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis (Rept. No. 1538);

H. R. 3265. A bill for the relief of Alkista Sfounis (Rept. No. 1539);

H. R. 3375. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee (Rept. No. 1540);

H. R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan and Virgin Giritliyan (Rept. No. 1541);

H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan (Rept. No. 1542);

H. R. 3845. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza (Rept. No. 1543);

H. R. 3857. A bill for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David (Rept. No. 1544);

H. R. 3869. A bill for the relief of Esther Ledeo Escobedo (Rept. No. 1545);

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnatzakanian (Rept. No. 1546);

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of Max Moskowitz (Rept. No. 1547);

H. R. 4185. A bill for the relief of Zabel Vartanian (Rept. No. 1548);

H. R. 5866. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich (Rept. No. 1549); and

H. R. 6363. A bill for the relief of Edward Barnett (Rept. No. 1550).

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

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Zaferatos (Rept. No. 1551);

S. 1465. A bill for the relief of Audrey Jean Younkers (Rept. No. 1552);

S. 1664. A bill for the relief of Balbina Borenstein (Rept. No. 1554);

S. 2143. A bill for the relief of Manda Pauline Petricevic (Rept. No. 1553);

S. 2289. A bill for the relief of David Hayes (Rept. No. 1555);

S. 2357. A bill for the relief of Nenita Santos and Elizabeth Santos (Rept. No. 1556);

S. 2570. A bill for the relief of Maximilien Beauvois (Rept. No. 1557);

S. 2744. A bill for the relief of Harold Manly Stewart (Rept. No. 1558); and

H. R. 1005. A bill for the relief of Alice Duckett (Rept. No. 1518).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1122. A bill for the relief of Szloma Kleidermacher and his wife, Sarah Kleidermacher, and their children, Ruchla, Abram, and Toba Kleidermacher (Rept. No. 1559);

S. 1846. A bill for the relief of Dr. Howard Seeming Liang (Rept. No. 1560);

S. 1889. A bill for the relief of Maria Guardalupe Shockley and her minor daughter, Evangeline Vega Shockley (Rept. No. 1561);

S. 1939. A bill for the relief of Victorine (Vicky) Shalam, John Shalam, and Claude Shalam (Rept. No. 1562);

S. 1987. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Peter Chou-Yuen Tchen (Rept. No. 1563);

S. 2304. A bill for the relief of Mary Tarlich Goldstein (Rept. No. 1564);

S. 2495. A bill for the relief of Anna Abbene (Rept. No. 1565); and

H. R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, J. Lizardo (Rept. No. 1566).

## BILLS AND 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. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 3235. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra Vasiliades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3236. A bill to permit unmarried annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to elect survivorship annuities upon subsequent marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3237. A bill to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3238. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 3239. A bill for the relief of the Board of National Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3240. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall select a site to which the naval magazine at Port Chicago, Calif., may be moved and report to the Congress thereon, and to suspend the acquisition of land in the vicinity of such naval magazine pending the making of such a report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3241. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3242. A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3243. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3244. A bill for the relief of C. H. Abrams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3245. A bill for the relief of Koriku Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. J. Res. 147. Joint Resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1956, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### CONTINUANCE OF LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE IN CERTAIN CASES UNDER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a serious technical deficiency in the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, has come to light and should be corrected as quickly as possible.

The problem is quite simple. An employee who becomes disabled through no fault of his own and who, as a result of the disability is unable to perform his duties, is eligible for disability compensation. Technically, when this occurs he no longer is an employee because he is not carried on his agency's payroll, but instead is carried on the disability roll of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation. The Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act provides that an employee's insurance will not continue in effect for more than 12 months "after discontinuance of his salary payments." Therefore, if a disabled employee should die within 12 months after being removed from the payroll of his agency and being placed on the disability roll of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, his insurance is valid, but if his death occurs after 12 months, his insurance is not valid.

I introduce for proper reference a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Insurance Act to provide that the insurance of an employee receiving disability benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall be continued in effect as long as he is held by the Department of Labor to be unable to return to duty. Further, the bill would become effective August 29, 1954, the date on which the Insurance Act became effective in order to reinstate the insurance of a limited number of employees who since that date have been on the disability rolls for longer than 12 months. In a small number of cases, employees died during their 13th, 14th, or 15th month on the disability roll. Their widows did not get the insurance they should have received. The bill I am introducing would restore their insurance policies and give them the benefits they did not receive because of a technical deficiency in the law.

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

The bill (S. 3237) to provide for continuance of life-insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. This bill is a companion bill to H. R. 8804, introduced by Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, on January 25, 1956.

Since the enactment of the original legislation, many States have had some very definite experience in dealing with this program, and the construction and operation of pilot projects has demonstrated the need for certain amendments to this act, in order that it may be of greater value to our farmers and our Nation.

Previous to the enactment of the Hope-Aiken Act of 1954, I had introduced a bill in the Senate which was similar to the one which was enacted by the Congress.

Personally, I feel the amendments proposed in the bill I have just introduced are vital to the expanded and successful operation of the program.

It is important that the soil-conservation districts of our Nation be permitted to function without interference in watershed-protection and flood-prevention programs. The soil-conservation districts under the able leadership of qualified personnel are cooperating with national farm, business, labor, and wildlife organizations to further our mutual objectives of upstream watershed treatment and management to protect and wisely use our precious soil and water resources.

After 18 months of experience with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, it can be truly stated that there are certain limitations in this law that seriously hamper full implementation of it.

There is no doubt in my mind but what Congress wanted to provide for Federal aid to local organizations in carrying out their own locally initiated and executed programs of watershed protection and flood prevention.

It is with this thought that I believe we need to secure approval of the amendments included in the bill that I have introduced, in order that we may obtain help for all types of improvements for better soil and water management. This should include, where

needed, not only soil conservation practices on the land and structures for flood prevention, but such other improvements as storage and distribution of water to increase the efficiency of farming by irrigation, disposal of excess water by drainage for the same purpose, storage and release of water into small streams during dry periods to provide stock water, maintain good fishing and dilute downstream pollution. It should permit a good dam site to be used for both flood prevention and municipal water supply or any other useful purpose. In fact, we should provide for the most beneficial uses of water as they are needed and demanded by the community where it falls.

One of the problems that must be resolved is where to draw the line between the size of the projects that should be built and controlled under the supervision and direction of the Chief of Civil Works and the Corps of Engineers. I have no doubt there are some of the larger size reservoirs that could be built under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. They would be of immeasurable value for flood control as well as many other phases of the control of water run-off.

It is my opinion that these projects constructed under the soil conservation district programs should not be under the supervision of any other agency, but should be left strictly under the control of the States and their subdivisions.

The soil conservation districts should maintain the right to conserve our rainfall, prevent disaster of floods and at the same time provide for expanded beneficial uses of water for our growing agricultural, industrial, wildlife, and municipal needs.

The projects already constructed and those on the design tables have been constructed on a cost-sharing basis as between Federal, State, and local interests. With this type of program, the control and management in the use of these impounded waters should be in the hands of local people once the structures are completed.

In the pilot watershed projects already constructed, local organizations have put up substantial sums in cash and other considerations for the construction of the project.

I am informed that the cost-sharing basis has been about 50-50 in the pilot watershed program. The local people apply the needed land treatment measures, acquire all lands, easements and rights-of-way, contract for all structures and guarantee their operation and maintenance while the Federal Government pays for the actual cost of construction for flood prevention.

It has been the policy of the Federal Government for years to provide construction costs for works for flood control. Our Nation has spent billions of dollars on our major rivers to protect cities and main stream flood plains.

I am not suggesting that Congress reverse this policy, but I firmly believe that we should give consideration to any additional Federal support to projects on upstream watersheds.

The national benefit which would result from the work farmers and ranchers



are doing to conserve and improve the lands of this Nation for our children and grandchildren would more than offset a 100-percent Federal contribution to construction costs.

The bill I have introduced would provide several amendments and recommended changes, but I want to call attention to and discuss four of them.

#### DEFINITION OF AUTHORIZED WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT

The bill would delete the phrase "agricultural phases of" under definition of "Works of improvement" in section 2 of Public Law 566. This would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to assist local organizations to plan and carry out improvements, as a part of a total watershed plan, not only for irrigation, drainage, and flood prevention, but also for such purposes as improved municipal and industrial watersupply, recreation, fish and wildlife improvement, pollution abatement by streamflow regulation, and saline water intrusion control. It would provide local organizations with assistance in carrying out a multiple-purpose water and land management program, instead of one confined to flood prevention and agricultural water management. This amendment would broaden Public Law 566 to include all the purposes contained in the conference committee print of the small projects bill, H. R. 5881.

#### LIMITATION ON CAPACITY IN STRUCTURES

The bill would permit inclusion in a watershed work plan of a structure providing more than 5,000 acre-feet of total capacity if, first, the structure is proposed to be constructed by a local organization as an integral part of a watershed plan; second, any capacity in excess of 5,000 acre-feet is for purposes other than flood prevention; and, third, the construction cost of such excess capacity is to be borne entirely by the local organization.

#### AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION

The bill would eliminate the date July 1, 1956, after which the Secretary of Agriculture may not enter into any contract for construction. The act would continue to prohibit the Secretary from entering into contract for construction if there is a local organization which has such authority under State law.

In most States soil-conservation districts as well as other types of local organizations have such authority.

#### REQUIREMENTS FOR REVIEW OF PLANS

The bill would provide that no plan for works of improvement need be submitted for review to the Secretaries of the Interior and Army, or transmitted to the Congress through the President, unless the estimated Federal contribution to the construction cost of works of improvement exceeds \$250,000.

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

The bill (S. 3243) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### C. H. ABRAMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Mr. C. H. Abrams, of Portland, Oreg.

Mr. Abrams was one of many people in the State of Oregon who worked with determination and for exceptionally long hours in the construction of Vanport City during the early days of the World War II emergency.

Mr. Abrams performed work of the highest importance on the Vanport project. In his communications with me he has indicated that he was an investigator for the Federal Government; that he performed the work of an auditor in the employ of the Government; that when he entered into this employment he signed the standard Form 57 for civil-service employees of the Federal Government. He further advises me that at one time he was interviewed by agents of the FBI who were then gathering facts concerning the operations of some of the contractors and subcontractors engaged in constructing the Vanport project. On this latter occasion the FBI appears to have been concerned as to certain practices being followed under the construction contract. Mr. Abrams was interviewed because of his special work in checking payrolls and performing similar services.

During the course of construction of the Vanport project, the President issued a directive on overtime which appears to have been addressed to all Government employees in defense areas. Mr. Abrams states that he was requested to initial a copy of this directive.

Despite the issuance of the presidential overtime directive, Mr. Abrams was not paid for the many hours of overtime work he performed on the Vanport project. In due course of time he presented his claim to the appropriate Federal Government agency, asking that he be compensated for overtime. Such compensation was denied and in a detailed letter of December 16, 1953, the Administrator of the House and Home Finance Agency expressed the view that Mr. Abrams and others similarly situated were not Federal employees, but were in fact employees of the local housing authority, and that there was no privity of contract between such employees and the Federal Government which would permit payment of overtime compensation by the Federal Government. Mr. Abrams' displeasure over this ruling is quite understandable.

Despite the adverse reports of Federal Government agencies, it appears to me that Mr. Abrams has made a strong prima facie case in support of his claim of entitlement to overtime compensation. I think his case deserves serious and thorough consideration by an appropriate committee of the United States Senate. If the committee finds, as I believe it should, that equity and justice call for the payment of this claim, I hope the committee will make its recommendation promptly because the claimant has waited almost 14 years for what he believes is honestly due him from his Government.

Mr. President, I have just received a very strong supporting letter from Mr.

Wayne A. Anderson, of Salem, Oreg., who was familiar with Mr. Abrams' initial employment on the Vanport project. Mr. Anderson's straightforward statement has impressed me, and I believe it deserves the attention of the committee to which this bill is referred. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with Mr. Anderson's letter of February 6, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3244) for the relief of C. H. Abrams, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. H. Abrams, of Portland, Oreg., the sum of \$580.80. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the said C. H. Abrams against the United States for compensation for overtime work performed by him during the period from November 1942 through June 1943 while he was employed as an auditor for the Federal Government in connection with the construction of the Vanport City project, Multnomah County, Oreg.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent hereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The letter presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

SALEM, OREG., February 6, 1956.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in response to your letter of February 1, 1956, concerning conditions surrounding the employment of Mr. C. H. Abrams, 1116 S. E. Nehalem Street, Portland, Oreg., and his subsequent claim against the Federal Government for overtime services.

There are apparently no specific written records of an employer order or a referral of Mr. Abrams as they were destroyed by a fire occurring in the Portland local office of the United States Employment Service (then also known as the War Manpower Commission office). However, it is my understanding that any remaining records of the WMC were shipped to Washington, D. C.

At the time of the referral of Mr. Abrams it was my impression that the position was that of a Federal inspectional type of auditor with wartime temporary indefinite civil-service status. I am confident that this was also the impression obtained by Mr. Abrams. There was no indication to me that the operation or administration of this function was to be delegated to the State or to any subdivision.

I am glad to authorize you to present my statements in behalf of Mr. Abrams. The claimant has been an acquaintance for about 15 years and I have always found him to be sincere and honest.

Yours very truly,

WAYNE A. ANDERSON.

### IMPROVED FARM PROGRAM— AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

### DISPERSAL OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2879) to promote the dispersal of industrial facilities in the interest of national defense, which was introduced by me on January 9, 1956.

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

### WILLMORE ENGINEERING CO.—IN- DEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement I have prepared, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

On July 30, 1955, I introduced the joint Resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to amend Private Law 495, 83d Congress, as amended, for the relief of Willmore Engineering Co. Senate Joint Resolution 102 has since been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Since the introduction of the joint resolution certain facts and information have come to my attention which lead me to the conclusion that no further action should be taken on the measure.

As the sponsor of the proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 102 be postponed indefinitely and that no further action be taken on it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have made this request because I found, after introducing the joint resolution, that the matter was pending in the courts in the District of Columbia; and the courts are amply able to decide the matter without the necessity of passing the joint resolution. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) will be indefinitely postponed.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS OF HEARINGS BY THE TOBACCO SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE USE OF PROCESSED TOBACCO

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, information recently presented to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry clearly indicates that the growers of some, and possibly all, types of leaf tobacco in the United States are facing

a very uncertain future market for their product as a result of new patented processes, now in use, which permit the manufacture of substitutes for natural leaf tobacco, which substitutes are generally referred to in the tobacco trade as manufactured tobacco leaf. These processes carry various names, such as homogenized leaf, reconstituted leaf, unified leaf, et cetera; and for the most part they appear to have had their known beginning uses in connection with the manufacture of binders for cigars. One of these new patented processes is at the present time being nationally advertised as a replacement for natural tobacco leaf binders on one of our large selling brands of cigars. The advertising claims that the synthetic product is better than binders heretofore used on the cigars, which were made from natural leaf tobacco. On the basis of data available to date, it appears that consumers are quite indifferent to this new development, and that therefore there is passive acceptance of this new product for use as cigar binders.

Very simply stated, all of these natural leaf substitutes are somewhat similar, in that they are manufactured by processes which involve the grinding or crushing of the entire leaf, including stems, into minute particles which, in turn, are combined with some binding or cohesive agent, and then, through intricate processes, are formed into thin, pliable sheets of manufactured tobacco having the desired width and thickness. It would seem that the processes involved may, in their final form, be roughly compared to the procedures involved in the manufacture of paper and newsprint.

Present information indicates that from several viewpoints these new developments may be attractive to many manufacturers of cigars and cigarettes. The most important is that of a distinct saving in labor and natural leaf tobacco costs.

Our American cigarette, which has gained favor through the world, is manufactured from a blend of several types of natural leaf tobacco, each of which is especially selected by the manufacturer for its quality, flavor, aroma, and burning quality. Natural leaf tobacco used in our cigarettes is processed to remove the heavy midrib in each tobacco leaf through an action known in the trade as stemming. The heavy, coarse stems which are removed represent a sizeable portion of the weight of each leaf of tobacco and are generally considered a byproduct of cigarette manufacturer for subsequent use in other ways by the industry. Since these new substitute processes would apparently permit the use of the entire tobacco leaf the costly stemming process involved in natural leaf would be eliminated.

The substitute processes also would appear to permit an absolute manufacturing control of the previously mentioned desirable characteristics found in natural leaf tobacco, such as color, burning quality, flavor, and aroma. It further appears that these desirable factors found previously only in natural leaf may now be obtained through these substitute manufacturing processes through

the use of a much lower quality of natural leaf than some manufacturers have previously purchased for cigarette purposes.

One of the new patented processes involves an additional intriguing procedure whereby the substitute tobacco sheet, after manufacture, may be increased in volume by 60 to 70 percent through the application of heat, which causes air cells to appear and remain in the finished product. This procedure, of course, would in turn permit the manufacturer of cigarettes to produce many more cigarettes per pound than would be possible if only natural leaf tobacco were used.

Rumors are quite widespread in the cigarette tobacco industry and among growers that these substitute processes are now in use by some of our larger cigarette companies and the recent tobacco markets just ending would seem to substantiate the fact that a distinct shift has taken place in the buying habits of some of our larger manufacturers with particular interest and emphasis in a desire for lower quality, less costlier natural leaf tobacco.

In view of the already known impact of these developments upon the cigar tobacco growers and the possible drastic upheaval which may occur in the future as it relates to growers of cigarette tobaccos it seems highly desirable that immediate steps be taken to obtain as much information as is possible regarding the future use of these substitute products in cigarettes.

I am sure you are aware that the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with its experiment stations throughout the tobacco area has for a number of years been conducting extensive research work in tobacco, as in other crops, looking toward the development of finer, more desirable types of tobacco which were apparently desired by the cigarette manufacturing industry. It seems entirely possible that the development of these new manufactured substitutes may well necessitate a complete change in our research as well as our current production programs for our tobaccos.

For this reason, and in the interest of some 800,000 farm families who make their living through the production of cigarette tobaccos, I, as Chairman of the Tobacco Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have requested and received permission from the Chairman of that Committee for the Subcommittee to hold hearings on this vital matter.

The objective of these hearings will be to receive testimony from all available sources in the tobacco trade from which we could determine the following:

First. The extent to which these processes are now being used by cigarette manufacturers.

Second. The extent of and possible uses in the future.

Third. What changes, if any, are likely to result in manufacturers' buying patterns in the future.

Fourth. What changes, if any, will be needed in our current production and research programs.

Fifth. Indications as to the reaction of consumers to utilization of substitute tobaccos in cigarettes.



I consider this subject to be one of exceedingly vital importance, and I sincerely hope that our subcommittee will have the full cooperation of everyone concerned in obtaining the answers to these important questions.

#### 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. HRUSKA:

Statement by him relative to the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him before the Decalogue Society in Chicago, Ill., on February 18, 1956.

By Mr. BEALL:

Excerpts from address delivered by Senator CASE of New Jersey at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Alexander Hamilton Club and the Republican City Committee, of Baltimore, Md.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Statement prepared by him on the 35th anniversary of Armenian independence.

#### THE FARM PROBLEM: WHAT IS IT?—ADDRESS BY HON. W. R. POAGE, OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as the Senate prepares to begin consideration of farm legislation, I should like to call the attention of Senators to a penetrating address *The Farm Problem: What Is It?* delivered recently in San Antonio, Tex., by the Honorable W. R. POAGE, of Waco, Tex., who is Representative of the 11th Congressional District of Texas, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. POAGE, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, knows his subject. His thoughtful analysis of the nature of the farm problem is worthy of close study.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. POAGE's address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

In September 1929 it was my pleasure to visit this great and historic city. At that time I thought I was "doing pretty well." I stayed at the Saint Anthony Hotel. I had served two terms in the Texas Legislature, although at that moment I held no public office. I was reasonably well established as a lawyer. I had been buying equities in property both rural and urban. I held title to more different pieces of property and I owed more money than I have at any time before or since. The future looked good. I talked with friends right here in San Antonio. We told each other: "Don't sell America short." "There is no limit to American development." Yes, the future looked good, but we could not ignore the fact that, as industrial wages and prices had been steadily climbing for 8 years, farm prices had been sinking ever lower and lower. But we told ourselves, "American business is sound."

I confess I did not understand just what was happening. I did not understand just what had happened a few weeks later when the bottom fell out of the stock market. I couldn't find that prosperity President

Hoover told us was just around the corner. I don't claim to understand all that is involved today, but today I do have the experience of the past and my hindsight is much better than my foresight.

I tell you of my 1929 visit to San Antonio to point out that the next time I visited this city about 2 years later, I stayed at a tourist court. I had lost most of the equities I had held. In short, I had been through the crash.

Since that time I have had a keen respect for the economic warning signs of declining farm income. Since then I have realized that no matter how many automobiles and silk shirts we made—no matter how high factory wages and stockmarket prices might go—no matter how many people were employed by industry and how many new corporations were organized, that unless American farmers were able to make a reasonable net profit that our entire economic structure was but a house of sand.

Maybe we are not now facing a situation similar to that which confronted us in 1929. Maybe we will be able to avoid the pitfalls which so nearly destroyed us at that time. I hope so—but I think we would be living in a fools' paradise if we failed to take stock from time to time.

Mr. President, it is because I sincerely believe that the most serious threat to our national prosperity is to be found in the steadily falling net income of our farmers that I unhesitatingly name the farm price problem as America's number one economic problem.

Surely it is not necessary to describe the problem. With the average per capita farm income from all sources at \$865 as against a national average for non-farm people of \$1,913 we can see what is happening to farm buying power. With farmers getting only 38 cents out of each dollar the consumer spends for food where they got 53 cents just 10 years ago we can see little justification for consumer criticism of farmers. With gross national production up 50 percent since 1947, with wages up 60 percent, with corporate profits up 74 percent in the same period, it is little comfort to the farmer to be told that gross farm income has almost held its own.

Holding one's own in dollar volume of sales would hardly be a basis for great rejoicing for a businessman when others are making 60 and 70 percent gains but when one's costs are constantly rising static income spells bankruptcy. To make these statistics even worse from the farmers' standpoint, we must remember that nearly one-third of the total of what is known as farmer income is derived from non-farm sources. In other words, a great many farmers are able to stay on the farm only because some of the family works off the farm.

At the same time nearly a million farmers per year are leaving the farm. This means that even though the pieces of gross income distributed to each individual have (along with the addition of non-farm income) remained nearly constant the distribution is being made to a progressively smaller number of people. The pie is no larger—there are just fewer children to share it. Can the grocer at Elmhurst or the hardware dealer at Seguin afford any further reduction in the number of his customers? And if the process continues, what happens to the wholesale house in San Antonio?

I think it is clear that the prosperity of every businessman in the United States is ultimately dependent on the prosperity of our farmers. Maybe I am wrong but I just can't believe that we can ever build a sound and lasting prosperity on anything less than on mother earth herself. I believe our foundations must rest on the soil. That is what was lacking in the 1920's. I wonder if it could be lacking today.

If we can agree that we all have a stake in the prosperity of the farmer, let us look just a little further into his condition. Have we any cause for alarm, or are our farmers actually pampered tyrants as Harper's magazine charges? Surely we need not waste much time on this question. You gentlemen know too much about farms and farmers to indulge in any illusions of farmers riding in Cadillacs, etc., even though there actually are millions of Americans who don't honestly know any better.

I have already given you the average net per capita income of farm people, \$865 per year, considerably less than one-half of the average of nonfarm people. But such average figures don't mean much. There are, of course, a few large farmers, about 2 percent of the total. Some of these have money. Very few of these are making money, farming. There are many small farmers, even in Texas. Most of these are not making enough to maintain their families, but they spend every dime they do make with local businessmen. They are essential to the general prosperity.

Farmers are dependent on price times volume of products for their gross income. We have, heretofore, been able to hold the price of cotton up to 90 percent of parity. Therefore, some will say the cotton farmer must be doing pretty well. Before you jump to that conclusion ask yourself, how have we maintained that cotton price? I'll tell you. We have maintained it by reducing production—the oil men call it "proration." We have reduced our cotton acreage from an all-time high of nearly 45 million acres down to just over 17 million, a cut of about 66 percent. Even as late as 1953 we planted 25,244,000 acres of cotton. Of course, the cut in bales has not been so severe, but it has been so drastic that the income of cotton farmers was barely holding static before the flexible cuts hit. Flexibles are now the law for the 1956 crop. No one knows just how far the new program will drop price, probably \$15 or \$20 per bale, and without any increase in the number of bales. So let's write off the cotton farmer as a prospective buyer of that new living-room rug.

What about the cattleman? We have heard lots about the money he was making. Some people have said that it was the fixed 90 percent support which got cotton farmers into trouble, the cattleman has never had any direct-price supports, so let's see how well he has done and is doing. Within the last 3 years, the price of live cattle has dropped more than 50 percent. In fact, the cowman has supplied feed and care for more than 90 million cattle without a penny of profit, given the packers 7 million head of young animals and has taken an average inventory loss of better than \$100 per head, and now holds his stock at just under \$100 around. If that cowman doesn't have a good oil lease, you are wasting your time trying to sell his wife a new suite of dining room furniture.

Of course, the hogman had some flexible supports a few years ago. In spite of flexibility, he has taken a 38 percent drop in the price of his hogs in the last year. He is not likely to buy a new insurance policy.

The peanutmen never could buy a television but with better than a 50 percent cut in his acreage, you are not likely to sell him a radio now.

So far, I have just talked about what these producers have lost in gross returns. If they have been able to reduce their costs maybe they are better off than I have made it appear. What has happened to their costs and therefore, to their net income? Let's take an example of a reasonably well fixed farmer who grossed \$10,000 in 1947. At that time he had expenses of \$7,000 and netted \$3,000. Since then, the price of machinery has doubled. Labor has gone up. Supplies are much higher. By 1955 this man's gross had gone down to \$8,600, a considerable drop, but

not necessarily fatal. What really puts him out of business is the fact that his costs have gone up to \$8,190. This left him a net of \$510 for his year's work and as a return on his \$20,000 or better investment. The interest on his invested capital has remained static. That's what we mean by the farm income squeeze, which you hear so much about.

To understand the reasons for our over-generous farm production we must look back to the war or even before. Actually when World War II broke out, we had a full generation of first-class but unused research and scientific knowledge neatly cataloged and filed. All during the twenties and thirties farm income had been so low that farmers had not been able to apply the practices they knew were desirable. We were farming as well as we could afford, not as well as we knew how. Crop yields weren't much higher in 1940 than they were in 1920.

Then came the war. The world needed food and fiber. Prices shot up. So did our patriotic fervor. Farmers were urged to produce as a patriotic duty. Food will win the war and write the peace. Farmers believed this. They went to work determined to do their full part.

The same war gave a tremendous impetus to the production of nitrates for explosives. Shortly, those new cheaper nitrates were showing up as fertilizers. Farmers poured them into the soil. Production zoomed. Farmers, short of help, invested in all kinds of new machinery, till the investment per worker in American agriculture is today \$14,389, compared with an investment of only \$13,000 per worker in industry.

Of course, industry toolled up also, but when the war ended the Government never looked back. It paid our industries about \$41 billion for losses on contracts which were never completed because the need no longer existed. A few years later when the Korean war broke out, we gave many of these same industries accelerated tax writeoffs to encourage them to complete much of the work which was discontinued in 1945 and 1946. This decrease in tax liability is presently running at the rate of more than \$800 million per year. I am not criticizing, but I have heard some of the beneficiaries of this arrangement condemn the agricultural adjustment payments.

But after the farm plant was expanded; after our farmers had mechanized; after they had adopted the new techniques, we offered them no termination payments. The best we offered any farmer was 90 percent of a fair price if he would agree to reduce his production to that point which the Secretary of Agriculture felt would equal our needs. In both 1952 and 1953, Mr. Brannan and then Mr. Benson overestimated our needs—or rather they played safe (not knowing what turn the Korean war might take) and refused to invoke marketing quotas. Again I am not criticizing, but it was 1954 before we actually applied the production breaks the law provided.

By that time, our surpluses had indeed become burdensome. Since that time we have had a rash of hysterical statements about our terrible agricultural problem. One would get the impression that adequate food and fiber was an unmitigated evil. Of course, I would like to reduce our surpluses but they may not be entirely bad. In 1941 we had 2 million more bales of cotton in the Government loan than we have today. Within 3 years we were out of cotton. During the Korean war, we actually embargoed the exportation of cotton, and forced American producers to sell for about 45 cents per pound while the world price went to twice that figure. We used price controls to keep the price of American wheat down to \$3 per bushel at the very time Mr. Peron sold it for \$5. The American farmer has consistently been denied the peaks of world prices in

order to protect the American public. Does not justice suggest that he should be protected from price valleys by that same public?

Admit that our farm price-support program has been expensive. It has never reached more than a fraction of the payments made to industry to enable it to reconvert after the war. And, believe it or not, some of our programs have not cost the taxpayers a penny. Here is the report of the Department of Agriculture issued by Mr. Benson. I don't believe that you will fear that he would try to picture the 90 percent support programs in any more favorable light than the facts justify; yet, his report of December 31, 1955, the latest yet available, shows that rather than having cost the taxpayers, the cotton-support program has actually made a profit of over a quarter of a billion dollars—267 billion to be exact.

Maybe we ought to see just how the consumer has fared?

I know that there are all too many people who have been led to believe, and today do believe that, in spite of their low incomes, farmers are imposing an unfair burden on consumers. Since we are all consumers we are all interested in this charge. I have already pointed out the fact that the farmer is receiving a constantly declining share of the consumers' food dollar, 38 cents today as against 53 cents in 1946.

But that tells only part of the story. In many instances, there is simply no relationship between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays. The price of live hogs has dropped 38 percent during the past year. The retail price of pork has dropped only 14 percent during the same time. Ten years ago wheat was bringing \$3 per bushel, and was worth 60 percent more on the world market. Bread sold for an average of 13.8 cents per pound. Today wheat is bringing about \$2 per bushel and bread is bringing an average of about 18 cents per pound. Surely price supports on wheat cannot be blamed for the increase in the price of bread. This shirt cost me \$4.95. Twenty years ago it would have cost about \$1.50. At today's prices it contains about 25 cents worth of cotton. The farmers' 90 percent price support could hardly account for the 300 percent increase in the price of the shirt.

Thirty years ago, the average man did not have to spend as much for food as he must today, but today he has lots more to spend. The percentage of his disposable income has remained almost constant for that period, it was, and is, just about 25 percent, but today he has approximately three times as much left for other uses. If we go back to the founding of this country, we find that our people had to spend approximately 75 percent of their disposable income for food. Even today most people of the world spend more than one-half, and many of them more for food of greatly inferior quality. I ask you businessmen what it would do to your business if our people had to spend one-half to three-fourths of their income for food. It might knock quite a hole in the jewelry or the ladies' ready-to-wear business.

All anyone has with which to buy the products of another's labors is his own efforts or the accumulated efforts of others which have been passed along by purchase, trade, or inheritance. Putting this accumulation of past efforts into the present tense, we can say that all man has with which to buy is time.

The American farmer is feeding the American city dwellers in exchange for just one-fourth of that city man's time. The farmer has never increased his prices in terms of your time. Not only that, but within the past 30 years we have almost doubled the amount of food the average consumer actually gets for that 25 percent of his disposable income or of his time, and we have infinitely increased its quality and attractiveness. In most cases this price includes built-in maid

service. All foods are attractively packaged, they don't come in barrels and tow sacks any more. But all these conveniences are available to today's consumer without any increase whatsoever in the percent of income required to pay the bill.

It may be all right to talk about the good old days when you could buy a round steak for a dime—if you had the dime—but who wants to go back to those days when industrial wages also averaged 16 cents per hour? It is true that in 1890 a loaf of bread cost only a nickel, but it took 19 minutes of work—today it takes only 6. In 1890 a pound of butter cost only two bits but it required an hour and a half's work to get the two bits. Today it takes just over 20 minutes' work to buy the butter. And that steak which now costs 90 cents per pound only takes 30 minutes as against 46 minutes in those good old days.

We could draw similar comparisons to show that the American consumer pays far, far less in working time for the food he eats than practically any consumer of the world today.

In other words, our city people are getting good food, adequate food, and cheap food. They need a prosperous agriculture and they should be the last to complain when the farmer asks only for parity—parity is simply that price which will enable the farmers to just maintain the same purchasing power for each unit of his products which he received during the last period during which his prices were unaffected by war, price controls, or inflation. It should be understood that parity is thus tied to a free market. It goes down any time the prices farmers must pay for the goods and services he must buy goes down. It goes up only after farmers' costs have gone up.

That, my friends, is, as I see it, the essence of the great debate about farm prices. It is an attempt to gear farm income, and therefore farm purchasing power, to the level of our general economy. If we succeed in doing this, our entire economy will be the stronger. The methods whereby this may be done are varied and are subject to bitter debate. I am not here to tell you that I have some patent medicine which will cure all the ills of agriculture. I am only here to say that agriculture must have help. That in our efforts to expand our markets and to move our surpluses we must never overlook the fact that unless the producer gets enough to leave him some reasonable net income there is little reason for expanding the market. I am here to say that everyone has a selfish stake in our ability to retain farm buying power. If we fail, our entire economy is, in my opinion, certain, sooner or later, to collapse just as it did in 1929.

#### WES SANTEE: LOSS OF AMATEUR STANDING

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, our Nation, and I think probably the world, were shocked this morning to read of the decision of a committee of the Amateur Athletic Union barring Wes Santee from amateur standing for life. I ask, Mr. President, how cruel can we get?

Wes Santee is a Kansan, a graduate of Kansas University, and presently a proud member of the United States Marine Corps.

This cruel, unfair decision by an autocratic body of an agency that can destroy not only the hopes of our Nation at the Olympics in Melbourne, Australia, in the 1500-meter or mile run, but also place a blight on the entire life of a young man, must come as a shock to every fairminded citizen.



Kansas as a State has given to the country such mile runners as Glenn Cunningham, San Romani, and presently Wes Santee. We are proud of all of them.

I have personally visited with Wes Santee about this matter and he has, I am informed, presented vouchers and certified statements as to the amounts of money he has drawn in the meets in which he has participated. He submitted the records without perjury or falsification.

I would be less than frank if I did not state I think he has taken more money than is allowed under the decadent rules of the AAU for amateur standing, but let us be practical about this matter. Here is one of the Nation's outstanding athletes who is in demand by promoters all over the Nation, urging him to attend meets, if for no other reason than as a drawing card. When he attends as a participant, the meet is an assured success.

In all fairness I suggest that the AAU review its rules in regard to payments which may be made to athletes of amateur standing without violation of their rules, or the loss for life of the opportunity to participate in amateur contests, the sentence just rendered against Wes Santee.

Mr. President, I think I should mention that this matter was considered by the board of managers of the Missouri Valley Association last year and Wes Santee was acquitted of any charges of professionalism by a 21-to-7 vote.

Mr. President, I regret to make this statement, but I sincerely believe that the sports-loving and patriotic American people do not share the views of the members of the AAU.

Wes Santee was our one big hope in the mile run at the Olympics. By such actions as that just taken, in my opinion the stage is being set for one of the most telling Russian propaganda coups ever knowingly and unnecessarily encouraged.

There are no restrictions on athletes in Russian competition, and, as a matter of fact, I am advised they are subsidized by the Government.

Last December I appeared on a State telethon with Wes Santee, held for the purpose of raising funds to send our athletes to the Olympics. Similar programs were held in practically every State in the Union.

It is blows like the one directed against Wes Santee that destroy the morale of our athletes who have an opportunity to place in the Olympics.

Again I say, Mr. President, does the AAU intend to blacken for life the career of an outstanding, clean-cut young American?

#### INTERDICTION OF ASSETS BY ARGENTINE GOVERNMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, an Argentine Government mission is now in the United States to complete arrangements for an Export-Import Bank loan.

I know that the mission will be courteously and generously received. All Americans have been impressed by the efforts of the Argentine people to reestablish the democratic tradition of their country. All of us want to see the development of the Argentine economy into a sound foundation for lasting democratic government.

Argentina and the United States now have an unparalleled opportunity to develop the most friendly relations with each other. On the United States side, this involves measures of financial assistance to help Argentina over its present economic crisis. On the Argentina side, it involves continued efforts to maintain a climate in which private American capital will be encouraged to participate in the financial and industrial growth of the nation.

As a friend of Argentina, I feel compelled to express my disquiet concerning recent steps taken by the present government of that country against American and other foreign companies, which have recently invested there. Argentina has recently "interdicted," or frozen, the assets of a number of firms with private American and other foreign interests, which began manufacturing operations in Argentina under the former government.

The ground of the interdiction is that these firms, apparently because they engaged in business under the former Government, are suspected of improperly acquiring their assets and of unjust enrichment. There appears to be a presumption that no foreign company could have dealt honestly with the former regime. The firms have been asked to submit proof that their assets were legitimately acquired, without being informed of the charges made against them or the identity of their accusers. In fact, some firms have been told by the interdiction authorities that these authorities do not know what the specific charges are.

While the interdiction remains in effect, some of the firms are being asked by the Argentine Government to negotiate changes in existing contracts with the Government, even though the validity of the existing contracts is not challenged.

If any American firm has violated any Argentine law, it should, of course, be tried and punished. But with the greatest respect for the good intentions of the present Argentine Government, and with full understanding of the problems that arise in the wake of a revolution, I have strong doubts whether it is consistent with the principles of any democratic country to seize the assets of business firms without charges and without hearing, or to reach judgments before the parties accused have been furnished with a statement of the charges, the identity of their accusers, and an opportunity for rebuttal. This sounds very much like the procedure of the Queen of Hearts at the trial of Alice: "Punishment first, trial later."

It is my hope that the Argentine Government will reexamine this situation, and in the very near future will take steps to remove the interdictions.

#### 1958 COMMEMORATION OF FIRST CONFERENCE OF STATE GOVERNORS—LETTER FROM C. R. GUTERMUTH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have just received from C. R. Gutermuth, secretary of the Natural Resources Council of America.

Mr. Gutermuth's letter announces that the 37 national conservation and scientific organizations which make up the council are in full support of Senate Joint Resolution 139. The resolution provides for commemoration in 1958 of the first conference of State governors, which was on natural resource and conservation problems, and was held 50 years previously, in 1908.

The 37 organizations comprising the Natural Resources Council are listed following the letter.

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

NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL  
OF AMERICA,

Washington, D. C., February 10, 1956.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: The 37 national conservation organizations and scientific societies enrolled in membership in the council are delighted to see that 60 other Senators joined with you in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 139. A companion measure, House Joint Resolution 525, was introduced in the House by the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey, and we are pleased that such a large number of Congressmen have introduced similar bills.

There is widespread belief that adequate provision should be made for the proper observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors. That conference was an important landmark in the conservation movement for the protection of the Nation's invaluable natural resources, and it is worthy of commemoration.

It is a pleasure to assure you that in the recent annual meeting of the council, the member organizations indicated that full support would be given to this commendable proposal.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,  
Secretary.

#### MEMBERSHIP LIST, OCTOBER 1, 1955

1. American Fisheries Society, Thomas Langlois, delegate, P. O. Box C, Put-in-Bay, Ohio.
2. American Forestry Association, Lowell Besley, executive director-forester, 919 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
3. American Geographical Society, Charles B. Hitchcock, director, Broadway at 156th Street, New York, N. Y.
4. American Museum of Natural History, Richard H. Pough, curator, Central Park West at 79th Street, New York, N. Y.
5. American Nature Association, Harry E. Radcliffe, vice president, 1214 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
6. American Nature Study Society, Stanley Mullak, editor, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

7. American Ornithologists' Union, Samuel R. Madison, 18 Oakwood Place, Delmar, N. Y.
8. American Planning and Civic Association, Miss Harlean James, executive-secretary, 901 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
9. American Society of Limnology and Oceanography, Thomas H. Langlois, delegate, P. O. Box C, Put-in-Bay, Ohio.
10. American Society of Range Management, Kenneth Parker, delegate, U. S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
11. American Society of Zoologists, Thurlow Nelson, delegate, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
12. Conservation Foundation, Samuel H. Ordway, Jr., vice president, 30 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
13. Ecological Society of America, James A. Macnab, delegate, 3440 N. W. Thurman Street, Portland 10, Ore.
14. Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, Edgar Wayburn, President, 490 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
15. Forest Conservation Society of America, Charles H. Stoddard, executive secretary, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
16. Friends of the Land, Ollie E. Fink, executive secretary, Route 3, Zanesville, Ohio.
17. Grassland Research Foundation, Theodore M. Sperry, secretary, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kans.
18. Izaak Walton League of America, J. W. Penfold, national conservation director, 702 Mining Exchange Building, Denver, Colo.
19. Mountaineers, The, Mrs. Pauline Dyer, secretary, 116 J Street NE., Auburn, Wash.
20. National Association of Biology Teachers, Richard L. Weaver, project leader, P. O. Box 2073, Ann Arbor, Mich.
21. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Nolen J. Fuqua, president, Duncan, Okla.
22. National Audubon Society, John H. Baker, president, 1130 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
23. National Fisheries Institute, Charles E. Jackson, general manager, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
24. National Parks Association, Fred M. Packard, executive secretary, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
25. National Wildlife Federation, Charles H. Callison, conservation director, 232 Carroll Street NW., Washington, D. C.
26. Nature Conservancy, George B. Fell, executive director, 4200 22d Street NE., Washington, D. C.
27. New York Zoological Society, Fairfield Osborn, president, 30 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
28. North American Wildlife Foundation, C. R. Gutermuth, secretary, 709 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
29. Pacific Northwest Bird and Mammal Society, Mrs. Maratha R. Flahaut, librarian, Washington State Museum, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
30. Sierra Club, David R. Brower, executive director, 1050 Mills Tower, San Francisco, California.
31. Society of American Foresters, Henry Clepper, executive secretary, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
32. Soil Conservation Society of America, Edward H. Graham, delegate, Shreve Road, Rural Route No. 1, Falls Church, Va.
33. Sport Fishing Institute, Richard H. Stroud, executive vice president, Bond Building, Washington, D. C.
34. Wild Flower Preservation Society, P. L. Ricker, president, 3740 Oliver Street, Washington, D. C.
35. Wilderness Society, Howard Zahniser, Executive Secretary, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
36. Wildlife Management Institute, Ira N. Gabrielson, president, 709 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

37. Wildlife Society, Daniel L. Leedy, Delegate, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

## HONORARY MEMBERS

1. Dr. Robert F. Griggs, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
2. Dr. Alfred C. Redfield, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Mass.
3. Dr. Paul B. Sears, Yale University, 77 Prospect Street, New Haven, Conn.
4. Mr. Tom Wallace, Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.
5. Dr. Charles G. Woodbury, 1801 Hoban Road, Washington, D. C.

## NONMEMBER, SUBSCRIBER-CONTRIBUTOR

- Field and Stream magazine, Mr. Hugh Grey, editor, 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.  
(Purchases Conservation News Service.) Not eligible to council membership. Harold Titus, conservation editor, Traverse City, Mich., receives service.

## SENATOR McMAHON'S PEACE PLAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on February 6, an Associated Press dispatch from Norwich, Conn., reported that Joseph P. Lyford, of Westport, had asked for revival of a peace plan proposed in this Chamber 6 years ago by our late, most distinguished, and beloved colleague, Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut.

I was deeply impressed with this news story; and as one of the many Members of this body who congratulated Senator McMahon on his statesmanlike proposal, I feel it appropriate at this time to reinsert in the RECORD the full text of Senator McMahon's address.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

[FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF  
February 2, 1950]

## THE HYDROGEN BOMB—SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTROL OF SUPERWEAPONS

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the President of the United States has now given orders to build the hydrogen bomb—to create, in deliverable quantities, those chunks of the sun technically known as thermonuclear weapons.

Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point the statement made by the President of the United States in making known his decision. I invite attention to the last sentence in that statement, wherein he said:

"We shall also continue to examine all those factors that affect our program for peace and this country's security."

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

"It is part of my responsibility as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to see to it that our country is able to defend itself against any possible aggressor. Accordingly, I have directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on all forms of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen or superbomb. Like all other work in the field of atomic weapons, it is being and will be carried forward on a basis consistent with the overall objectives of our program for peace and security.

"This we shall continue to do until a satisfactory plan for international control of atomic energy is achieved. We shall also continue to examine all those factors that affect our program for peace and this country's security."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in line with the President's intention of continuing that examination, I shall make my remarks today with the hope that the thoughts which are expressed may be somewhat helpful in the situation.

The scientists feel more confident that this most horrible of armaments can be developed successfully than they felt in 1940 when the original atomic bomb was under consideration. The hydrogen development will be cheaper than its uranium forerunner. Theoretically, it is without limit in destructive capacity. A weapon made of such material would destroy any military or other target, including the largest city on earth.

The President's decision was dictated by the severe realities of the world which we inhabit today. He had no choice, and his decision under present circumstances is right.

American renunciation of the hydrogen bomb would mean embracing the folly of disarmament by example. Our friends abroad would shrink away from us, seeing that we had lost power to defend the United States, much less to help defend Europe. Kapitza, the great Soviet physicist, and German scientists imported into Russia are noted for their special competence in the technical problems relating to hydrogen weapons. Densely populated American cities are made to order for an explosive that will level hundreds of square miles. Communism suffered a defeat in prestige when our democracy completed the earliest atomic bombs, but this prestige defeat would be more than recouped, assuming that Russia were to complete hydrogen bombs soonest. Furthermore, if the Kremlin believes that it cannot outproduce us in ordinary atomic weapons—imagine calling the destroyers of Hiroshima and Nakasaki ordinary—its logical strategy is to excel in the thermonuclear field. All such factors as these serve to warn America against complacency.

Voluntary acceptance of the idea of being less well armed than other nations in this era of our greatest vulnerability runs completely counter to the traditions of our leaders—and, I might add, to good common sense. In my judgment, a failure to press ahead with the hydrogen bomb might mean unconditional surrender—in advance—by the United States to alien forces of evil.

But please note my insistence that we possess no monopoly upon the hydrogen-bomb idea. If we win the race to build this weapon first, it will be only a matter of time—and possibly a short time—before the Kremlin achieves success also. Let me warn, with all the solemnity at my command, that building hydrogen bombs does not promise positive security for the United States; it promises only the negative result of averting for a few months or years well-nigh certain catastrophe. Do not for a moment overlook the obvious—that Soviet Russia broke our atomic-bomb monopoly sooner than we had expected, and she would break any hydrogen-bomb monopoly we enjoyed with equal or greater speed. Mr. President, I have the idea that in discussing this subject we are dealing with something which is extremely important. We are plunged into a truly terrible arms race.

What are we going to do about it?

There are really, I suggest, no more than two broad policies from which to choose. One consists in resigning ourselves to a generation of waging the cold war—that is, striving endlessly to contain Russia's outward pressure, pouring out our substance to stay ahead in the weapons competition even after the Kremlin becomes armed with



hydrogen bombs, and cherishing indefinitely the hope that Soviet tyranny will somehow see the evil of its ways and reform itself from within. Arrayed against the choice of such a policy is 5,000 years of recorded history, which teaches again and again and again that armaments races lead to war—under today's conditions, hydrogen war.

But even if this policy could enable us to avoid armed conflict for a whole generation, it would undermine and corrupt that which we prize more highly even than the absence of hostilities: I refer to liberty. How is it possible for free institutions to flourish or even to maintain themselves in a situation in which defenses, civil and military, must be ceaselessly poised to meet an attack that might incinerate 50 million Americans—not in the space of an evening but in the space of minutes?

Consider what sustained fear does to the individual—especially to the individual enterpriser. It constricts his imagination, paralyzes his initiative, and even affects his personal morality. It constitutes the most subtle and potent of poisons. Consider the crushing burdens already imposed upon our private-enterprise economy. Consider, too, the restrictions on freedom already brought about by the atomic bomb and by its pressures upon us to accept loyalty checks, espionage countermeasures, and widening areas of official secrecy. For a preview of the future if the armaments race continues, multiply the effect of these factors by something like 1,000 times—to allow for the 1,000-times greater energy release of the hydrogen bomb—and if you are candid and realistic, I believe you will find it is difficult indeed to see a dominant role for freedom in such a picture. To stay alive we will find ourselves more and more compelled to imitate the totalitarian rival.

The other broad policy which we may choose consists in moving heaven and earth to stop the atomic armaments race, to establish worldwide atomic peace, and to make possible atomic-created abundance among all men. In pursuing that policy we would tap to the roots the resources of our ingenuity and imagination; we would regard no suggestion as too startling or unconventional for careful consideration; and we would be guided, disciplined, and inspired by our code of ethics and democratic, peace-loving decencies.

It was from this kind of philosophy that we generated our original proposal for international control—a proposal which should constitute a source of pride to every citizen of our land. When the atom was split for destruction during the recent war, a transcendent moral problem came into being; and the responsibility for moral leadership on an equal order of magnitude rested upon us, since we had made the first bomb. There were those who advised us to advance no special or unusual peace plan, and who hewed to the same pseudo logic that now sees us waging the cold war for another generation. Fortunately, a wiser counsel prevailed and we rose to the moral challenge. We have written a page of history, Mr. President, that will live as long as history is read, and will reflect its glory upon those who formulated our program to serve God and mankind.

In essence we offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, and we asked only for the minimum safeguards, as operative upon ourselves as upon others, that would prevent the evil in atomic energy from being used to destroy us. We proposed that men of all countries, including Russians, come to America under the auspices of the United Nations and inspect our atomic activities and share in the control of our atomic raw materials and the operation of our atomic plants—all for the purpose of assuring themselves, to their own complete satisfaction, that we had honored our promise to exploit

the atom for peace, and peace alone. Equally, we proposed that the same just and necessary protective measures be made effective throughout the globe.

More than 3½ years have elapsed since Bernard Baruch, as spokesman for the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, presented our official plan to the United Nations. He delivered one of the greatest addresses known to the English language, saying:

"We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead.

"That is our business.

"Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction."

We may as well bluntly recognize, here and now, that in the ledger of life and death, the ledger of world peace and world destruction, there is only one entry on the hopeful side: the study, the improvement, and finally the endorsement of the American proposal by an overwhelming majority of the United Nations. On the death side of the ledger, on the side of world destruction, there have been repeated entries, a succession which began when Mr. Gromyko, as the Soviet delegate, stated that our plan is unacceptable either in whole or in part. For the sake of confusing world opinion, the Kremlin has retreated somewhat from that statement, using phrases too vague to define; but basically Mr. Gromyko's words reflect the Soviet attitude as accurately today as when they were uttered.

It is my intense conviction that our decision, born of necessity, to build the hydrogen bomb must be accompanied by the immediate initiation of a moral crusade for peace having far greater potential effect than any physical weapon, even chunks of the sun.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Before the Senator leaves the point he has just mentioned, I should like to inquire whether it is correct that our offer of 3½ years ago, the plan of Mr. Baruch, is still just as good today as it was when it was made.

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that because it was objectively right, because it was based fundamentally on the scientific facts, which are inherent in this problem, the American plan, which now has ceased to be the American plan and is the plan of the United Nations, is as objectively correct today in its essentials as it was on the day when it was formulated.

Mr. President, if we should fail in the business of working in a crusade for peace, we would deal a severe blow both to our moral position and to our fervent hopes for a secure future. The people of the United States want harmony among nations infinitely more than they want a new bomb. A fresh proposal for atomic peace, as dramatic as it is sincere, impresses me as urgently desirable.

Yet, through Bernard Baruch's immortal address of more than 3 years ago, we have already undertaken one major peace effort—and it was unsuccessful in that today we remain as far distant from atomic agreement as when we started. Why did this honest peace effort fail to impact successfully upon all mankind?

The answer is obvious and may be summarized in three words: Russia's Iron Curtain. The people of Russia, thanks to the Iron Curtain, have been prevented from knowing the true and desperate nature of the atomic crisis. They have been kept from learning, due to the Iron Curtain, how we extend toward them the hand of friendship and

offer a just atomic control plan for their protection and incalculable benefit as well as our own. Any information on the subject that reaches the Russian people is first twisted and distorted into the red focus of the Kremlin's official line.

We all know why the Soviet elite members maintain their curtain. It is because, using Churchill's phrase, "they fear our friendship more than they fear our enmity." A prison cannot be operated with too many doors and windows unguarded and unlocked. The men of the Kremlin do not want us to look in. Above all, they do not want their own people to look out. This explains not only the Soviet clinging to the curtain but also to the Soviet rejection of an atomic inspectorate and other essential controls.

It is completely accurate to say that, in final analysis Russia's Iron Curtain is responsible for our enormously reluctant decision to make hydrogen bombs, for the curtain prevents the Russian people from appreciating that we want and seek atomic peace; they, therefore, bring no effective pressure upon their rulers to accept atomic peace; the rulers maintain their absolute sway through popular ignorance; and the atomic armaments race rushes madly onward.

But though we may justly blame the Iron Curtain, we must also blame ourselves for failing to bring our message of peace and conciliation adequately to the attention even of those peoples who enjoy reasonably free access to information. Few of our own leaders have recognized that global control of atomic energy is the heart question of all foreign policy and that the German dilemma, the Austrian treaty, the status of Japan, and like matters are relatively insignificant compared to the overriding issue of whether or not more atomic weapons shall enter into existence with each month and year which passes.

If a new crusade for peace is not to miss its objective, as did the peace effort which we launched with such high hopes in 1946, we must not only crack the Iron Curtain and gain the ear of the Russian people, but we must also gain the ear of people on the near side of the barrier, including the many in our own country who do not yet grasp what is at stake.

We have spent \$29 million a year on what we are pleased to call the Voice of America. It should be called the whisper of America. We spend in this country over \$30 million a year to advertise cosmetics, and \$29 million, I repeat, to sell the most precious commodity we have to sell—freedom itself.

All over the world today, perhaps because listlessness and mediocrity have characterized our attempts to sell what America is, what America wants, and what America intends, there exists misunderstanding as to our attitude. The 30 years of vilification emanating from behind the Iron Curtain in Moscow have taken a toll on our reputation as a peace-loving and a peace-loving nation. There are millions of people abroad who observe our armaments expenditures and fail to grasp that these are for self-defense.

They should appreciate the truth, but they do not. We assume that our actual good intentions and actual good feelings must be known to them; but they see that we devote billions to guns, tanks, planes, and atomic weapons, and day and night the Communist propaganda machine hammers into them the theme that American armaments are designed for conquest. Even worse, they do not see—at least with the same clarity—the huge resources being diverted to munitions inside Russia; for the Iron Curtain conceals such activity and even enables Mr. Vishinsky to deceive multitudes by claiming that his country uses atomic energy to move mountains.

I advocate, Mr. President, a United States program of attention-arresting foreign broadcasts that would compare in size and scope



to the Soviet effort along this line and that would genuinely deserve the name, Voice of America. I favor exploring the efficacy of printing millions of leaflets for worldwide circulation explaining a new United States proposal for atomic peace. We should publicly and repeatedly challenge the Kremlin to make known the terms of the proposal to newspaper readers and also to listeners inside Russia. We should publicly and repeatedly challenge the Kremlin to permit a meeting of the United Nations in Moscow itself, so that the trend of international discussions and our own sincerity would be more likely to enter the mental horizon of the average Russian.

There are other possible methods of creating a window in the Iron Curtain. Some have already been made known to the Senate; others will occur to us if we give the problem sufficient thought; all should receive the most painstaking scrutiny. At almost any cost, we must assure that the Russian people have opportunity to consider, side by side, the atomic proposals of their own rulers and our atomic proposals, and that the Russian people act as part of the world jury which brings in a verdict covering this monumental issue.

There remains the question of what fresh atomic offer we should advance as means of igniting a moral crusade for peace. Recently some observers, quite properly conscious of the decisive position occupied by atomic energy have argued that a board should be appointed, analogous to the one which prepared the famous American report in 1946, and that such a board shall take a new look at the entire control problem—especially with a view toward reevaluating the need for certain technical phases of what is now the United Nations plan. Yet the scientific facts surrounding the hydrogen bomb more than ever render necessary the general kind of technical program which the United Nations, after exhaustive study, has approved. More than ever it is true that an ineffective agreement would be worse than no agreement at all. More than ever there is no escape from strict control of raw materials, strict control of plants and continuous inspection. We can enter into no scheme of a type which would only serve to mislead us and induce a false sense of security.

The new approach I have in mind is somewhat different. Although it flows from many weeks, and indeed months, of continuous reflection, I offer it only as an example of the bold steps which the Soviet atomic explosion, the shadow of the hydrogen bomb, and the pyramiding arms race should persuade us to consider.

We now spend about \$15 billion annually for armaments. Why not offer to take two-thirds of this sum or \$10 billion, and, instead of amassing sterile weapons, use it to foster peace throughout the world for a 5-year period? Why not offer to spread the annual \$10 billion over three programs: President Truman's point-4 proposal, development of atomic energy everywhere for peace, and general economic aid and help to all countries, including Russia? Such a global Marshall plan might combine with the marvelous power of peacetime atomic energy to generate universal material progress and a universal cooperative spirit. In exchange for our own contribution of \$10 billion annually, which we would save from the military budget, we would ask first, general acceptance of an effective program for international control of atomic energy, and, second, an agreement by all countries, enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of their present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends. Administration of the annual \$10 billion which we offered to make available for 5 years would be carried out through the United Nations.

Such a proposal, if advanced by our Government, might vividly bring home to all the

world's population—in a manner far more successful than we have so far used—the profundity of our desire for peace. It would accomplish this result even if it accomplished nothing else. If the proposal were actually accepted, we would have concluded the cheapest monetary bargain in the history of the world; we would have probably saved mankind from destruction by fire; and we would have paved the way toward a new era of unimagined abundance for all men, based upon atomic energy constructively harnessed.

At present only one-third of the world's 2,200 million people receive enough food to sustain life on a decent basis. The other two-thirds live continuously at the margin of starvation. Mr. President, it is atomic energy that opens up the vision of expanding material decencies until there is enough to go around for all, until every last hungry mouth is filled. Perhaps, through the expenditure of a few extra tens of millions of dollars we can conquer the riddle of photosynthesis and extract from the processes of plant growth a means of multiplying many times the world's food supply. Perhaps through atomic power for industry and agriculture we can transform the deserts of Africa, Asia, and the Americas into blooming crop-producing acres, and the arid hills of the world into gardens. It is almost impossible to overestimate what all-out concentration upon atomic energy for peace might accomplish in terms of remaking and improving the physical environment of mankind.

I might point out that we have already poured billions of dollars into foreign economic aid, asking nothing in return, and still Communist propaganda has blackened our motives in the eyes of millions of men. Here, in accordance with my suggestion, we would ask effective control of the atom and substantial disarmament—which every man and woman in the world has a right to expect without any further inducement on our part. Yet we would in fact provide further inducement, in the form of \$10 billion annually for 5 years, as proof of our overwhelming will to peace.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

At the same time it goes without saying that we would provide no such funds unless they were associated with the measures needed to rescue humanity from hell on earth, control of the atom, and disarmament.

I suppose that my suggestions will be termed impractical or theoretical in some quarters. Before they are condemned, however, I would ask that whoever condemns them produce a better proposal.

I am willing to have my suggestions today judged against the background of Mr. Baruch's words spoken more than 3 years ago—words which I have quoted and which I now repeat:

"We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead.

"That is our business.

"Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction."

Mr. President, I would write those words upon the heart and mind of every statesman in the world in the crisis in which we find ourselves today.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I have only a brief statement to make, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

This much, Mr. President, I would add: In 1945 and 1946, when our thoughts were

focused upon the Hiroshima bomb, we enjoyed an opportunity to wage atomic peace that somehow, despite the magnificence and generosity of our proposal to the United Nations, we did not fully exploit. Our present concern with the hydrogen bomb furnishes a second opportunity. I do not think a third will be given us.

I believe that every morning each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and each high official of the executive branch of this Government should glance at the sun and reflect that what he sees there, millions of miles away, threatens to be recreated on this earth, in our own cities, in Washington, New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and New Orleans. This is a time for soul-searching, for nationwide and worldwide debate, and for the launching and maintaining of that moral crusade for peace which alone can save us and lead mankind along the righteous paths of security, abundance, and liberty.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the proposals the late Senator McMahon made in 1950 were prophetic and discerning at that time; today, they are even more significant because of the state of world affairs. I should like to call attention to the details of the Senator's plans for a multibillion dollar "Marshall global plan" for peace that would expand our point 4 program, would develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes and make it available to all nations, and would undertake a massive campaign of truth about democracy and America's desire for peace, to be directed to all corners of the world.

The principles of Senator McMahon's proposal deserve the most careful consideration. They were advanced by a man who, perhaps more than any other civilian of his time, understood both the threat and the promise of the atom. He warned, and I repeat his warning, that we cannot guarantee our national security or lasting peace by simply struggling to keep a numerical and technical advantage in the production of nuclear weapons. We must also develop a positive program for winning the friendship of other nations and for drying up the sources of economic and social unrest which are the most fertile breeding grounds of communism.

#### TRIBUTE TO H. CHAPMAN ROSE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the people of the United States owe a debt to a man who has served them well and faithfully, the Honorable H. Chapman Rose. Mr. Rose has recently resigned his post of Under Secretary of the Treasury, to return to private law practice.

It has been my privilege from time to time to observe Mr. Rose's performance of his duties. It is clear to me that two of his guiding principles have been fairness and a determination to find the true facts. As a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I have been impressed with his selflessness and with the contributions he has made to our Nation's economic well-being.

Mr. Rose particularly deserves high commendation for the impartial approach he displayed in settling, during his closing weeks in office, a number of long-standing and troublesome issues which had been confronting the Treasury Department. Among them were the



serious and complicated matters of customs administration affecting the importation of Swiss watch movements. The far-reaching aspects of these problems have manifested themselves in my own State of Maryland because of the grave impact which the curtailment of watch imports has had on the sale of Maryland tobacco to Switzerland.

There is little doubt that Mr. Rose has made a significant contribution to the eventual restoration of improved trade relations with Switzerland. As a result of forward-looking actions taken prior to his leaving Government service, the Treasury Department, on February 7, 1956, published a ruling clarifying and upholding its existing practices with reference to the collection of duties on adjusted watch movements. By confirming its long-standing interpretation of the Tariff Act, the Department, in effect, has rejected contentions by the domestic watch manufacturers, and others, that watch importers have avoided the payment of proper duties. It is heartening to see the Treasury Department take such a firm and justified stand on this matter, since erroneous allegations have done a great disservice, not alone to the Swiss, but also to the American watch importers.

Mr. Rose's dedicated and devoted service in behalf of the American people should not go unnoted. For this reason, I wish to commend highly the exemplary record of Mr. H. Chapman Rose. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a most fitting editorial from the Washington Post and Times-Herald, dated January 14, 1956.

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

#### MR. ROSE'S RETIREMENT

Under Secretary of the Treasury H. Chapman Rose is one of those officials who ought to be a permanent part of the Government. Like his chief, Secretary Humphrey, he is an exceedingly expert administrator who is more than capable in any situation. Any administration would be lucky to have such an official; indeed, one of Mr. Rose's strong points has been that he has had the confidence of both Democrats and Republicans in Congress. He can take pride in the fact that the Treasury has won distinction as perhaps the best-managed agency of the Government; this success has been due in no small measure to his own skill and understanding. He has played a brilliant role in both the formulation of Treasury policy and in administration. His resignation to return to the practice of law in Cleveland leaves a void in the Treasury that will be most difficult to fill.

#### PROPOSED DISCONTINUANCE OF DIRECT FREIGHT AND PASSENGER SERVICE BY THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD BETWEEN CERTAIN POINTS IN CONNECTICUT—RESOLUTION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has indicated that it wishes to discontinue direct freight and passenger service between Hartford, Willimantic, and Boston, via Putnam, Conn. I have before me a resolution adopted by the Development Commission of the State of Connecticut, expressing opposition to the

taking of such action, and the hope that the railroad will reconsider the matter, and will not discontinue that service. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

#### STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,

Hartford, Conn., February 16, 1956.

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: For your information I am enclosing a resolution adopted by this commission at its regular meeting yesterday.

With very kindest personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY A. EDWARDS,  
Managing Director.

#### RESOLUTION RE DISCONTINUANCE OF DIRECT FREIGHT AND PASSENGER SERVICE BY NEW HAVEN RAILROAD BETWEEN HARTFORD, WILLI- MANTIC, AND BOSTON VIA PUTNAM

Whereas the State of Connecticut through the Governor's office, the development commission, the highway department, the water commission, the department of education, and many other State departments and agencies is bending every effort to stimulate and encourage the rehabilitation and economic development of eastern Connecticut; and

Whereas these efforts in concert with the activities of dedicated local officials, local civic groups and others are meeting with definite results and are, in fact, reversing the long-time downward trend of the area; and

Whereas the development and greater use of transportation facilities of all types is essential to the future success of such efforts; and

Whereas the announced intention of the New Haven railroad to discontinue its passenger service and direct freight service between Willimantic and Boston via Putnam, if it becomes effective, will severely handicap the rehabilitation and economic development efforts previously mentioned; Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Connecticut Development Commission bring these facts to the attention of the president of the New Haven Railroad, the public utilities commission, the Governor of the State of Connecticut, the Interstate Commerce Commission and others who may be interested in the growth and prosperity of all sections of Connecticut and especially the flood-damaged areas of eastern Connecticut, in the hope that some common ground of understanding may be reached whereby the New Haven Railroad will reconsider its intended action and as a direct beneficiary accept its full share of responsibility for the continued success of these efforts.

(The above resolution was passed unanimously at the regular monthly meeting of the Connecticut Development Commission, held in Hartford, Conn., Wednesday, February 15, 1956.)

Mr. BUSH. Furthermore, Mr. President, I should like to state that eastern Connecticut is one of the most beautiful parts of our State, but it does need some economic stimulus. Certainly the discontinuance of railroad service in the area and the discontinuance of shipments of raw materials and other articles necessary for manufacturing and commerce there would be a blow to that section of the State, which has suffered more losses from the moving of mills into the South than has any other area of my State.

So I desire to express my deep sympathy with the resolution which has been adopted by the Development Commission; and I join my own expression of hope with that of theirs that the railroad will reconsider this entire matter.

#### THE NEED FOR ADEQUATE DEFENSE MEASURES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday last, after making some remarks in relation to the veto by the President of the natural-gas bill, I had occasion to reply to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on the need for adequate defensive measures. My remarks will be found on pages 2797-2798 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I pointed out the changed geographical conditions of today as compared with what they were when I came to Washington 17 years ago. We all realize that, just as in this changing world, we have by our ingenuity eliminated time and space, likewise, in this changing world, due to the same ingenuity and inventiveness, we are now finding new energies, new methods, and new means. We are now talking about intercontinental missiles which will travel 5,000 miles. We are talking about the fallout of an H-bomb which would cover the whole State of Wisconsin.

As appears from the press, Trevor Gardner in secret session has raised the question of our neglecting necessary military research in the field of atomic and guided missiles. I am not entering into that controversy. I am not on the committee; but, just as we were asleep at the time of Pearl Harbor—thinking it would be impossible for the Japanese to attack—so it is possible that in the field of research, we may discover that we are lagging or asleep.

This must not happen, because times are different now than they were at the time of Pearl Harbor. We had 2 years then to make good our mistakes. Now, because of the elimination of time and space, we will not have 2 hours.

A young man from my own State, a former United States marine, Russell D. L. Wirth, Jr., has prepared what he calls an open letter to our Government. In this letter he points up some of the well-known information and statements that have been made available on the floor of the Senate and in the press concerning the Russians' advance in the field of rocket and intercontinental missiles.

I ask that this statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

#### LETTER IN DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

(By Russell D. L. Wirth, Jr.)

#### OPEN LETTER TO OUR GOVERNMENT

We, the sovereign people salute your brilliant achievement over the past 3 years. For the first time in cold-war history you have maintained both freedom and security within the blessed framework of peace.

But we the people are not misled concerning the mounting Communist challenge to peace. We recognize our awesome role in history as the ultimate defender of freedom.



Along with Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Malenkov, and Khrushchev, we know the sole aim of communism is "world domination through world revolution." We know that every single 1 of 19 successful Communist revolutions depended upon military force or threat of force.

We know that our proven military superiority to communism is the absolute minimum requirement for freedom, security, and peace. That our superiority must be first, in intercontinental weapons for global warfare, and second, in tactical forces against local aggression. Only with this dual superiority can we prevent both the horror of world war III and the debacle of Korean stalemate.

We know that our tragic unpreparedness and moral indecision under Wilson before World War I, Roosevelt before World War II, and Truman before Korea misled totalitarians to aggress and forced us to the horror of war. Today, unlike the past, we are blessed with a leadership totally dedicated to peace through adequate preparedness. We are led by perhaps the greatest military team in history, in our Joint Chiefs of Staff headed by a Commander in Chief who is America's greatest living wartime leader.

Neither we the people nor political partisans among us can judge just what are the necessary levels of military strength to achieve our objectives. None of us are qualified to do this without access to secret plans and trends, without vast scientific and technical knowledge, without professional strategic training. We accept your decisions in awareness that they were made without shortsighted panic, without false regard for "critical" years, without bankrupting our economy, and without sacrificing security to domestic politics.

Yet we would summarize for you the awesome facts of Communist military challenge, as imperfectly reflected in the public press. We do this in full knowledge that these may be subject to distortion and inaccuracy. We do this because published figures indicate an ever-mounting threat and because we wish to prove our willingness to undertake whatever dollar sacrifices proves necessary to preserve peace and freedom.

In terms of commitments, we are formally obligated to defend 39 foreign nations, informally to participate in the defense of 25 more. Our total commitment then extends to 64 nations abroad, comprising over half the world's land area and about two-thirds of its population, in which we man some 950 foreign bases.

In expenditures, we have a staggering current investment of \$124 billion in military goods and property. We are spending 2-out-of-every-3 dollars, over \$40 billion in recent budgets, on national security expenses. But this represents only 10 percent of our national production while Soviet Russia forces its slave economy to concentrate 50-60 percent on war production.

In land forces, we face an estimated 190 infantry and 65 mechanized Communist divisions in the West, supported by 40,000 tanks and 9,000 tactical aircraft. In the East, we face Communist China's veteran 3 million-man trained army backed by 13 million Chinese militia.

Our own Army is reported at 19 divisions. Of these, 2 are static, split between Alaska and the Canal Zone, and 5 are training units. This leaves America with but 12 fighting divisions to fulfill our vast global commitment.

In land tactics, some 95 Soviet divisions are thought to be reorganized for atomic warfare. We are reported to have made but a beginning on 2 United States divisions. And the cost of "atomicizing" all 12 United States divisions is considered upwards of \$3 billion.

In naval power, the Russians have advanced from seventh to second place in the

world. They already surpass the United States in naval manpower. They should exceed us in total naval strength within the next 10 years at present rates. They have spent \$45 billion since World War II on a cruiser, destroyer, and submarine construction program that exceeds the combined programs of all NATO powers.

By latest estimate, the Russians have a massive 400-vessel submarine fleet, more than 5 times Nazi sub strength at the outset of World War II. They are thought to have capitalized on Nazi underwater rocket launching techniques and to be outfitting their subs with rocket launchers in the Kom-somolsk naval yards.

Assuming the Russians staged underwater atomic rocket raids on our coastal areas up to 40 miles inland, they could strike 5 of America's 7 largest metropolitan centers, all our major naval bases and shipyards, almost all our aircraft industry, and about half of our air bases in a single surprise blow.

In nuclear weapons, America is thought well ahead both in quantity and quality. But both sides are approaching the "nuclear saturation" point wherein adequate stockpiles of weapons exist for all available targets. Unofficial estimates place the rapidly growing Soviet stockpile at well over 500. When converted into hydrogen weapons similar to that exploded by the Soviets in the fall, this stockpile is considered capable of destroying the United States in one devastating blow.

Our Civil Defense planners believe that 50 to 60 percent of an attacking force could penetrate to deliver bombs on target. Assuming that only one-half, or 250 bombs, were so delivered, this would still be sufficient to mount major nuclear assaults on the 92 United States "critical" areas and lesser atomic raids on the additional 123 "suitable" targets.

Navy Department personnel have indicated that the Russians should be able to deliver their major assaults with, at the very minimum, 5-megaton hydrogen bombs. Even this initial 5-megaton bomb could achieve major destruction through fire and blast in a circular area of 300 square miles and could contaminate a wider area of 7,000 square miles with deadly radioactive fallout. In a major attack with such weapons, civil defense estimates that some 20 million Americans would be killed, an equal number injured, and our industrial potential crippled.

Ahead in the nuclear field lies the threat of warfare with radioactive strontium and other forms of atom ash generated in the peacetime nuclear plants of numerous nations. It has been estimated that by 1975 Britain alone will have produced 20 billion curies of atomic ash. A mere 5 percent of this, weighing only 3 tons, is reported capable of contaminating 4,000 square miles.

Today we recognize that the key to the world power balance lies, not so much in weapon stockpiles as in relative delivery, defense, and retaliation capability, and in the will to utilize weapons available. Hence the crucial race for survival shifts to air and rocket power.

In air power, published information suggests that the Soviets are taking a decisive lead in intercontinental bombers and in day and night interceptors. Only our 1,500 B-47 medium range bombers provide us with a now-challenged margin of superiority.

Within 2 years, it is thought, the Soviets will have 600 to 800 intercontinental jet TU-37 bombers and 800 to 1,000 medium jet TU-39 bombers. Our Strategic Air Command over this same period will see little improvement other than replacement of obsolete reciprocating B-36's with some 330 jet B-52's. Even this improvement would give the Soviets a 2-to-1 advantage in long-range intercontinental striking power plus the traditional advantage of the aggressor.

Our present operational interceptors are not considered adequate defense against the

new Soviet bombers. Our new F-102's and F-104's are thought good enough but are not expected to fully replace present equipment by the time the Soviet bomber force reaches full strength.

Our strategic air power appears overly dependent on some 100 overseas bases over which we have little political control. Our 1,500 B-47's cannot strike from the United States itself without two-way air-to-air refueling. But we are reported lacking enough air-tankers to refuel more than one-fifth of our fleet at a time.

Our military aircraft production has fallen over recent years to an estimated 8,000 planes in 1956. This compares with an estimated Soviet figure of 10,000 to 16,000 planes per year. The Russians are reported producing their latest night fighters at 5 times, their day fighters at 3 times, their intercontinental bombers at 2 times current United States production rates.

In rocket warfare, the limited speed and human error of piloted aircraft will ultimately be replaced by the instantaneous speed and mechanical accuracy of guided missiles. The Russians have been reported working on an intercontinental guided rocket with 5,000-mile range and nuclear warhead ever since 1946. They began a top-priority program immediately after they seized 2,000 German rocket specialists, principal German rocket centers at Peenemunde and Thuringia, and plans for the A-10 German rocket designed to bombard New York from Europe.

The Russians are reported building massive rocket launching sites along their Arctic coast aimed over the Polar Cap. Marshall Bulganin boasted to the Supreme Soviet this last December that the Russians would soon have an intercontinental missile. And our top scientific Killian Committee is reported as saying the Soviets should achieve decisive superiority in intercontinental missiles within the 1960-65 period.

To date, the Russians are thought to have definitely tested a guided rocket of 1,500 mile range. This intermediate range missile, with a nuclear warhead, could strike almost all of America's 100 overseas bases. It might thereby neutralize our basic retaliation weapon, the medium range B-47.

On the other hand, our Defense Department gave the intercontinental missile low priority up until 1955. Secretary Wilson estimates we may have one in the next 5 years. With a \$1.3 billion budget and a newly established coordinator, our rocket program may now have entered the life-and-death race to beat the Soviets to the so-called "ultimate weapon."

Should the Russians develop the intercontinental missile before us, the free world's entire treaty and defense structure might be imperiled. By merely demonstrating the weapon's destructive capabilities and the impossibility of effective defense, the Soviets might achieve their basic aim of destroying our allies' will to resist. Then, through a series of maneuvers, revolutions, and subversions, they might achieve the piecemeal disintegration of the free world under the awesome threat of missile warfare. There is the equal danger that the Soviets would attempt to exploit their temporary advantage by means of surprise aggression against the continental United States before America matched or countered their new weapon.

Once warfare with intercontinental missiles, thermonuclear warheads, and radioactive ash becomes generally feasible, it would appear that any side could totally destroy any other no matter which side initiated warfare. War would cease to have any relation to national policy and become a matter of mutual suicide.

At some point well before this time, it would again appear absolutely imperative that we achieve some form of inspection, disarmament, and ultimate international ban



or control of nuclear weapons. The key to disarmament would appear to be achievement of proven and clear American military superiority, involving prior development of an intercontinental missile, for thereby it would become clearly to the advantage of the Communists to disarm.

We, the people of America, wish to reassert our awareness of these grim facts and our willingness to pay whatever the price of peace and freedom may be.

#### FOOD SHIPMENTS TO RELIEVE EUROPEAN DISTRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have all read with genuine sympathy the news from all parts of Western Europe concerning the tremendous damage inflicted by the cold wave, regarded by many observers as the worst such storm period in a century.

The President of the United States, acting for the people of the United States, has, as usual, responded with promptness, humanitarianism, and effectiveness.

From Thomasville, Ga., he has sent word that we are prepared to use a part of the Nation's farm surpluses to relieve the suffering in Western Europe.

Already, American relief activity has reminded the world that no Nation is more responsive to human need than is our own Nation.

Thus, American Armed Forces stationed in Europe, by means of their relief operations by airplane, by helicopter, by truck convoys, and the like, have shown once again that the only war which we Americans want to fight is the war against mankind's age-old enemies of want, disease, hunger, and other forms of suffering.

We have, of course, been particularly eager to respond to the dire needs of our friends in the Republic of Italy. They in turn have already responded through a message of thanks from President Gronchi for all our assistance activity to date.

I know that the Congress enthusiastically commends the President for his action. We earnestly hope and pray that nature's fury will relent, and that Western Europe will be spared from further suffering.

But if we may judge from the past, there will be other natural disasters, unfortunately, in time to come—floods, tornadoes, earthquakes, avalanches, and the like. So, we must and will be prepared at all times to utilize the fruit of nature's bounty, in the form of farm production, to relieve distress whenever it occurs, at home or abroad.

#### SENATOR HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today is a very auspicious day in the life of my senior colleague, CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona. Today he enters his 45th year as a Member of Congress. It had been my intention to make some remarks on this occasion, but yesterday I had the pleasure of reading in the Washington Star a very excellent article written by Joseph F. McCaffrey, entitled "Last Frontiersman Marks His 44th Year in Congress."

Because the article so clearly portrays the unselfish public life of my senior colleague, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

#### LAST FRONTIERSMAN MARKS HIS 44TH YEAR IN CONGRESS

(By Joseph F. McCaffrey)

The only real life frontiersman still in public life enters his 45th year as a Federal legislator today.

He is CARL HAYDEN, senior Senator from Arizona and second ranking Member of the Senate in point of service. Only his fellow Democrat, WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, has been in the upper house longer than Mr. HAYDEN, who "graduated" from the House to the Senate in 1927.

But Senator HAYDEN has a distinction that is unique. Not only does his tenure on Capitol Hill exceed even that of the timeless SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, the Arizona Democrat is the only man now living to have served his State in Congress continuously since it achieved statehood.

Arizona was only 5 days old as a State when Representative-at-Large CARL HAYDEN took his seat in the House. There still were wild Indians back home, and only 200,000 persons in his statewide constituency. The United States itself was only on the threshold of greatness.

#### NO DAVY CROCKETT

To say that CARL HAYDEN is the last frontiersman is not to say that he is a Davy Crockett. No blusterer, he is rather the product of the American West, A. D. 1877.

Senator HAYDEN was born in the settlement of Hayden's Ferry, now known as Tempe. The adobe house where he was born is a local landmark, though its former resident has now moved to Phoenix and spends most of his time in Washington.

His youth was that of the West, a-ridin' and a-ropin', with time set aside for as much reading as he could get in. Young HAYDEN managed to wade through all nine volumes of Ridpath's History of the World by the time he was 12.

The future Senator entered Stanford University just 3 months after Herbert Hoover graduated. He became a big man on campus in two fields—football and debating.

After college HAYDEN made his first stab at public office. He won this race, for a spot on the Tempe Town Council, after which he became county treasurer and later sheriff. During his term as sheriff, 48 years ago, he married his college sweetheart, Nan Downing. Mrs. Hayden and the Senator live today in a large apartment near the Senate Office Building.

From the sheriff's office HAYDEN went directly to Congress.

#### EVERYONE'S NICE

Looking back the other day Senator HAYDEN puffed on a cigar that wouldn't stay lit, and observed:

"Everyone has been very nice to me all my life.

"I remember when I first got here. I asked around some of the oldtimers how they kept getting reelected. I got a lot of advice and most of it I followed."

The key piece of advice, Senator HAYDEN said, was not to forget the home folks. He got into more work than he bargained for the first time he decided to apply this advice.

"I got hold of about 14,000 farm bulletins and sent them out with a letter. I told the folks I'd welcome any ideas they had on legislation."

The ideas rolled in. Unfortunately, most of them were from Socialists.

"I decided I had to face up to it," the Senator recalls. "So I studied up on every pro-

posal they offered and then I'd sit down and tell them, 1-2-3, why I opposed the plan."

Senator HAYDEN's most cherished piece of advice came from Representative Frederick C. Talbott, of Maryland:

"There are two kinds of Congressmen—show horses and work horses. If you want to get your name in the papers be a show horse. If you want to gain the respect of your colleagues, keep quiet and be a work horse."

The Arizona newcomer decided on the workhorse role. As a result his name is not too often in print, but he is one of the most influential Members of the Senate.

One of the country's great authorities on Government spending, Senator HAYDEN has served on the Senate Appropriations Committee since entering the Senate and has been chairman of that committee since January 1955. He also serves as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing and as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

From the day he came to Congress, concerned with the responsibility for helping Arizona shoulder the full burdens of statehood, Mr. HAYDEN has devoted his primary efforts to developing the great Southwest. His worries today are much the same as they were in 1912: The largest Indian population of any State in the Union, mining, irrigation and reclamation, agriculture, and highways.

He made one of his most vital contributions to Arizona and the West as coauthor of the Hayden-Cartwright bill that set the formula for distribution of Federal aid to highways on the basis of area rather than population. This was followed in 1950 by Senate approval of the central Arizona project which HAYDEN had set in motion 12 years before. Its final passage was hailed as one of the greatest individual victories in Senate history, "a personal triumph for CARL HAYDEN."

"I guess I've seen a great piece of history," the Senator says. "I'd been here only a few years when we entered World War I."

"When that was over we found we had passed from a debtor nation to a creditor nation. Then followed the great depression and a revamping of our economy. Next came World War II and we emerged from that as a world leader."

"The comparison between the 1912 budget and today's budget is interesting. Today's budget reflects those two great wars and our present state of atomic-age preparedness. Give us the impossible—a guaranteed world peace—and we could slice our spending almost in half."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes being paid to our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He is an extraordinary man, and holds a unique position, inasmuch as he has served his State in the two Houses of Congress since Arizona was admitted into the Union as a State.

He has performed great service for his State and country, and I express the fervent hope and prayer that the senior Senator from Arizona will be with us in the Senate for many more years to come.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to join those who have paid tribute to our colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. President, there are only two Members of the Congress at this time who came here at the beginning of the 63d Congress, on March 4, 1913. One of them is the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and the other is the junior Senator from Kentucky, who now occupies the floor.

When we arrived, there was a young Representative from Arizona who had been elected in February 1912. His election had taken place on that unusual date because Arizona and New Mexico had both been admitted into the Union at that time, and a special election was required to elect a new Member to the House from Arizona. The amendment providing for the popular election of Senators had not yet taken effect and, therefore, the legislature elected the two new Senators, one of whom was Senator Marcus A. Smith, and the other was Senator Henry F. Ashurst. Representative HAYDEN came to the House before the legislature elected the two Senators. Therefore, he antedated their entrance into the Senate.

I think it may be said without the slightest fear of contradiction or of controversy that no more effective legislator ever served in either House of the Congress than the senior Senator from Arizona. I remember serving with him for 14 years in the House. He and I came to the Senate at the same time, on the 4th of March 1927. As a Member of the House and as a Member of the Senate, without any fanfare or noise or histrionics, CARL HAYDEN has served his State and the Nation with as much industry, intelligence, and effectiveness as can be attributed to any man who has ever served in either House, since he came to Washington at the beginning of the 63d Congress, on the 4th of March 1913.

I join with his friends in hoping that he may continue to serve his State and this Nation as he is serving and has served them for 44 years without interruption.

Mr. President, I am glad the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has had printed in the RECORD the article which was published yesterday in the Washington Star concerning the Senator from Arizona. I had intended to ask that it be printed in the RECORD, but shall not duplicate the request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe all my colleagues will join with me in best wishes to a Member of this body who is celebrating an important anniversary.

It was just 45 years ago that Arizona entered the Union as a State and CARL HAYDEN entered Congress. Both events were of tremendous significance.

The emergence of Arizona as a State ended the process of creating a nation that stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. The entry of CARL HAYDEN into the Congress brought us one of our wisest, one of our ablest, and one of our most beloved colleagues.

CARL HAYDEN brought to us the daring and the imagination that characterized the American frontier. But it was tempered with a prudence and a keen mind that has made him one of the most effective Members of either branch.

Almost every bill that passes Congress bears upon it some part of CARL HAYDEN's stamp. Every colleague who has a project—be it big or little—stands on ground that is firmer when he has first sought CARL HAYDEN's advice.

He is a quiet man—a modest man. He does not seek public notoriety, and he

cares little for the cheers and plaudits upon which ambition feeds.

He always, I have observed, seeks the substantial, not the sensational.

He is content to go his own modest way—satisfied with the knowledge that the Congress is better and the Congress is more orderly because his effective work has shaped legislation in the path of the public interest.

Arizona is the youngest of our States. But from the very beginning, it demonstrated a wisdom beyond its years. That wisdom was expressed by the action of the people in sending CARL HAYDEN to us and returning him to our midst, year after year.

I hope that he will always be with us, and that he will always be my friend. Mr. President, no man could ask for more.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate who arrived only some 5 years ago, I know of no other Member of the United States Senate who has ever been so considerate, so helpful, and so understanding as has the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Arizona.

Senators with difficult committee loads respecting appropriations and other legislation, and other matters of tremendous importance, find it difficult, as a rule, to extend advice to fledgling Senators; but I may say that CARL HAYDEN has the reputation, among young Senators on both sides of the aisle, of always being available and helpful to them as they break into their positions in this great legislative body.

I can remember during my first days, that, busy as CARL HAYDEN was, he would come to my office, in his rounds through the Senate offices, to consult with me, to cheer me up, to give me a pat on the back, and to make many helpful suggestions based on his wide experience and understanding which had been gained over a great number of years of most constructive service in this great legislative body.

I appreciate what the distinguished majority leader has said, and I appreciate being able to join with him in this tribute to a great United States Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to concur fully in the remarks previously made by the majority leader and other Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and particularly with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma regarding the helpfulness of CARL HAYDEN to new Members of this body.

It happened to be my privilege, when I came to the Senate 11 years ago, to have an opportunity to talk with CARL HAYDEN. I felt I had an acquaintance with him that extended one additional generation before mine, because my father served in the House of Representatives with him. My father served in that body from 1903 to 1915, and CARL HAYDEN came to Congress as a Member of the House when Arizona was admitted into the Union.

As the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out, not only has CARL HAYDEN been helpful to new Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, but he has also been of assistance and most cour-

teous to those of us on the Republican side of the aisle.

It has been my privilege to serve with CARL HAYDEN as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and to have served with him on a number of subcommittees of that great committee. In legislation affecting the Government of the United States, he has taken a keen interest, and in such matters his actions have been based not on narrow partisan lines, but on what is best for the welfare of our country.

As minority leader I am happy to join in paying tribute to a great Member of this body. It has been stated that Arizona was the last of the States to be admitted into the Union. That is true, of course. However, I hope it is not going to be the last State to be admitted into the Union, because we have knocking on our door two great Territories that have served their apprenticeship. I refer to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. I hope in the not too distant future both those great Territories may be admitted as States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to contribute a few words to the tributes which have been paid to Senator CARL HAYDEN. As one who was in Arizona at school when Arizona was still a Territory, and as one who has a slight remembrance of Mr. HAYDEN as sheriff, I recall that he won my respect at that time. Then I came to know him well as a colleague in the Senate.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to complete my statement first. As the minority leader has stated, CARL HAYDEN has been kind to new Members, not only to Democrats but to Republicans. He took us into his confidence and advised us as to the methods of procedure. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, he has always been cooperative and helpful. While we have not always agreed, we have always parted as friends, and always continued to work together as friends.

I desire to join other Senators in commending him on his anniversary, and express the hope that he will have many more years of service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask the former Massachusetts student who was in Arizona if there was any reason why, in referring to his acquaintanceship with the former sheriff in Arizona, he used the word "slight" acquaintance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I will stand by the word "slight." It is my remembrance that my colleague, Senator HAYDEN, was a sheriff and helped keep order at the ballgame in which I played, which the team of which I was a member won. There was no need for his being on duty as a guard at that time, because the feelings were friendly. The Senator from Arizona states he remembers the occasion, and I am sure he does.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts realizes that my remarks were wholly facetious.

I do not want the occasion to pass, however, without joining in the tributes which are being paid to CARL HAYDEN



upon this anniversary. I became a member of the Appropriations Committee in January 1934. It was not very long before I learned that Senator HAYDEN regarded a committee as an agency of the Senate, and not as an agency of the political party to which he belonged. I was very happy, therefore, to have the Senator from California, the very able and very skillful minority leader, agree that Senator HAYDEN operated wholly without partisanship.

Senator HAYDEN has a grasp of the affairs of this Government which, in my experience, few Members of the Senate have had. His study of requests for appropriations which come from every branch of the Government has given him a deep knowledge of the entire Government of the United States, a knowledge which he uses for the benefit of all of the people of the United States. He is a great Senator; he has rendered magnificent service to his State, the Nation, and this body as a whole, and has also given much assistance to those of us who are Members of the Senate as individuals.

I am happy, indeed, to participate in this tribute to him.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to join in the many fine tributes which have been paid to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on his 45th anniversary of service in the Congress of the United States.

Senator HAYDEN is one of the most likeable Members of the Senate. Certainly he is one of the most able Members of the Senate. I know of no one who is better informed on all matters coming before the Senate than is the senior Senator from Arizona.

He has been most helpful to me during all the time I have been privileged to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. Like all the other members of that committee, the Senator from Arizona treats appropriations in a strictly bipartisan manner.

CARL HAYDEN has taken many hours of his own valuable time to look into the problems of Senators from other States, and at all times he has been most considerate.

CARL HAYDEN is truly an honorable man, a great Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have previously commented on my senior colleague's anniversary. But, as a citizen of Arizona—and I feel I can safely speak for the entire State of Arizona—I did not want this opportunity to pass without thanking the Members of this body for the laudatory and well-earned remarks my senior colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] has received today.

It may seem peculiar to my colleagues in this body, who would expect a Republican and a Democratic Senator from the same State to be fighting, to find them not doing so. As a Republican, Mr. President, I find myself in great sympathy with the people of my State who have eternal gratitude for the service of CARL HAYDEN in the Senate.

I merely wish to take this opportunity as an Arizonian, and in speaking for my State, to thank the Members of this body

for their very generous and appropriate remarks this afternoon concerning my colleague.

#### FEDERAL INDIAN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Congress is aware that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, and I have been in contact with the Department of the Interior and Bureau of Indian Affairs officials relative to Federal Indian policy on a national scale and more particularly with isolated instances in our State, Montana. To date there has been little success in moving the Department from its hard and inflexible policies toward the indigent Indians in the United States.

I want to take this opportunity to bring my colleagues up to date on my most recent correspondence with the Department and other correspondence to which I make reference. I ask unanimous consent that the following letters be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay's reply to my letter of January 6, 1956, dated February 8, 1956. The January 6 letter addressed to Assistant Secretary Wesley A. D'Ewart is printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 12, 1956, pages 381-382.

My reply to Secretary McKay, dated February 18, 1956.

An open letter addressed to Secretary McKay, by Cliff McKay, Blackfoot tribal councilman, Browning, Mont., as reprinted in the Glacier Reporter on December 30, 1956.

Assistant Secretary D'Ewart's letter to Mr. T. A. Busey, publisher, the Glacier Reporter, Browning, Mont.

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

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1956.  
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: We have your letter of January 6, 1956, expressing your belief that the policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs are too restricted and do not meet the needs of Indians who live away from reservations. Although you refer to Hill 57 as an example of the problem, you express the opinion in general terms that "All indigent Indians should be the responsibility of the Federal Government, regardless of tribal affiliation or location." We should like to discuss this opinion.

At the outset, I should like to indicate that this Department and the Bureau of Indian Affairs are concerned about Indians, their needs, their economic and social adjustment, and their health. We work constantly with the Indian people themselves and with community agencies and branches of local, State, and Federal governments to meet their needs. The problem then is not whether the Indian needs should be met. There is general agreement on that subject. The problem is whether the cost and the responsibility should be assumed solely by the Federal Government or whether it should be shared by the Federal and State governments when Indians move away from reservations and take their places in non-Indian communities.

The Federal Government has enacted legislation that provides either directly or through State governments millions of dollars to be used for the benefit of all citizens who are in need of certain kinds of help. The States also contribute funds to these programs. The following is a list of only a few of them:

- Old-age assistance.
- Aid to the blind.
- Aid to dependent children.
- Aid to the totally and permanently disabled.
- Veterans' benefits, of several kinds.
- Unemployment compensation.
- Old-age and survivors insurance benefits.
- Vocational rehabilitation.

They are for the benefit of all persons who are in need, and Indians may participate regardless of whether they live on or off a reservation. It would be difficult to obtain statistics to indicate how many Indians out of the total population receive assistance under these programs, but we believe that the cash value of such benefits for Indians runs into millions of dollars a year.

If the Federal Government were to assume responsibility, as you suggest it should, for all indigent Indians regardless of tribal affiliation or location, the appropriations to the Bureau of Indian Affairs would need to be increased many millions of dollars in the community services field alone. The administrative staff in Washington would need to be augmented, and a staff would need to be provided in nearly every State.

Your proposal would apply, however, to much more than relief programs involving food, shelter, and clothing. It would also apply to the education of Indian children. The present policy is to be sure that all Indian children have an opportunity for an education on the same basis as non-Indian children. During the fiscal year 1955, 49.2 percent of all Indian children attended public schools. This was possible because the Indian people for the most part want their children to attend public schools; States and local school districts in many instances also want this; and through Federal assistance in two forms it is possible for these arrangements to be made. As you know, Federal funds have been available under title IV of Public Law 815, as amended, to assist States subject to the impact of Indian population. This act is administered by the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The second form of assistance for public schools is through Johnson-O'Malley contracts between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and States which assist school districts where need is created by large areas of nontaxable Indian lands and numbers of Indian children. Many States acting under their constitutions have taken responsibility for the education of Indian children and have not insisted upon Federal financing for Indian children. Any policy that indicates that Indians are the complete responsibility of the Bureau of Indian Affairs will result in many more millions of dollars being needed for the education of Indian children.

Your suggestion would also create an almost insurmountable administrative problem in connection with the determination of whether a person who does not live on a reservation is an Indian. In many cases the degree of Indian blood will be very small, the person will have no connection with an Indian tribe, and he will be indistinguishable from the general population. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is constantly asked to help such persons determine whether they are descendants of some particular tribal member who died years ago. The requests are stimulated by judgments recovered by some tribes in the Indians Claims Commission and in the Court of Claims. The process by which the Bureau determines the persons who are eligible to share in those judgments is as complicated as the determination of heirs. The problem of making such

determinations would be an impossible one in connection with a general program that applies to all Indians, undefined, in the United States regardless of their assimilation into the general population. When is a person living in Great Falls, for example, who has both Indian and non-Indian ancestors to be considered an Indian and when is he to be considered a non-Indian?

A few years ago a representative of the Boston (Mass.) Department of Public Welfare telephoned to inquire whether the Bureau of Indian Affairs would pay for the burial of an Indian who had lived in Boston for 18 years. It was explained that the Bureau could not do so but could advise the State on ways to locate relatives. This inquiry resulted in a report that the relatives did not want to take charge of the body or assist with funeral arrangements. This man had never been active in tribal affairs and had been a resident of Boston for years. The usual procedures applied to him as to other citizens.

As you know, the relocation program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is purely voluntary, and Indians are assisted financially to move to a new location and to obtain housing and to make other adjustments during their initial period in a new community. These communities would not agree that the Indians who have moved under the plans of the Bureau have created a financial burden. There has not been a single complaint on this score from the communities.

Your letter implies that situations such as Hill 57 are the result of our relocation program, and that the Department is "dumping" the Indian population into these communities. We assure you such is not the case. The Hill 57 situation developed long before the Department's relocation program, and it has no connection with that program. In fact, the relocation program is designed to avoid the creation of such situations, and we believe that it has.

No Indian is encouraged to leave a reservation until he is equipped to take care of himself without creating a community problem. Moreover, the Department has never questioned the right of an Indian to return to a reservation if he wishes to do so. The right of freedom of movement is one which the Department scrupulously respects.

The Department has repeatedly been accused of conducting a program for Indians that is too paternalistic and that has retarded Indian progress. We believe that one of the ways in which Indian dependency on the Federal Government can be overcome is to treat the problems of individual Indians, whenever possible, in the same manner that similar problems of the general population are treated. Any program that makes it possible for every appeal to be made to the Federal Government without regard to the responsibilities of the county and State governments tends to continue Indian dependence on the Federal Government, and is especially questionable in the case of Indians who have of their own volition moved away from reservations.

The approach suggested by you would tend to make a small segment of the total population completely dependent on the Federal Government, in perpetuity, and would give some basis to the claim frequently made that Indians are second-class citizens because they are not allowed to participate on a plane of equality in governmental programs that are available to the general population.

The proposal that all indigent Indians should be the responsibility of the Federal Government, regardless of tribal affiliation or location, is completely impractical of administration, aside from the enormous cost that would be involved, and we believe that the proper dividing line between Federal and State responsibility is residence away from a reservation. There is no way

without great overlapping of agencies and duplication of services in which we can properly assist Indians who have voluntarily chosen to live away from reservations. This is not to say that such Indians should be denied any rights or be subjected to discrimination. On the contrary, we insist that they should be treated the same as all other members of the communities in which they live, and be allowed to participate in relief and assistance programs without discrimination because of their ancestry.

We believe that our proper role is to care for those Indians on reservations who are not cared for by other agencies and to continue our role of working with communities when we can be of assistance in an advisory or cooperative way for those Indians who have moved away from reservations.

One final word with respect to Hill 57. It should be noted that in the September 1955 hearings in Montana that were held by the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, a representative of the State testified that Hill 57 Indians are entitled to participate in all State and county relief programs without discrimination because of their Indian ancestry. The problem, therefore, becomes one of whether the entire cost of such programs should be shifted from the county and State governments to the Federal Government merely because of the Indian ancestry of the people involved. We respectfully suggest that if such a policy is to be adopted by Congress, it should be done only after careful deliberation, and that it should not be restricted to one isolated community such as Hill 57.

If you care to discuss this general policy problem in terms of the Nation as a whole, we shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,  
Secretary of the Interior.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
February 18, 1956.

Hon. DOUGLAS MCKAY,  
Secretary of the Interior,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in reply to your letter of February 8, answering questions raised in my inquiry of January 6 addressed to Wesley D'Ewart, Assistant Secretary. I have read with interest your declaration of the administration's Indian policies nationally as well as in isolated cases. However, there remains a wide gulf between our two viewpoints in regard to Federal Indian policy. I wish to take this opportunity to express my views on several of the statements made in your communication.

You are correct in assuming that the area in which we disagree most heartily is on the degree of Federal responsibility to the Indian. I have never felt that the Federal Government should assume the entire responsibility for all Indians, regardless of the degree of blood relationship, economic or social status. I do feel strongly that the Federal Government is not assuming enough responsibility to the indigent American Indian. There are too many sharp divisions, too little flexibility in the Department's policies. States and local governments are being asked to carry too heavy a load in welfare and relief matters. Residence on or off a reservation as criteria for Federal aid is one instance of an inflexible position.

Federal-State cooperative education programs for Indians are admirable, but they do not reach all of our Indian children. You state that "The present policy is to be sure that all Indian children have an opportunity for an education on the same basis as non-Indian children." You state further that 49.2 percent of all Indian children attended public schools; however, I would like to know what percentage of Indian children attended schools on or off the reservation? If the

figures for Indian children meet the NEA advance estimates of 97.1 percent for all children in the United States for this same period, it will be indicative of equal opportunity for Indian children.

The relocation program is a worthy venture. I am sure that progress has been made where actual contact is made between the Indian and the relocation officer. Also, I assume interested Indians receive adequate preparation for the move from the reservation into another locality. However, information at my disposal indicates that many reservations are overcrowded because of increased population and restricted land holdings. Many of these reservation Indians and their families are forced to leave to seek out a more satisfactory livelihood. Many in their haste fail to take advantage of Bureau of Indian Affairs services. If all Indian families who left the reservation, in addition to those interested in relocation advice, were to descend on the Bureau officials, I am sure they would be greatly overtaxed. When they leave the reservation, they are no longer eligible for Federal aid. If this relocation program is to be a success, the number of relocation officers and workers must be increased on the reservation as well as being placed in the field to assist the Indian families in relocating.

I agree that the Indian should be treated the same as all other members of the communities in which they live, and be allowed to participate in relief and assistance programs without discrimination because of their ancestry. This can become a reality only after many Indians have been properly educated and rehabilitated. Under the present program I feel that this is not being done.

In regard to the situation among the Indians on Hill 57 in Great Falls, I need not reiterate that these people are in dire need. Adequate assistance is not available from State and local agencies. Your firm stand against aiding this Indian settlement is not consistent with a recent statement made by Assistant Secretary D'Ewart in his letter to Mr. T. A. Busey, publisher, the Glacier Reporter, Browning, Mont.

In regard to welfare policies, Mr. D'Ewart states:

"Second, . . . welfare policies . . . The Indians as citizens of this country and of their State and county are entitled to welfare assistance of various kinds under the social-security laws and welfare laws of the States. It is our policy to work with the Indians and with the States and counties to see that this assistance is actually provided. There are, of course, many Indians who will not be eligible for the several types of welfare assistance for a number of reasons, even though they may be in great need. In order that these people will have somewhere to turn for help, the Indian Bureau obtains funds to prevent suffering by those Indians who are in real need of relief assistance and cannot obtain it from other sources. It is our policy to provide the same amount of assistance to the individual needy Indians as each State or county provides their non-Indian neighbors."

From all information I have at my disposal, the Indians on Hill 57 would qualify as "those Indians who are in need of relief assistance and cannot obtain it from other sources."

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Congressman LEE METCALF, and I have spent a great amount of effort in behalf of the Indians in Montana and the Nation in attempting to see that they get a fair break. We shall continue to do so and will welcome any additional assistance on the part of the Department of the Interior and its agencies. The Indian was the first American and should be entitled to treatment and respect accordingly.

With best personal wishes, I am  
Sincerely yours.



[From the Browning (Mont.) Glacier Reporter of December 30, 1955]

# McKAY ANSWERS McKAY

BROWNING, MONT., December 30.

Open letter to:

Hon. DOUGLAS McKAY,

Secretary of the Interior,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McKAY: Being a politician like myself, you will realize the seriousness of the situation I find myself in appearing in local papers in this area. These papers are in the habit of printing your releases under big headlines, "McKay says, etc. \* \* \*" I have been asked to explain many of these articles by people who are under the impression that I am the McKay to whom the article refers. For the most part, I have been able to either laugh at some of the comments made or have simply dismissed them as a misunderstanding.

But now, due to an article which carried the headline "McKay Defends Indian Policies" (December 16 issue of Glacier Reporter), I find myself bombarded by members of our tribe with questions like "What in the \* \* \* do you see in Indian Bureau policies to defend?" or "What Indian Bureau policy do you know of that is doing us Injuns any good?" Well, my only defense to date has been "Me? Why I didn't even know the Indian Bureau had a concrete policy." Then they tell me that according to the newspaper, I have defended the policies of the Bureau. You can see the position that put me in. I had to read the article. (Most members of the Tribe only read the headlines of such articles.) Don't you know that after reading the article, I still don't know what the policies of the Indian Bureau are?

I certainly hope one of their policies isn't to withhold legal opinions regarding Indian affairs from the Indians concerned, all the while distributing copies to everyone in the country, as was done in the case of your letter of October 7, 1955, to a Mr. Ralph E. Becker, of Washington, D. C. For your information, this letter concerned the right of the Blackfeet Tribe to manage their own elections. Incidentally, who is this Mr. Becker? Is he a voting member of the tribe? Does he want a precinct established in Washington, D. C., so he can vote? We have some Beckers on our tribal rolls, but none named Ralph. It doesn't really matter. The thing that concerns me is that even common courtesy was disregarded when the Blackfeet Tribe was not furnished a copy of this letter about their internal affairs.

I note that when your solicitor ruled that the Blackfeet members would lose a right they have enjoyed in the past, a copy of the ruling was sent to the reservation in good time. I refer to the opinion of the solicitor which states that from now on members of the tribe will have no preference in the leasing of minerals belonging to the Blackfeet Tribe. I want to ask a question about that, too. Is this part of a new drive which will soon end in Indians even losing their right to a preference on grazing leases?

I ask this because I have been informed that Indians on the San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation recently lost their right to a preference in the issuing of labor contracts on their reservation. Is this one of the Indian Bureau policies I am mistakenly accused of defending—the policy of stripping the Indian of a preference to realize the full potentialities of their resources and enjoy the benefits themselves? It even goes further. If this is to continue to be the policy of the Indian Bureau, it will soon result in many Indians not being able to make a living on their own land.

So you see, I'm really on the spot. Like Ike, I'm up for reelection in 1956, and if something isn't done to correct this, I'm a dead duck. It won't do no good if you asked the copywriters to headline the articles "Secre-

tary McKay Says, etc.," as I sometimes act as secretary for the tribal council, of which I am a member, and members of our tribe might still be confused. You might ask them to headline the releases "Interior Department McKay Says. \* \* \*" Maybe that will do it. I'll do the same for you and if I ever write anything, I'll insist mine be headlined "Tribal Council McKay, etc."

To take some of the heat—and soon—though, I wish you would do the following for me: Tell me what the policies of the Indian Bureau are, specifically, and what is being done to enforce them. Please do not expound upon the virtues of love for mother, God, and country, or the great potentialities of the noble first American. Put it in good plain English that even a first American after his experience with a first reader can understand. Tell me what the policy is regarding keeping reservations as a land base for an impoverished people, what is being done to equip children and Indian youth for the problems of a complex civilization, what is the Indian Bureau policy regarding fee patents, what is your policy regarding welfare, the leasing of trust land, and so on. Then, maybe, I can do you a good turn and defend some of them, but right now and until I get some definite information I'll just have to go on playing the part of the injured party.

Sincerely,

ILIFF McKAY,  
Tribal Councilman.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. T. A. BUSEY,  
Publisher, the Glacier Reporter,  
Browning, Mont.

MY DEAR MR. BUSEY: There was recently brought to my attention an open letter to Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay from Mr. Iliff McKay appearing in the Glacier Reporter, on December 30, 1955. He said that as his name is also McKay, statements by the Secretary of the Interior sometimes are mistakenly attributed to him. Therefore he asked to be told in good plain English just what the policies are regarding a number of matters of concern to the Indians of this country.

As Indian affairs come under my general supervision in the Department of the Interior, as I am particularly interested in Montana, and as there should be no confusion of our names, I would like to respond to his public request.

First, "what is being done to equip children and Indian youth for the problems of a complex civilization": This administration takes special satisfaction in progress that has been made in education. We believe that one of the most important responsibilities we have to the Indians of this country is to see to it that they all have an opportunity for a first-rate education. I believe the Indians too understand the importance of education and are eager to have their children in school. With the cooperation and support of State and local school authorities we are encouraging the enrolment of Indian children in the public schools wherever this is possible in the belief that they should have the same kind of education as other American citizens. Also, there will be a better understanding between both the Indians and non-Indians if they attend schools together and are on an equal footing. Where local public schools are not available, the Indian Bureau itself runs boarding schools and day schools so that the Indian children may be better prepared to make a living and to be good citizens.

When this administration took office, half of the 27,000 Navaho children of school age were growing up without the opportunity of even an elementary education. That prob-

lem has been vigorously attacked in the past 2 years and for the first time in history all of the Navaho children presented for schooling are being accommodated. This was accomplished by a hard-hitting emergency-type program which involves substantial expansion of Indian Bureau school facilities on the reservation, enlarged enrollment at off-reservation boarding schools, increased use of mobile facilities such as trailers and quonset huts and the placement of Navaho students in the reservation border towns where board and room have been furnished by the Bureau.

For the benefit of those Indians who missed the advantages of school in their youth an adult education program has been started this year in five tribal areas where there is great interest in such a program—the Seminole, of Florida; Papago, of Arizona; Rosebud Sioux, of South Dakota; Turtle Mountain Chippewa, of North Dakota; and Fort Hall Shoshone-Bannock, of Idaho.

Second, "welfare policies": The Indians as citizens of this country and of their State and county are entitled to welfare assistance of various kinds under the social security laws and welfare laws of the States. It is our policy to work with the Indians and with the States and counties to see that this assistance is actually provided. There are, of course, many Indians who will not be eligible for the several types of welfare assistance for a number of reasons, even though they may be in great need. In order that these people will have somewhere to turn for help, the Indian Bureau obtains funds to prevent suffering by those Indians who are in real need of relief assistance and cannot obtain it from other sources. It is our policy to provide the same amount of assistance to the individual needy Indians as each State or county provides their non-Indian neighbors.

Third, "keeping reservations as a land base": A number of tribes such as the Blackfeet have considerable land resources which are of vital importance to them. Many other tribes are less fortunate. We in this Department are vigorously opposed to any congressional legislation or other proposed action that would sell off or liquidate the Indian lands against the wishes of their owners. Everything possible will be done to help the Indians to hold on to those lands which they need and want, and which are important to their economic welfare. More than that, we are not content to merely go on preserving the present land base. We are placing great emphasis on working with the tribal groups and with commerce and industry to promote the economic development of reservation areas and to provide employment. The lack of full opportunity for economic advancement has been one of the most basic and serious problems confronting Indian people.

Fourth, "leasing of trust land": Wherever it is practical the owners of trust land, either individuals or tribes, are encouraged to negotiate their own leases and to receive rental payments directly. Such leases, of course, have to be approved by the superintendent so that we may fulfill our obligation as trustee to assure that a fair price is being received. Where conditions are such that competitive bidding for leases is best, the superintendent arranges for the advertisement and competitive leasing. Of course, leases of the trust lands are made only with the approval of the Indian owners. Where tribal range land is being permitted, it is our policy to allow Indian owners with less than 250 head of cattle, or the equivalent of sheep, to have an allocation of range at the appraised price without competitive bidding if the tribal council wants this preference granted. A larger Indian cattle owner has to compete in the bidding to lease tribal land, but if a non-Indian offers to pay more to the tribe than he has, he may be given the privilege of meeting the higher bid, again with the approval of the tribe.

Fifth, "fee patents": We do not believe that a man who has demonstrated his competency and seeks control of his property should be denied that basic American right merely because he happens to be an Indian. Before a fee patent is issued, a thorough and conscientious examination of the applicant's background is made to be sure there is no real doubt about his competency to manage his own personal business affairs. If he plans to sell or lease the land the Indian Bureau will counsel with him in any way that seems necessary to protect his best interests. It also provides him with an up-to-date appraisal of his land. While we recognize the competent Indian's undeniable right to ask for and receive a fee patent, we also keep in mind our continuing trust responsibilities to the tribal group and to other Indian landowners whose holdings may be affected. If there is any real possibility that the disposal of a particular allotment might have a bad effect on other Indian land in trust, the Indian Bureau will take the initiative in consulting with the Indians concerned and will give them every possible assistance in working out a satisfactory solution to the problem. There are, of course, many Indians today who have no interest in agriculture or livestock operations and are eager to dispose of their allotted holdings and use the proceeds for some other purposes. In the past, land was retained in Indian ownership regardless of the ability, wishes or needs of the Indian owner himself. In many cases needy Indians live out their entire lives without realizing benefits from their allotted holdings.

Briefly and simply, these are our policies on the subjects Mr. McKay asked about. They are for the protection and help of the Indians of this country. I would like to add that this administration in many ways is making a very sincere and sympathetic effort to learn just what the Indian people have in their minds and in their hearts to work with them in doing the things which will give them the kind of life they want and that they want for their children.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,  
Assistant Secretary, Public Land  
Management.

#### MONEY EXPENDED BY SOME LABOR LEADERS IN BEHALF OF CANDIDATES FOR OFFICE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, David Lawrence in his typically intelligent approach to the problems of the day, has done the American people a great favor by the publication of his column Campaign Coin Has Two Sides in the newspapers of the Nation last Thursday, February 16.

In this article he points out the vast sums expended by some leaders of labor, in behalf of candidates for office. He does not imply, nor do I, by inserting this article that this money was intended to influence the voting of these men. I am hopeful that the coming investigation of pressures which are exerted on Members of Congress will entail a thorough examination of the monies spent by these few leaders of labor, as I am convinced that it will uncover the most active and influential source of pressure in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of February 16, 1956]

#### CAMPAIGN COIN HAS TWO SIDES—WHOLE SYSTEM OF POLITICAL DONATIONS CRITICIZED; \$50 LIMIT SUGGESTED

(By David Lawrence)

What's all the fuss about the unsuccessful attempt of an oil company attorney to contribute a mere \$2,500 to the campaign fund of Senator CASE, Republican of South Dakota? What's so novel about it?

For the records show that approximately \$2 million was actually contributed and spent by labor groups in the 1954 congressional campaign to reward Members of Congress who voted "right" and to punish those who voted "wrong" on legislative measures listed by labor unions. This list is published every campaign year as the acid test of whether certain candidates are endorsed or opposed by labor organizations having a pocketbook interest in the legislation.

The files in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives show that, in connection with the 1954 congressional campaign, AFL and CIO unions and independent labor organizations, through their own political committees, contributed these sums to the following successful candidates for Congress:

Senator DOUGLAS, Illinois.....	\$35,500
Senator MURRAY, Montana.....	32,450
Senator NEUBERGER, Oregon.....	23,250
Senator HUMPHREY, Minnesota.....	20,947
Senator McNAMARA, Michigan.....	19,000
Senator KEFAUVER, Tennessee.....	18,850
Senator O'MAHONEY, Wyoming.....	14,500
Senator BARKLEY, Kentucky.....	13,000
Senator SCOTT, North Carolina.....	11,000
Senator SPARKMAN, Alabama.....	10,250

Total..... 198,747

The above-mentioned Senators, like Senator CASE, are all men of integrity. Their names are given here only because the records show they received the largest total amounts from the labor union groups. Another \$91,050 was spent by the labor union committees in unsuccessful attempts to elect their senatorial candidates in California, Ohio, Massachusetts, Iowa, and New Jersey.

There was, of course, a huge sum spent to try to elect certain candidates in the House of Representatives. Generally speaking, the labor money went primarily to Democratic candidates. Much of the money was contributed in an effort to defeat candidates deemed unfriendly to labor. Thus, when Senator CASE was running 6 years ago, about \$5,000 was spent in trying to defeat him. There are rumors that about \$10,000 will be contributed this year for the same purpose.

The same files in the House show various persons of prominence—including officials of large corporations—who contributed out of their personal funds, as the law permits, to different candidates for Congress, mostly Republicans. One cannot tell from a reading of the records how these contributions tie into any votes on specific pieces of legislation, whereas labor unions, of course, boldly publish their list of measures and are known to be active in preventing the passage of particular laws affecting them or in securing the repeal of certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley labor-management law.

The whole system is wrong in principle. Even conceding that every Senator or Representative to whom campaign contributions are made by labor unions, for instance, will vote as his conscience dictates and will try not to be influenced in the least by the

amount of money spent to help elect or defeat him, the fact remains that large campaign contributions are subject to the query as to whether they do not exert some degree of influence on the legislators.

Thus, the CIO and AFL regularly maintain lobbying agents in Washington who frequently call on Members of Congress in person to endeavor to persuade them to vote for certain labor legislation or to oppose the bills in which labor leaders claim to have a deep interest. These same legislative agents do not themselves offer campaign contributions. But back home in the districts and States, the local union organizations—with their affiliated political leagues—arrange this and make widely known what the record of the Congressman or Senator has been on various rollcalls.

This box score is published and, if a Senator or Representative has not voted enough times for labor's list of measures, he is opposed, whereas, if his voting record has been preponderantly favorable, he is endorsed and funds are given to his campaign. It used to be that the national labor organizations did the blacklisting or endorsing or giving of money directly but now these are left largely to the local organizations.

To get rid of the present system, campaign contributions of \$50 or less would be the solution. It would, of course, be costly to canvass for small contributions. The acquisition expense would be very high. But in the long run the limitation of campaign contributions to a maximum of \$50 would make it impossible for any organization of a special-interest nature—like a labor union or an employer's association—to raise enough money to influence the votes of Members of Congress. Moneyraising, moreover, would have to be limited to political committees the members of which donated their services or were paid out of the campaign funds, and who could be by law prohibited from being on the payroll of any company, or labor union, or national organization which has an interest in pending legislation.

#### PRESSURES TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in the furor that has been raised over the revelation by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] of what he thought to be the improper use of money by people interested in the passage of the Harris-Fulbright bill, we have lost sight of a source of pressure which has existed for a long time and which grows stronger as Congress repeatedly refuses to face the issue. This is the lobbying and pressure of the unions. Their resources are unlimited, their spending in Washington is far above the amount one would expect to be spent by that group, and their means of bringing pressure are not limited to the Washington level.

Two weeks ago, in Miami, Fla., these people condemned to political death 11 Republican Senators whose most heinous crime is that of being Republican. The fact that these men have voted consistently with what is good for America, have devoted years of their lives to the service of their country, have been endorsed by a majority of their voters for this office is of no meaning to this small group of leaders who would, by virtue of their very power of money, attempt the destruction of the service of these Senators. If that is not pressure of the vilest type, then I do not understand the meaning of the



word. If that type of influence is not more harmful than any we have witnessed to date, then we Americans have lost our sense of values. Its worst aspect lies in the fact that these leaders purportedly speak for their entire membership, giving in effect the power of 16 million votes to their utterances. This is not so, but these few leaders ignore the political freedoms of their members by constantly telling the country what they will do, and not asking the membership what they would do. Then they proceed with their efforts with dues money, money collected by compulsory means from a man as a condition of employment—and spend it against the stated wishes of a minority of the group.

By their very evidence contained in a report of the executive council of the AFL, this group admits that their influence extends in a powerful way onto the very floor of the Senate itself. Allow me to read from that report a statement concerning a bill that came up in the 83d Congress. I am reading from the report of the executive council on S. 2650:

When debate began in the Senate on the bill, after Chairman SMITH had made his speech in behalf of it, Senator GOLDWATER presented his very objectionable amendment. This amendment turned all labor matters back to the States. This was most objectionable to practically all Democratic and Republican Senators from Northern States as there are some 17 States, mostly in the South, who have right-to-work, non-union-shop laws, and the amendment would have given further impetus to the migration of industry to these Southern States, and we were advised that if the Goldwater amendment was adopted that all southern Senators would be obliged to vote for the bill. We, therefore, permitted the debate to continue for a couple of days and then Senators IVES and LEHMAN presented fair labor practices amendments. This, of course, put the southerners on the spot because they were obliged to oppose this and it also did the same for the Republicans who, as a party, are supposed to favor the proposal. The A. F. of L. was opposed to a FEPC proposal being added to a labor bill.

We then made arrangements with Senator HILL to offer the motion to recommit before any amendments were voted on and as all factions were fearful and more or less confused, they voted to recommit the bill, 50 to 42.

Mr. President, I have quoted that statement to show that these labor leaders flagrantly and openly report in their publication that they can control the Senate of the United States.

I suggest that in any investigation which is conducted by the Senate all sources of pressure, including that of labor leaders, be considered.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point editorials published in the Fort Lauderdale Daily News and the Washington News.

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

[From the Fort Lauderdale Daily News of February 10, 1956]

**IF THIS IS JUSTICE DICTIONARIES NEED TO BE REWRITTEN**

Two events of the past week, touching on the same moral issue but involving far dif-

ferent reactions, are deserving of a little thought today.

One event, involving a \$2,500 campaign donation to Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, touched off quite a furor and now has become the subject of a special congressional investigation.

The other event, a decision by the leaders of the AFL-CIO to spend as much as \$1,500,000 this year to influence the course of the presidential and congressional elections this fall, has created nary a ripple of interest from the very same groups which look with so much horror on the \$2,500 donation to Senator CASE's campaign.

The \$2,500 contribution was made by a Nebraska lawyer, John M. Neff, who has never met Senator CASE personally. He has stated he made the gift in good faith because he felt the Senator's record was deserving of support and there was no strings of any kind connected to the gift.

But because Mr. Neff once was registered as a lobbyist for oil interests, and because at the time the gift was made public, the Senate was embroiled in a bitter battle over a bill to exempt natural gas producers from Federal controls, it was charged that the campaign contribution was little more than an outright attempt to influence Senator CASE's vote on this bill.

Whether this was the purpose or not it didn't work as Senator CASE rejected the contribution and instead of voting for the bill as he had originally been inclined to do he voted against it on the final rollcall.

But the gist of this whole business is not the contribution, itself, but the acceptance on the theory that it is all wrong for a private individual or a business corporation to openly give financial support to political candidates while it is perfectly all right for labor unions to do it.

Our laws set up a very strange distinction in this respect. Corporations, for instance, are expressly forbidden from making contributions to political campaigns on the theory that if they were so minded they could strongly influence political campaigns to their own end by liberally contributing to the campaigns of their chosen candidates.

But labor unions, which, in effect, aren't a whole lot different than corporations, are not banned from contributing to political campaigns. In the 1954 congressional campaigns the AFL and the CIO have openly bragged about spending approximately \$850,000 in an effort to secure the election of legislators friendly to their objectives. Now they have come forth with a program calling for the expenditure of almost twice as much this year in an effort to influence the upcoming presidential and congressional elections.

If it is morally and legally wrong for a businessman to spend corporation funds to help secure the election of a legislator whose attitude he admires and respects then isn't it equally wrong for a labor union to collect money from its members for the very same purpose?

How can conscientious legislators justify the calling of a special congressional investigation into the source and the purpose of a \$2,500 donation by an individual to 1 Senator's campaign while overlooking the fact that the AFL-CIO has just announced the raising of a \$1,500,000 war chest which will be used to help elect not 1, but hundreds of legislators sympathetic to organized labor's objectives?

How, in the name of heaven, can anybody with any sense at all argue that there is any difference between these two things? If one is wrong then the other is equally wrong, yet the individual who made the contribution is hailed before a congressional investigating committee to explain his actions and his motives while the AFL-CIO leaders sit back

in their fancy hotel suites at Miami Beach knowing full well Congress won't have the nerve to give their political activities and their political contributions the same searching once-over.

Truly, we are getting to be a strange Nation. Wrongdoing can't be given a simple definition anymore. It is shaded with distinctions depending upon who is the wrongdoer. And in the case of organized labor, acts that are wrong for everybody else to commit have been clothed with a cloak of immunity that legislators, beholden to the hand that feeds them, won't or don't dare to remove.

For the life of us we can't get very disturbed about this \$2,500 contribution to Senator CASE's campaign. That's peanuts compared to the \$1,500,000 organized labor boasts it is getting ready to toss into the coming campaigns, yet Congress gets all hot and bothered about the \$2,500 while ignoring the \$1,500,000. In other words it isn't what you do anymore that determines wrongdoing it's who you are and how you do it that counts with Congress, and if that is justice the dictionaries need to be rewritten.

J. W. GORE.

[From the Washington News of February 13, 1956]

#### CASH FOR POLITICS

It is common knowledge that the laws which presume to control the collection and spending of political campaign funds are freely and rampantly violated.

It is obvious the laws themselves are full of loopholes.

It is doubtful Congress, even doing its honest best, could write an airtight law on campaign contributions and expenditures.

The most effective restraint on abuses, then, is a vocal public opinion. And that opinion can be aroused only by an ample display of the facts.

The United States Senate now has a timely opportunity to pry the lid off these facts.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, of Missouri, is a candidate for reelection this year, so he is expected to withdraw from his post as chairman of the Senate Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, the watchdog of campaign and election ethics. His place probably will be taken by Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee.

And Senator GORE has ideas about an investigation of political spending which would provide the public with some highly illuminating information—if he is permitted to go ahead.

For instance, Senator GORE would probe the so-called interstate contributions—those which come from donors outside the State where the money is spent. He would include in this a review of contributions by labor unions as well as business outfits. In fact, the whole question of the use of union funds for political purposes ought to be aired.

This is a fertile field for senatorial inquiry. Such an inquiry, if impartially and diligently conducted, could make for a healthier climate in political spending. And this is the year to do it, when campaign funds promise to be more lush than ever.

[From the Washington News of February 14, 1956]

#### SURE, TAKE THE LID OFF

Senator GORE, of Tennessee, has taken over as chairman of the Senate Elections Subcommittee and is eager for a full-scale investigation of lobbying and campaign contributions.

Whether by his subcommittee, or some other, there ought to be a full-dress investigation. It should add to general interest

and public enlightenment in this election year.

But let there be no sacred cows in this investigation. Public attention has been focused on slush funds by Senator Case's revelation of an attempt made to contribute an unsolicited \$2,500 to his campaign.

But the representative of the president of the Superior Oil Co. is not the only man momentarily interested in the outcome of this election.

The gas lobbies should be investigated—both of them. The producers' lobby which favored the Harris-Fulbright bill, and the distributors' lobby, which opposed it.

Nor is that the only issue before the sitting Congress. The highway bill is coming up, and the truckers' lobby is ready to try to put the major burden of the cost on the rest of us, who will use the interstate and intercity highways only occasionally—and then inconveniently—if you get stuck behind some pavement-grinding diesel monster.

There are other lobbies. Let's investigate all of 'em—

The teachers' lobby, trying to get Federal funds for school aid.

This lobby carries no little black bag, nor even an envelope filled with \$100 bills. But it carries a currency more negotiable at the polls—ballots.

The union labor bosses' lobby, which at Miami Beach has just received the recommendation that the AFL-CIO amass a slush fund of \$3,750,000 for the elections, not counting money spent for "political education" of union members.

That's more money than any old-time political committee ever had.

Let's investigate everything.

If Senator GORE is running the show, then obviously the first thing to look into is the contributions of those who are getting electric power for less than it is worth in the Tennessee Valley. Let's move on from there.

#### "THE LAST BEST HOPE OF EARTH"— ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I had the honor of speaking at the annual Lincoln Day dinner held in the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, on February 13, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

##### THE LAST BEST HOPE OF EARTH

I feel very greatly honored again to be invited to speak here in Los Angeles on this occasion. Yesterday was the birthday of a noble American President, one of the great men of all the ages. It was he who saved our country from dissolution, and it was he who broke the literal chains which had enslaved a whole race of people.

Abraham Lincoln was a humble product of common American soil. His whole lifetime was full of difficulties and replete with sorrow. His sweet philosophy of life and his magnificent philosophy of free government both developed during a cruel period of American history. Both sedulously guided him into the political life of his day and, finally, through the faith of people, to the stewardship of a nation making signs of cracking up. Before he died in a little house across the street from Ford's Theater in Washington, the martyred President had preserved America for future generations, and had enunciated a new meaning of free government and freemen.

In the late 1860's, a biography of Lincoln was published. A friend of mine gave me a copy of it. I quote a few paragraphs of it:

"A little incident occurred during the campaign that illustrated Mr. Lincoln's readiness in turning a political point. He was making a speech at Charleston, Coles County, when a voice called out, 'Mr. Lincoln, is it true that you entered this State barefoot, driving a yoke of oxen?' Mr. Lincoln paused for a full half minute as if considering whether he should notice such cruel impertinence, and then said that he thought he could prove the fact by at least a dozen men in the crowd, any one of whom was more respectable than his questioner. But the question seemed to inspire him, and he went on to show what free institutions had done for himself, and to exhibit the evils of slavery to the white man wherever it existed, and asked if it was not natural that he should hate slavery, and agitate against it. 'Yes,' said he, 'we will speak for freedom and against slavery, as long as the Constitution of our country guarantees free speech, until everywhere on this wide land, the sun shall shine and the rain shall fall, and the wind shall blow upon no man who goes forth to unrequited toil.'

"From this time to the close of his life, he was almost entirely absorbed by political affairs. He still took charge of important cases in court, and practiced his profession at intervals. But he was regarded as a political man, and had many responsibilities thrown upon him by the new organization. During the summer succeeding the presidential canvass, and after Mr. Buchanan had taken his seat, Mr. Douglas was invited by the grand jury of the United States District Court for Southern Illinois, to deliver a speech at Springfield when the court was in session. In that speech, the Senator showed the progress he had made in his departure from the doctrines of the fathers, by announcing that the framers of the Declaration of Independence, when they asserted that 'all men are created equal,' only meant to say that 'British subjects on this continent were equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain.' Mr. Lincoln was invited by a large number of citizens to reply to this speech, and did so. After showing in his own quiet and ingenious way the absurdity of this assumption of Judge Douglas, telling his auditors that, as they were preparing to celebrate the Fourth of July, and would read the Declaration, he would like to have them read it in Judge Douglas' way, viz: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all British subjects who were on this continent 81 years ago, were created equal to all British subjects born and then residing in Great Britain.'—he said: 'And now I appeal to all—to Democrats are well as others: are you really willing that the Declaration shall thus be frittered away?—thus left no more, at most, than interesting memorial of the dead past?—thus shorn of its vitality and its practical value, and left without the germ, or even the suggestion, of the inalienable rights of man in it?' Then Mr. Lincoln added his opinion as to what the authors of the Declaration intended; and it has probably never been stated with a more catholic spirit, or in choicer terms:

"I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men equal—equal in certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This they said and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it upon them. In fact,

they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and, even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence—and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people, of all colors, everywhere."

Ladies and gentlemen, I venture to suggest to you that today, almost a century after Lincoln's time, we are giving new and vigorous augmentation to the principles of freedom as set forth in the Declaration of Independence. We are augmenting, in Lincoln's words, "the happiness and value of life to all peoples of all colors." Indeed, in my judgment, we have contributed more mass happiness to more Americans these last 3 years than has been accomplished in the lifetime of many here today. And, in the Lincoln tradition, we march forward under the leadership of a humble, dedicated and inspiring citizen, President Dwight Eisenhower.

"What President Eisenhower has done," said a great eastern newspaper which had not supported him in the 1952 election, "is not so much from a political motive but from deep-seated moral and spiritual convictions. Dwight Eisenhower is determined to be President of all the people."

"I am a Democrat," states a prominent Member of the House of Representatives. "I nonetheless believe that President Eisenhower is proving to be such a President, and all the peoples, Negroes and white, will be better, and America stronger, because of it."

Both as Americans and as Californians, we may be proud of the record of constructive achievement in Washington.

The 13½ million people who live in this great State of ours again and again have received complete and constructive cooperation from the Congress and the administration in solving the problems of this fast growing western territory. Since 1953, the President has signed into law over a half dozen bills authorizing the Federal Government to build dams and water works in various parts of California. Among them is the largest reclamation project in the whole history of this administration, the \$230 million Trinity Dam project in Weaverville.

The Federal air pollution law authorizes a long-range program of Federal scientific and technical assistance to State and local government in a concerted campaign to overcome a menace now spreading across the Nation, of which we here in southern California are acutely aware—"smog" as it is known here, "smaze" in New York.

For years, our Federal Government has been in the habit of renting office space, in some instances paying rent for the same quarters over half a century. That is not only a costly operation but the public has not been served, in its business with Uncle Sam, with the greatest efficiency. Now, under new lease-purchase legislation, those same rental moneys may be used as periodic payments in the purchase of new buildings specifically designed to serve our citizens better. The Federal Government will now buy buildings the way you and I buy our homes. Under this program, I look forward to a new Customs House in Los Angeles and to badly needed new public structures in various parts of our State. And the construction will be undertaken by private business. New jobs will be available as a result.

In the field of flood control—so important to all sections of our State—I believe that the administration and Congress will give more Federal assistance to California than



ever before. At any rate, that will be one of the goals toward which I shall work during the remainder of this Congress.

Devastating as this winter's rains and floods have been to many sections of our State, they would have wreaked far greater damage had it not been for the flood control projects already completed in partnership between Federal and local government.

By the way, we have rapidly acted to pass legislation authorizing low-interest, long-term loans to flood-disaster victims for repair or reconstruction of their flooded homes or flooded businesses. And with Presidential recommendation, the Congress is presently considering the question of flood disaster insurance legislation, to which I want to have added the similar problem of earthquake insurance.

In our country today, more Americans are gainfully employed than ever before in our history. The national economy approaches \$400 billion a year. This is essentially a time of industrial peace. Wage increases are real. Inflation has been halted and a dollar today buys about what it did in 1953 when this administration came into power. We have eliminated wage and price controls. We have given business and industry an incentive to modernize their plants, to purchase new equipment, to make capital outlays, all of which stimulate employment. Twice in 3 years the people of our country have received cuts in Federal taxes. We have reduced Federal Government spending by more than \$10 billion. This year's budget will be in balance. Social security has been extended to 10 million more Americans, and unemployment insurance now covers 4 million more of our people.

"The opening of this new year," said President Eisenhower in his state of the Union Message to Congress, "must arouse in us all grateful thanks to a kind Providence whose protection has been ever present and whose bounty has been manifold and abundant. The state of the Union today demonstrates what can be accomplished under God by a free people; by their vision, their understanding of national problems, their initiative, their self-reliance, their capacity for work, and by their willingness to sacrifice whenever sacrifice is needed."

The people of this Nation, regardless of party, demand clean, strong, and honest American Government. And that is the kind of American Government we have today in this land of ours. Progress has been made, much more remains to be done. But all in all, these last 3 years have been years of steady and continuing accomplishment for all the people of the United States.

Of paramount importance to all of us, however, are the cause of freedom and the cause of peace. Our Nation's basic goal remains the security of the people of America in a just and honorable peace.

We live in an era unique in human history. Our globe is divided between free nations of free people, and Communist states together with their satellites. Communism is unchanging and changeless. Its goal remains the same: World domination. Unhappily, both sides in this ideological and psychological cleavage possess the secrets of thermonuclear energy. Thus, each side has the power to obliterate mankind and destroy the earth.

Fear of retaliation is a powerful deterrent of any outright aggression. Indeed, it must be the reason or one of the reasons for the zig and the zag of Communist policy. Direct threats of violence are now substituted by economic infiltration, continuing subversion, division, duplicity, and deceit.

At Geneva, in July, the heads of the Soviet agreed that a nuclear war would be a frightful disaster which must not occur. Yet they refused thereafter to accept the President's "open sky" reciprocal inspection proposals.

And then, in September, Mr. Khrushchev commented at a Kremlin banquet that anyone who "mistakes our smile for a withdrawal from the policies of Marx and Lenin is making a mistake."

"Those who expect this will have to wait," he cynically suggested, "until Easter falls on a Tuesday."

Then, late in January, Mr. Bulganin wrote a letter to President Eisenhower. It was courteous and conciliatory. He suggested a United States-Soviet treaty of friendship and cooperation. He pointed to the need for ending a race of arms and of the need for peace.

Do you remember the tone and the words of Dwight Eisenhower's answer? Listen again to this part of our President's reply:

"The present state of international tension was not prevented by the words of the (United Nations) Charter. How can we hope that the present situation would be cured merely by repeating those words in bilateral form?"

"I wonder whether again going through a treaty-making procedure, and this time on a bilateral basis only, might indeed work against the cause of peace by creating the illusion that a stroke of a pen had achieved a result which in fact can be obtained only by a change of spirit."

Once again, Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States hewed to the line of principle. "Deeds, not words," continued to be the Eisenhower condition precedent to acceptance of Soviet good faith.

Our foreign policy has been forthright and courageous. Like every other human endeavor, errors have been, and will be made in the implementation of that policy. But this Government has been motivated by high principle and by a devotion to America's security in a just and honorable peace.

At home, our defense strength has increased. Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, puts it this way: "From the standpoint of security, the country has never been better off in peacetime." And in the last analysis, there is no one in this country more qualified to make defense decisions than the soldier-statesman who now occupies the White House.

In the face of potential Communist aggression, we shall continue to maintain an effective system of collective security—a system which constitutes both a warning that aggression will be met by joint action of free nations and the collective power of those nations to make the warning unmistakably effective. And we have witnessed growing strength in our collective security system. Western Germany belongs to NATO, despite the threats and imprecations of Moscow. In Southeast Asia, SEATO is developing.

None can deny that there are sorely troubled spots around the world. Soviet power in the Middle East, through Communist arms allotments to Egypt, presents the gravest kind of threat to peace in the world. And but for the clear provisions of the Formosa resolution, many of our military experts believe that war long since would have raged between Soviet China and Nationalist China.

I am one of those who does not see all good in our own party nor all bad in the other. There is some of each in both. I am one, also, who devoutly feels that our foreign policy must be free from politics. And the proudest recollection which I have of my 3 years in the Senate of the United States is that the Senate, in considering foreign policy, has been singularly free of partisan bias. I say with pride as an American, the Senate, on every single occasion since January 1953, has upheld the President in his foreign policy recommendations, and has done so overwhelmingly, and in a bipartisan fashion.

The Senate Democratic leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, has stated that he does not expect

foreign policy to be a partisan issue in the next election. I agree with him. Sure, we want full public debate on that vital subject. But the political differences which may logically and understandably divide some Democrats and some Republicans in this year's election should not and must not divide our country in the determination of what foreign policy is best for the perpetuation of freedom for all Americans and the attainment of a just peace for all the world.

President Lincoln told the country, in a message to the Congress in 1862, "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history." Neither can we in 1956. "The fiery trial through which we pass," he said, "will light us down in honor or in dishonor to the latest generation." So it is with America today. Indeed, Mr. Lincoln's words come crashing through the years: "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth." God grant us the wisdom and the courage and the vision to succeed.

#### AMERICAN CITIZENS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not more than 5 minutes during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last week there appeared in a national magazine a letter written by a purported Californian named Lincoln Yamamoto, which contemptuously and contemptibly libeled a great segment of patriotic and loyal Americans. On February 20, in the letter column of Newsweek magazine, there appeared the following:

#### THE MEANING OF TREASON

I think it was prejudice and miscarriage of justice that "Tokyo Rose," Iva D' Aquino (Newsweek, January 16), was convicted of treason. Was MacArthur guilty of treason for fighting for his country? Why then was Iva D' Aquino guilty of treason for doing her duty to hers? It's our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan, regardless of where we're born and our first allegiance is to Japan.

We niseis are proud of Iva D' Aquino and we're going to give her a heroine's welcome.  
LINCOLN YAMAMOTO.

PASADENA, CALIF.

A heroine's welcome for Iva D' Aquino, "Tokyo Rose," when she arrives in California? No, not by the loyal and patriotic American people of California, certainly not by the loyal and patriotic American citizen of California who happen to be of Japanese ancestry.

Mr. President, it was a scurrilous thing for whoever Lincoln Yamamoto really is, to say, as has been said in this letter:

It's our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan, regardless of where we're born and our first allegiance is to Japan.

Mr. President, that is not so. The splendid record of American citizens of Japanese ancestry in World War I, in World War II, in Korea, and at the present, demonstrates that the latter statement is a lie, and a shameful, false indictment of people who are proud to call themselves patriotic citizens of the United States.

I have here a telegram, Mr. President, which I received this morning, and

which I wish to read to the Senate. It is from Gardena, Calif., and is addressed to me. I read:

Lincoln Yamamoto's letter is an insult to the memories of our comrades who died proving their allegiance and loyalty to America. We, the living, are proud of our accomplishments, challenge the right of anyone to load us down with customs of which we know nothing and care less. We are Americans and proud of it. We owe no allegiance to Japan. If Tokio Rose receives a welcome of any kind in Pasadena it will only be by those who enjoy the freedom and economic liberty of America without accepting any of its responsibilities. We who have served and continue to serve refute any implications that we are anything but sound solid taxpaying Americans, and we love it.

Yo Kobata, Sonny Yonezawa, Kaz Minami, Fruik Kuida, Tom Gohata, Yo Minami, George Kobayashi, Kay Muramoto, Paul Kuida, George Kobata.

Mr. President, a few days ago I had an opportunity to talk with an American citizen whose name is Soichi Fukui, who is commander of Commodore Perry Post No. 525 of the American Legion, Department of California. He wrote me a letter, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

AMERICAN LEGION,  
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,  
COMMODORE PERRY POST, No. 525,  
Los Angeles Calif., February 16, 1956.  
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I am writing in reference to a letter to the editors of Newsweek in the February 20th issue signed by one Lincoln Yamamoto which is enclosed. In this letter Mr. Yamamoto asserts: "It is our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan, regardless of where we're born and our first allegiance is to Japan." I find it difficult to believe that Lincoln Yamamoto really exists. If he does, he has slandered thousands of second-generation Americans of Japanese ancestry, the Nisei, who have but one allegiance and that to our native country, the United States of America. I say this with the utmost confidence backed by the record set by Nisei veterans in World Wars I and II.

The famed 442d Combat Team won a total of 3,915 decorations among which was a Congressional Medal of Honor, and 2,022 Purple Hearts, a 1,000 percent casualty record to make it the most decorated unit of the United States Army in World War II.

In the Pacific area Nisei constituted a major factor in the success of military intelligence, thus hastening the defeat of their own ancestral country.

In the Korean conflict, Nisei responded wholeheartedly by entering into every branch of the service and another Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded to an American of Japanese ancestry.

Loyalty to the United States is not restricted to second-generation Japanese-Americans but is shared by first-generation immigrants who, long denied the privilege of becoming citizens of the United States by law, when given the opportunity through enactment of the Walter-McCarran Act, responded wholeheartedly and in the first 2 years in Los Angeles County alone, 2,400 became citizens of our country.

On record also in the fact that not one case of sabotage or espionage by a first- or

second-generation Japanese-American has ever been perpetrated against this, our native land.

Yours sincerely,

SOICHI FUKUI,  
Commander, Commodore Perry Post,  
No. 525, the American Legion, Department of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to quote from that letter, in part:

The famed 442d Combat Team won a total of 3,915 decorations among which was a Congressional Medal of Honor, and 2,022 Purple Hearts, a 1,000 percent casualty record to make it the most decorated unit of the United States Army in World War II.

In the Pacific area Nisei constituted a major factor in the success of military intelligence, thus hastening the defeat of their own ancestral country.

In the Korean conflict, Nisei responded wholeheartedly by entering into every branch of the service and another Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded to an American of Japanese ancestry.

Loyalty to the United States is not restricted to second-generation Japanese-Americans but is shared by first generation immigrants, who, long denied the privilege of becoming citizens of the United States by law, when given the opportunity through enactment of the Walter-McCarran Act, responded wholeheartedly and in the first 2 years in Los Angeles County alone, 2,400 became citizens of our country.

On record also is the fact that not one case of sabotage or espionage by a first or second generation Japanese-American has ever been perpetrated against this, our native land.

Mr. President, I am glad to have received a letter dated February 17, 1956, from George F. Moss, commander of the 17th District, Department of California, the American Legion, who denounces, for the veterans who reside in California, the spurious statement in the letter by Yamamoto, to which I have just alluded. I ask that the letter by Mr. Moss be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,  
DISTRICT 17,  
Los Angeles, February 17, 1956.  
The Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL,  
United States Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am shocked by reading a letter printed in Newsweek, February 20, 1956, signed by Lincoln Yamamoto, of Pasadena, Calif. The sentence in Mr. Yamamoto's letter is, "It's our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan, regardless of where we're born, and our first allegiance is to Japan."

As commander, 17th district, Department of California, the American Legion, I have read with interest and approval the letter to you from Soichi Fukui, commander, Commodore Perry Post, one of the component posts of the 17th district.

The record of loyalty and devotion of these, our brother veterans, is such as to render as utterly ridiculous such statements as appeared in Newsweek.

Nevertheless, nationwide, many people may read the letter, and not knowing the facts, will arrive at a most erroneous conclusion concerning the American Japanese.

Therefore, understanding that you intend to read on the Senate floor the Newsweek letter and Commander Fukui's answer, in the interest of justice and fair play, may I

commend you both as a United States Senator and as a fellow Legionnaire.

We in California are proud of Legionnaires of Japanese ancestry of both Wars I and II. You may use this letter in any manner you see fit.

Sincerely,

GEORGE F. MOSS,  
Commander, 17th District, Department of California, the American Legion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have also the text of an article entitled "Newsweek Rapped for Clouding Nisei Loyalty," printed in the Rafe Shimp of February 16, 1956. This is an English language newspaper published in Los Angeles by Americans of Japanese ancestry. The article contains some comments with respect to the letter printed in Newsweek, to which I have referred, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

#### NEWSWEEK RAPPED FOR CLOUDING NISEI LOYALTY

SAN FRANCISCO.—Masao Satow, JACL national director, today took a news magazine to task for its irresponsibility in publishing a letter to the editor written by an alleged Lincoln Yamamoto, of Pasadena, Calif.

The Yamamoto letter stated that it was the custom "to consider ourselves citizens of Japan regardless of where we are born and our first allegiance is to Japan. We Nisei are proud of Iva D'Aquino and we are going to give her a heroine's welcome," describing the treason conviction of Tokyo Rose as a miscarriage of justice since she was only doing her duty.

The text of JACL Director Satow's letter follows:

"In the February 20 issue of Newsweek a portion of a letter by Lincoln Yamamoto referring to Tokyo Rose was printed.

"Lincoln Yamamoto, if there is such a person, speaks only for himself in his irresponsible and fanatical outburst. The record of unswerving loyalty of Americans of Japanese ancestry, especially during World War II highlighted by our Nisei GI's who went 'for broke,' and the tremendous services rendered by thousands of our boys to this country with the United States military intelligence in the Pacific theater against the land of their ancestors completely refutes this individual who purportedly speaks for all of us.

"For more than a quarter of a century, our national organization of the Japanese American Citizens League, with its motto 'For Better Americans in a Greater America,' has operated upon the principle that we are Americans and that our first and only loyalty is to the United States of America. Not a single one of our members believes as does Yamamoto that 'it is our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan,' nor have they ever acted in such a manner.

"We feel that Newsweek does all of America a disservice in dignifying this Yamamoto letter. Apparently, you have no faith in the American way in which we have been brought up."

"MASAO SATOW,  
National Director, Japanese American Citizens League."

(According to southern California Regional Director Tats Kushida, who investigated today in Pasadena with Tom Ito, past JACL president, there is no known Lincoln Yamamoto in Pasadena to the knowledge of 7 Yamamoto families now 10-year-long resident leaders of the Japanese-American community, Kushida expressed the



opinion that the Yamamoto letter was a fraud and written by a crank or crackpot.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the glories of this country is that in its Government and in its people runs the blood of persons from almost every section of the entire globe. That is part of the strength of our devotion to freedom. I am of German extraction, but I also have within me Irish, English, and Swiss blood.

In the small town in California from which I come, I went to school with a boy named George Shigekawa. Today Shigekawa works for the United States Government. For a while, his competent and efficient daughter was a member of my staff in Washington. Now she attends Bryn Mawr College.

I think that a part of the great strength of the people of the United States is that we love liberty and love this country, regardless of what blood flows through our veins. I think it is reprehensible and contemptible for one to write the type of letter which was written by Yamamoto, who has defiled the name of Lincoln by using it as his own first name; to write for publication in a national magazine the kind of diabolical untruth which was published on February 20. I denounce Mr. Yamamoto's letter, as I know it will be denounced by the Senate and the American people, including the Americans who trace their ancestry to the country of Japan.

#### DISTRESSED CONDITIONS IN THE AREA OF CARBONDALE, PA.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made by the Hon. Frank P. Kelly, mayor of Carbondale, Pa., before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on February 10, 1956, in the course of a hearing held at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on the subject of unemployment.

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

FEBRUARY 10, 1956.

#### MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE.

HONORABLE SIRS: The people of northeastern Pennsylvania and those of the city of Carbondale, in particular, are most fortunate that this senatorial committee has seen fit to come here to obtain first-hand information about conditions in this acutely distressed area.

As mayor of the city of Carbondale I am thankful to be offered this opportunity of telling the story of an American community that is now in the throes of death.

To acquaint you honorable gentlemen with today's facts, permit me to go back over 140 years ago, and, in a brief manner, relate the Carbondale story.

Carbondale came into existence in 1812—36 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Resolute settlers, seeking the then free land, came into this northeastern Pennsylvania valley and built their humble log cabins along the banks of the tranquil Lackawanna.

These hardy souls little suspected that they had established their farms upon a great section of the world's finest anthracite

deposits—but they were not long in finding out. Less than 8 years later two engineers from Philadelphia made preliminary tests to uncover the coal. These engineers had heard other settlers tell the Indian legend about the mountains of black rock that could be sighted up where the Lackawanna began its leisurely course.

The engineers did not stay long. That autumn they went back to Philadelphia to form a mining company, aided by New York capital.

The following spring the first Carbondale coal was hauled by mule to Philadelphia and then sent by ship to New York. An exhibit of coal at the Battery in 1820 bore the legend "Removed from the ground at a junction called Ragged Island in Northeastern Pennsylvania." "Ragged Island" was the name given to Carbondale.

Shortly afterward, Philip Hone, New York financier and political leader, had the name on coal shipments changed to "Carbondale" upon the suggestion of his friend, author Washington Irving.

The name "Carbondale" has been with this great city, through prosperity and poverty, through joy and sadness, since that time.

Incorporated as a third class city in 1851, Carbondale was built around the mining industry. When anthracite prospered, as it did for 80 years, Carbondale prospered. The good people of the pioneer city never believed that the supply of coal would dwindle or that the market demand for it would drop by an amazing percentage.

Because of faith in anthracite, the people of Carbondale were lulled into becoming a one-industry community. The few plants that did come into the city were hard-pressed to match the wages being paid out to mineworkers and some of them left the scene abruptly. Others, though, stayed for some years.

Back in 1922, Carbondale began to feel the pressure of a restricted economy. In 1930 several independent mines closed. Within another year two mines of a major coal concern suspended operations.

But the worst was yet to come. In the next 6 years, the principal railroad serving Carbondale removed its car-repair yards employing 200 men; a silk throwing mill with 90 employees left Carbondale; a nationally known welding concern with 80 men left for central Pennsylvania to be near its main operation; a machine company with some 210 men was sold to a New Jersey concern; one of the community banks closed its doors.

Carbondale, as the year 1936 came to a close, believed that it had suffered enough. Efforts were made to obtain industries to replace those that had departed, but there still remained that faith in coal mining and the residents felt that the picture would brighten.

They were wrong. From 1936 to 1942 a steady decline was noted. Money from the young men serving in the Armed Forces helped ease the burden during the years 1942 to 1945 and the few local industries managed to secure some military contracts and the idle males went joyfully to work.

The year 1946 saw GI training schools mushrooming all over Carbondale. The war veterans went to shoe schools, automotive schools, plumbing schools, carpentry schools, welding schools, and machine shop schools. Even the mines seemed to enjoy a period of false prosperity from 1942 onward.

Then, all of a sudden, the dream ended. City leaders awakened to the fact that mine employment had taken another sharp drop. As the GI schools began to close the flow of money that once was a deluge became a trickle.

From 1949 to the present day has been a series of tragic happenings for the people of Carbondale. The community that boasted of being the first place where an

underground anthracite mine was opened in the United States could no longer look to the coal companies.

Caves tipped once proud dwellings and the people sought aid in vain. Huge draglines and shovels appeared on the scene and strip mining, because it was cheaper, came into existence. Piles of earth, some towering 30 to 60 feet, left in the wake of such surface mining now have changed the landscape into something resembling the dire battlefields of Europe. Efforts to speak out against such conditions have been without avail.

The principal railroad serving Carbondale changed from steam to diesel in 1952 and the huge roundhouse, once employing 290 men, is now idle. A plant that started in the former machine company location went bankrupt. Passenger train service between Carbondale and Scranton was suspended. The list of railroad workers was cut by some 670 men during the past 10 years.

What has happened to all these workers, you may ask? Some of them have found meager employment in Carbondale, a few have found substantial jobs—but most of them are now working in New Jersey, District of Columbia, Maryland, Ohio, and New York. Others are scattered across the Nation.

In 1945 the needle industry came into Carbondale and this valley. Evidently they had heard of conditions and realized that there would be many women looking for work. This industry, which employees only a very few men, is now the chief source of work in Carbondale. This is a far cry from 30, 40, or 50 years ago when all men had profitable jobs and women worked only in stores.

The entire attitude of Carbondale is one of discouragement. For the past 12 years the city has been besieged by a mine fire, the scope of which forms a subterranean furnace beneath one-quarter of our community. The Federal Bureau of Mines has expended some \$200,000 in a futile effort to conquer this fire and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has voted a \$1 million appropriation for the task when funds are available.

In the meantime, those who reside in the mine fire area must set their alarm clocks by the hour so that the family may arise for mutual safety. Toxic gases from the fire have already claimed 2 lives and more than 20 other persons have escaped death by narrow margins.

Last January 1955, a fire costing over \$425,000 swept a section of Central City in Carbondale. This was followed on February 4, 1955, by one of the Nation's biggest fires—one which gutted about one-quarter of the business district with damages running to \$3,200,000. The city is still struggling to recover from this blow.

Latest unemployment figures for Lackawanna County show that approximately 12.3 percent are unemployed. A checkup with Carbondale office, Pennsylvania State bureau of employment security, indicates Carbondale's unemployment averages about 13.4 percent. If you include idled railroad workers, who are now receiving benefits through the Railroad Retirement Act, this would bring the unemployment average for the city of Carbondale to 15.2 percent.

Back in 1920, the population of Carbondale was 18,640. In 1930 it was 20,061. In 1940 it was 19,335. But in 1950 it had declined to 16,235. Today it is safe to assume that Carbondale's population has dropped to 13,000.

Carbondale, gentlemen, is a proud city. It is a patriotic city. During World War II over 2,000 of its sons and daughters served in the Armed Forces and the monument in Memorial Park contains the names of 92 war dead.

It is a city that is fighting to stay alive. The Carbondale Chamber of Commerce and

Carbondale-Lackawanna Industrial Development Co., along with other organizations, are doing all they can to save the community. I have appointed a five-man city planning commission, designed to work with the Federal Government in an effort to map out a program for the future.

We don't want to see Carbondale, a typical god-fearing American city, die. The city and its people deserve a better fate.

That is why, gentlemen, I have come before you today to appeal to you for aid. I would welcome a visit from this committee to our city so that they could see conditions for themselves \* \* \* so that they could talk with our people \* \* \* so that they could learn what it means to live in a great country but still live in a city that has no apparent future.

We love Carbondale very dearly. That is why we are still fighting to save all that she represents to us—a great city with great people.

I extend to you my heart-felt thanks for this opportunity of appearing before you. I have stated the case of Carbondale as briefly as possible. I trust that you will give our city every possible attention in your recommendations. All that you do for Carbondale will be remembered for generations in the prayers of a grateful populace.

FRANK P. KELLY,  
Mayor of Carbondale.

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

#### INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS CONNECTED WITH THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate Concurrent Resolution 65 will be the unfinished business at 2 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Since it is not yet 2 o'clock, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before I suggested the absence of a quorum, I had not seen on the floor my friend the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I understand he desires to address the Senate for approximately 20 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 65 is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I think the consideration of the concurrent resolution will take only a few minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think it will take more than a few minutes. I was advised there would be a speech on the subject.

Mr. GREEN. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I am correctly informed, and if the Senator from Oregon desires to proceed with his address, I should like to accommodate the Senator. I wish to inform the Senate that at the conclusion of the speech by the junior Senator from Oregon I shall suggest the absence of a quorum before having the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

#### FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS TO RELIEVE OFFICEHOLDERS OF PRIVATE OBLIGATIONS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, whenever a citizen must abandon hopes of seeking public office because he does not have a sufficient campaign treasury democracy has failed.

Whenever a citizen is defeated for public office because the opposing candidate had overwhelming superiority in campaign funds democracy has failed.

The idealists who founded this Nation fought a war of revolution against the inherited political power wielded by distant kings. Shall we, their heirs, permit political power in our own day to be dependent upon and wielded through the simple, crass expenditure of money?

This crucial question—indeed, the No. 1 problem of our political processes—has been brought home to the Nation vividly in recent weeks because of the controversy over the \$2,500 contribution offered to one Member of the Senate by a representative of an oil company interested in passage of the gas bill.

All at once many millions of Americans have become aware of the fact that their representatives in Government frequently enter high office obligated for vast sums in campaign contributions.

#### RADIO AND TV HAVE MADE CAMPAIGNS BIG BUSINESS

These contributions, in my opinion, have become an unbearable yoke to many of the men who must accept them. They even have become onerous and objectionable to the individuals who parcel out such contributions. Yet everyone has been caught in the ensnaring web of campaign financing. It takes tens of millions of dollars to elect a President, and perhaps a million dollars to elect a Senator in a populous State. Indeed, U. S. News & World Report for February 17, 1956, lists \$200,000 as the average senatorial campaign fund in even a typical State. Think of what it is in New York, Pennsylvania, or California.

These expenditures have become necessary because of the tremendous cost of reaching people through modern media of communication, particularly through radio and television. It has been a long time since a presidential or senatorial campaign could be conducted wholly by traveling from town to town and crossroad to crossroad, speaking directly to large or small groups of voters. If the debate of the issues between the parties in an election, which is the essence of the democratic choice, is to be brought to the people, it must be through these and all other modern media.

But while greatly increased expenditures for political campaigns have become necessary, the accompanying dependence of candidates and their supporters on large campaign contributions to raise these necessary funds has become a great evil. I am convinced that neither candidates nor contributors want this frenzied scramble for campaign financing to continue. I am therefore introducing today the most far-reaching bill ever proposed to strike loose the financial fetters from our democratic processes of government.

In essence, my bill would call for substituting Federal funds for large private campaign contributions in elections for Federal offices—that is, President and Vice President, Senators, Representatives, and Delegates to Congress. I am not the originator of this proposal. It originated nearly half a century ago. Its author was the 26th President of the United States, who even at that relatively early date foresaw the danger of financial domination of our electoral processes.

#### THEODORE ROOSEVELT ASKED CONGRESS TO ENACT THIS PROPOSAL IN 1907

Theodore Roosevelt saw that limits on campaign contributions, and complete disclosure of contributions and expenditures, were necessary—but also that they were not enough. So this is what President Roosevelt proposed in a message to the 60th Congress at the opening of its 1st session, on December 3, 1907:

Under our form of government voting is not merely a right but a duty, and, moreover, a fundamental and necessary duty if a man is to be a good citizen. It is well to provide that corporations shall not contribute to presidential or national campaigns, and furthermore to provide for the publication of both contributions and expenditures. There is, however, always danger in laws of this kind, which from their very nature are difficult of enforcement; the danger being lest they be obeyed only by the honest, and disobeyed by the unscrupulous, so as to act only as a penalty upon honest men. Moreover, no such law would hamper an unscrupulous man of unlimited means from buying his own way into office. There is a very radical measure which would, I believe, work a substantial improvement in our system of conducting a campaign, although I am well aware that it will take some time for people so to familiarize themselves with such a proposal as to be willing to consider its adoption. The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish if Congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties, an appropriation ample enough to meet the necessity for thorough organization and machinery, which



requires a large expenditure of money. Then the stipulation should be made that no party receiving campaign funds from the Treasury should accept more than a fixed amount from any individual subscriber or donor; and the necessary publicity for receipts and expenditures could without difficulty be provided.

Mr. President, Theodore Roosevelt looked ahead of his time. He lived in a period when a whole presidential campaign might be conducted for half a million dollars. He could know nothing, then, of TV network programs which would use up \$100,000 in about half an hour. But he realized that it was becoming more costly all the time to reach the eyes and ears of the people. If this access to the voters ever could be controlled and dominated by big money, what would happen to democracy? Should a dollar sign be imprinted on the ballot box?

Ever since I became a Member of the Senate, I have worked on legislation to enact into law President Roosevelt's proposal. I have hurried its completion because of the significant events disclosed to the Senate during debate of the bill removing Federal controls from natural gas prices.

TIME HAS COME TO ENACT "TEDDY ROOSEVELT BILL"

Sometimes I call my bill the Teddy Roosevelt bill, because of its origin. The more I have studied it, the more I have become convinced that it is the most effective step we could take to free our candidates for Federal elective office from the shackles of great private campaign funds. The hour has come—nay, it is long since past—to put President Theodore Roosevelt's recommendation into the form of law. That is why I am today introducing my bill on behalf of myself, my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until the end of the week, in order to permit any other Senators who may wish to do so to join in sponsoring it.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at this time I introduce the bill, request its appropriate reference; and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3242) to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on

Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

#### FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SECTION 1. Congress finds that it is in the national interest to prevent the dominance of large political campaign contributions in elections for Federal office.

Free and untrammelled representation of the public is possible only when men and women in high office are not indebted to special interests for financial donations.

Disproportionate inequality among parties and candidates, with respect to campaign financing, is a peril to democracy—particularly during an era when access to the most compelling media of public information is increasingly decisive and costly.

Government financing of the major political parties, as recommended in 1907 by the then President of the United States, offers the most practical and effective remedy for preventing private persons and groups with great wealth from influencing unduly the decisions of the ballot box.

#### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(1) The term "major political party" means any political party whose candidate for the presidency in the election next preceding polled at least 10 per centum of the total popular vote, or whose candidates for Senator, Representative or Delegate to Congress polled at least 10 per centum of the total popular vote for all of those offices in such election.

(2) Terms defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, shall, unless the context otherwise indicates, have the meaning assigned to them in that act.

#### FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Board to be known as the Federal Campaign Contributions Board (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Board") to be composed of one member of each major political party, appointed from private life by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members of the Board shall each receive compensation at a rate not in excess of \$50.00 per diem when engaged in the business of the Board, and while away from their homes or regular places of business shall be allowed transportation and not to exceed \$15.00 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

(b) The Board shall without regard to the civil service laws appoint an Administrator, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board and shall have such functions as are herein prescribed in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of \$15,000 per annum. The Board shall provide for the appointment by the Administrator, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 as amended, and for the compensation of such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

#### PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized to make payments to the national committee of each major political party in the manner and subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth.

#### AMOUNT AND CONDITIONS OF PAYMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Payments authorized by this act shall be made to the national committee of each major political party in a total amount for each such committee in any 2-year period, beginning April 1 following a national election;

(1) if during that 2-year period presidential electors are to be elected, not to exceed the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the average total number of voters

casting votes for candidates for the offices of presidential elector and Delegates to Congress in the last two elections for those offices; and

(2) if during that 2-year period presidential electors are not to be elected, not to exceed the amount obtained by multiplying 15 cents by the average total number of votes cast for all candidates for Representative and Delegate, in the last two nonpresidential national elections.

(b) Such payments are authorized for the purpose of enabling major political parties to make legitimate campaign expenditures, and shall be made from time to time upon application therefor accompanied by a certification of the chairman and treasurer of the national committee that they will be used to discharge lawful obligations incurred for past or future expenditures during the 2-year period in which application is made, in support of the candidacy of such party's nominees for Federal elective office. Payments shall not be made in the case of any candidate on account of obligations incurred prior to the date the candidate has been nominated.

(c) The nature and extent of such obligations shall be stated in such detail as regulations under this act may prescribe.

(d) Not more than two-thirds of the amount authorized to be allocated to any national committee during any 2-year period shall be paid prior to the national election which occurs during that 2-year period. The balance shall be payable upon completion and review of all reports required by law or regulation on all expenditures made on behalf of all candidates of that political party in connection with that election.

#### LIMITATION ON FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION

SEC. 6. (a) To receive any payment authorized under this act, the chairman and the treasurer of a national committee shall certify that no individual has contributed more than a total of \$100 to the campaign of one or more candidates for Federal office of that major political party.

(b) If the total expenditures in any 2-year period from contributions from private sources for all candidates for Federal office of a major political party, as shown by reports required by law or regulation, exceed the amount authorized by this act to be paid to the national committee of that political party during such 2-year period, payments to that national committee under this act shall be reduced by the amount of the excess.

#### PENALTIES

SEC. 7. (a) No committee shall apply for or use any part of the payments authorized under this act except on the conditions and for the purpose authorized hereby.

(b) Any violation of this section by any committee shall be deemed also to be a violation by the chairman and the treasurer of such committee and by any other person responsible for such violation and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and, if the violation was willful, by a fine of not more than \$20,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

#### REGULATIONS

SEC. 8. The Administrator is authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

#### APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, let me explain just what my bill proposes to do.

In a nutshell, it would make available Federal campaign funds, in very adequate measure, to the major political

parties, in lieu of large private contributions. Federal funds would be made available for legitimate campaign expenses on two conditions: First, that the party and its candidates for Federal office accept no more than \$100 from any one private contributor; and, second, that not more than an amount equal to the authorized Federal contribution be spent from private sources on behalf of the party and its Federal candidates.

This is how the Federal contribution would be administered: An impartial, nonpartisan Administrator would be selected by a board having one member from each major political party. The Administrator would be authorized to make payments from time to time, upon application by the chairman and treasurer of the national committee of a party, for legitimate past or future campaign expenditures certified by those party officers. The total authorized Federal contribution for each party during any 2-year period would be determined by this formula: If a presidential election were to be held during the 2-year period, each party would be equally entitled to 20 cents per vote to the extent of the average of the total votes cast in the past 2 presidential elections. In the intervening 2-year periods, when nonpresidential Federal elections are held, the sum would be 15 cents per vote for the average of the total votes cast for Representative and Delegate to Congress in the past 2 nonpresidential elections.

To qualify for the Federal contribution as a major political party, a party's candidates would have to have received 10 percent of the total popular vote in the last preceding national election. Allowance would be made for the Terri-

tories of Alaska and Hawaii, which do not vote for President or Senators or Representatives, by including votes for Delegates to Congress in all calculations.

#### THIRD PARTIES MIGHT HAVE QUALIFIED ONLY TWICE IN THIS CENTURY

I believe, Mr. President, that the 10-percent rule would adequately provide for equal financial rights for any future third party which might arise, once the program or the candidates of such a party have earned the attention and the support of a substantial segment of the American people. In our modern history, two parties have won such support. In 1912, the "Bull Moose" Progressive Republican ticket, headed by Theodore Roosevelt, won 27.4 percent of the popular vote. In 1924, the Progressive Party of Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., obtained 16.6 percent. In this century, these two and no other third parties would have qualified for Federal contributions in their next subsequent election campaign, under the formula of my bill. Except for these, the high point for third parties was reached by the Socialist Party in 1920, with 3.4 percent. In 1948, the Progressive and States Rights tickets each received only 2.4 percent of the popular vote.

Mr. President, how would my bill have applied in practice to financing the 1952 election, and how would it apply in 1956? I have prepared a chart which demonstrates the operation of the formula and its theoretical application to the elections of 1952, 1954, 1956, and 1958. I ask unanimous consent to have the chart printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

*Proposed Federal contributions to elections of national candidates*

Year	Total vote for President and for Delegates to Congress (Alaska, Hawaii)	Total vote for Representatives and Delegates to Congress	Average total vote of 2 preceding similar elections	Federal contribution per vote	Total Federal contribution to each major political party
1944	48,088,772				
1946		34,509,682			
1948	48,956,634				
1950		40,560,165			
1952	61,703,224		48,522,703	\$0.20	\$9,704,540.60
1954		42,745,018	37,534,923.5	.15	5,630,238.53
1956			55,329,929	.20	11,065,985.80
1958			41,652,591.5	.15	6,247,888.73

Mr. NEUBERGER. Thus, Mr. President, in 1951-52, for instance, each major party would have been entitled to \$9,704,540.60 in Federal campaign contributions, provided it and its candidates did not spend more than an equal amount from private contributions, none of which could exceed \$100. In other words, about \$18½ million would have been available for campaigns on behalf of the candidates for Federal office of each of the two major parties in that election.

In 1953-54, when there was no presidential election, the Federal allocation to each party would have been \$5,630,238.53, permitting total expenditures of over \$11 million on behalf of all its candidates for Federal elective offices across the Nation.

Mr. President, I have explained that the main purpose of my bill is to bring about the substitution of Federal funds—with no political strings attached—for the present evil of large private campaign contributions. The mere fact that several million dollars would be made available equally to each major party, which it would not have to go out and raise from wealthy contributors, would go far toward giving access to the media of public opinion to both candidates representing major opposing viewpoints on public issues.

#### PLAN WOULD ENCOURAGE VOLUNTARY REDUCTION OF TOTAL CAMPAIGN SPENDING

But in addition to helping both sides to get their political message to the public, my bill would have a salutary effect toward reducing the overall size of total campaign expenditures in a national

election, which now threaten to reach stratospheric proportions. Even with equal Federal contributions to both sides, democracy is still in danger if one side can finance, from private wealth, a saturation bombardment of public attention with uncounted billboards, radio talkathons, television spectacles, newspaper and magazine advertising, skywriting, and whatever else the imagination of professional publicity and advertising men with plenty of money can offer. Thus, in legislation based on Teddy Roosevelt's plan, I would also make the Federal contribution contingent on a limitation of total spending from private contributions, as well as of the maximum contribution of any one person.

Under my bill, if there were privately collected and spent on behalf of all Federal candidates of a political party a sum more than equal to the amount of the authorized Federal contribution, the Federal contribution to that party would be reduced by the amount of the excess. In 1956, for example, each of our present two major political parties would be entitled to \$11,065,985.80 under the formula of the bill. There might be spent on behalf of its candidates for Federal office another \$11,065,985.80 from small private contributions. Thus the total for each party might be in excess of \$22 million.

Let us assume, however, that the reported expenditures on behalf of the candidates of one party proved to be more than that—say \$14 million from private sources. Then a corresponding portion of the Federal contribution would be withheld, and only about \$8 million in Federal funds turned over to that party.

#### FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS SCHEME DOVETAILS WITH CORRUPT PRACTICES BILL

Mr. President, there is before the Senate at this time S. 636, a well-considered and comprehensive bill, sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri and former chairman of the elections subcommittee [Mr. HENNING] and reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration by the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], which would modernize the Federal elections and corrupt practices laws. My bill is entirely consistent with that proposed legislation. It is not only consistent with it, but it depends for its administration on adoption of compulsory reporting provisions such as those provided in that bill. In my bill, I have not gone over the ground covered by S. 636; I have assumed the enactment of at least its rules on reporting of campaign expenditures. My bill would not affect the legality or illegality of campaign contributions or expenditures by any person. Legal controls over these are necessary and desirable, and I am in favor of strengthening them. But so long as money continues to be essential for presenting political candidates and programs to the public, so long will efforts at enforcing limits on campaign spending by legal penalties, without anything more, be ineffective. The Teddy Roosevelt bill is needed, too.



Mr. President, I believe that the carrot of Federal campaign contributions, accompanied by the stick of losing these funds if the limits of my bill were exceeded, would furnish the extra incentives needed to keep election expenditures within reasonable bounds. If one party could raise so much money from private wealth that it would feel deprived and restricted under the Federal formula, my bill would not prohibit this party from doing so and giving up its Federal funds. I doubt that my own party would find itself in that position.

**CAMPAIGN SUPPORT FROM MILLIONS OF SMALL CONTRIBUTIONS STRENGTHENS DEMOCRACY**

But if, under the proposed bill, the candidates were to give up all contributions of more than \$100 from one person—and they would feel better and more free by reason of doing so—the candidates of our major national parties would have no difficulty in raising matching funds from private sources to equal the Federal funds authorized for their party under the formula of my bill. Millions of men and women in the United States would gladly make modest contributions to the candidates or the party of their choice to raise the matching funds. Participation in campaign financing on this level would actually strengthen our democracy, rather than weaken it, as does our present dangerous dependence on large private donations for campaign chests.

Plans for mobilizing such small, individual contributions from millions of individual citizens have been developed by Mr. Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and by the Advertising Council of America. For 1956, these plans have unfortunately had to be abandoned because of the inability of the Republican Party to find party leaders prepared to participate in organizing such a program which would, perhaps, have meant relatively little to Republican campaign financing anyway. But, Mr. President, a Gallup poll taken only last month showed that 15 million American families would be prepared to give \$5 each to the campaigns of candidates of their political party. Even though this full amount could perhaps not effectively be collected, the total would easily be enough to match the Federal allowance for Federal candidates, and finance State races all over the Nation, too. I shall ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this report by Dr. George Gallup, as it appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on January 11, 1956, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

**CAMPAIGN FINANCING IS CRUCIAL MORAL PROBLEM OF MODERN DEMOCRACY**

Mr. President, I believe that the financing of our election campaigns stands alone as the dominant ethical question confronting our democratic political system. A campaign to elect a President of the United States, a Senator or a Representative in Congress, is of necessity a very expensive thing. It is a terrible comparison that such a campaign—the heart of our process of self-government—should have to be bought and paid for much like a campaign to

sell soap, or to promote a new movie star. Yet, under present conditions, this unfortunate comparison is, tragically, inescapable. Yet I am convinced that before the end of this century, the next generation of Americans will consider this an unbelievable anachronism of our era.

Mr. President, 96 years ago, Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States with a campaign fund of \$100,000. Today this sum would barely pay for one network speech over television. Treasure chests to elect one United States Senator in one of our more populous industrial States run to many hundreds of thousands of dollars. Even in my own State of Oregon, which has little more than 1 percent of our national population, more money was spent on the last congressional election than in the national election which in a time of great crisis sent Abraham Lincoln to the White House.

As a Member of the Senate who was elected after a hard campaign in a State where a member of my party had not been successful for 40 years, I think I can speak with experience about the whole matter of campaign funds. It was hard, and not always pleasant, for my supporters and me to try to raise the sums which were spent in my campaign. Inevitably, the opposition could throw against us substantially larger amounts than we were able to raise.

After the election, I reported expenditures by campaign committees on my behalf of a little more than \$103,000. My opponent's committees reported total expenditures of \$142,000, or almost 40 percent more. I made my report to the Secretary of the State of Oregon. It is, incidentally a telling commentary on the present Federal reporting laws that the participants in many close, hard-fought campaigns in States many times as populous as Oregon reported campaign expenditures only a fraction of those of former Senator Guy Cordon and myself in 1954. I felt that, although it would be legal not to report expenditures of different committees on my behalf, the spirit of these reporting laws would be better observed if I made a full report on these expenditures.

As reported to the secretary of state of Oregon, under Oregon's State laws, all the various Democratic Party committees in the State, including that enlisted in my behalf, spent a total of \$154,938. All the various Republican Party committees in the State, including that of my opponent, reported a total of \$271,431. Thus the groups supporting my opponent spent approximately 75 percent more than was spent to elect me.

As I mentioned before, the magazine U. S. News & World Report estimates the average total cost of being elected to the United States Senate to be at least \$200,000. This means that the sums spent in behalf of my opponent were about average; those spent supporting my election were somewhat less than average. Although I was considerably outspent by my Republican opponent, I nevertheless had the largest campaign fund of any Democrat in Oregon in many

years. Regrettably, I must admit that probably I would not have had a chance to win unless this had been the case. In a democracy, is this a happy condition of affairs?

**WILL THOSE WHO ATTACK LABOR'S CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS SUPPORT THIS BILL?**

Much has been said in recent weeks about spending in elections by means of the political-education funds of various trade unions. It is estimated that these funds contributed by working people added about \$23,000 to the committees supporting my election effort. This is a substantial sum. Yet the owners of big business and large industry spent far more in behalf of my Republican opponent.

I am sure that mine is not at all an unusual example. I am sure that nearly every candidate for Federal office who has received a substantial share of campaign financing from labor sources has been faced by an opponent whose campaign was backed by far superior financial resources. I suggest today, Mr. President, to those who have been pointing with the most horrified alarm at campaign funds raised by union groups that they join me in backing the Teddy Roosevelt bill, which would substitute equal Federal campaign contributions for huge, unequal funds raised by large donations from private contributors. I wonder who will be first to back this effective and long overdue reform—those whose election campaigns have been helped by the working men and women of America, or those who are loudly denouncing the political efforts of labor while holding high Federal office with the far greater campaign support of wealthy individuals and economic groups?

Mr. President, in a free country in which any citizen may be a candidate for public office, we cannot expect equality of character, integrity, and ideas as between candidates. Furthermore, these are subjective qualities not capable of tangible measurement. They, and the policies a candidate represents, are proper subjects for the decision of the electorate. But disproportion in campaign finances is something else again. An undemocratic element is introduced when one nominee can eclipse his opponent not because of any superiority of ability or of his policies, but merely through a preponderance of coin of the realm.

Yet this probably happens more often than we care to think. The kind of funds spent on our modern elections—even on the election, in a crucial district, of only 1 of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives—are of such dimensions that they simply are not available equally to all candidates. The substantial financial backing which may determine the odds in a race for Congress is likely to go preponderantly to one candidate.

**WHY ARE CAMPAIGN FUNDS UNEQUAL?**

What determines, under our present system, which candidate will have this advantage and which will be handicapped in his effort to present his program to the voters for their choice?

Who makes the many multi-thousand-dollar contributions which are necessary to create great financial preponderance for the campaign of a candidate for Federal office? And why?

More money is spent to elect many Members of both Houses of Congress than the Government pays them during their term of office. We would not dream of permitting our Presidents or our Senators and Representatives to draw their pay from a private payroll or in the form of private contributions; they get paid by the public for whom they act. Why, then, leave their campaigns for these offices to be lavishly financed from private sources?

The proverb, "He who pays the piper shall call the tune," may have originated in medieval England, but politically it has more relevance in this country today than in Britain, where campaign spending is firmly controlled. My speech today is not concerned with the merits of policies, to support or oppose which contributions are made to either side in our two-party system. It is concerned with conditions which create doubt—reasonable doubt—among the American people as to how these policies are judged and determined. Our political parties may and do disagree on policy; but in a free democracy no responsible party can keep one eye on the cashbox when drawing up its platform for America.

Yet if the choice before the country on election day is to be effectively presented to the people, the cashboxes of the parties must be filled somehow. In an editorial on February 17, 1956, the New York Times stated its estimates that in the 1952 election \$80 million may have been spent, as against perhaps \$50 million in 1948. With many more television stations and receivers, total expenditures this year may run far above \$100 million. Such expenditures, resulting from the present unrestricted competition between the parties and their candidates, are far greater than what would be necessary if a reasonable equality of access to the public could be assured. Do the American people want their political parties and their candidates for the power of governing them indebted to anyone for totals exceeding \$100 million? The question, once it is recognized, answers itself.

Although I have been critical of the spending of huge sums to win elections, I wish to make it abundantly clear that I believe the vast majority of men and women in political life are basically honest. These people, at heart, do not desire to enter into the mad spending spree which accompanies so many elections. I am convinced they would prefer to enter office without obligations to any individual or interest group for large donations. But the men and women in public life are caught by a system that has made colossal treasuries virtually indispensable to political success. It is the system which must be changed, Mr. President, not the individuals. The independence of the most honest person on earth can be imperiled by multimillion-dollar political campaigns. That is why I am introducing this bill today—to make it possible for people who are independent and honest, by nature, to

exercise those qualities as they think best in the public interest. I know of no other adequate way to free candidates from the fetters of big contributions than to have the Federal Government take a major role in the financing of Federal election campaigns.

**"TEDDY ROOSEVELT BILL" ESSENTIAL STEP FOR EQUALITY IN POLITICAL DEMOCRACY**

Mr. President, I think Theodore Roosevelt's proposal to the 60th Congress, half a century ahead of its time, is the only feasible solution. The time is ripe for us, in the 84th Congress, to put it into effect. The cost of the Federal contributions I propose would be a negligible sum in the Federal budget. But the ultimate benefits to the American people, in free and unfettered representation in the halls of their Government, would be immeasurable. Theodore Roosevelt's reform is needed today as never before to bring us nearer to that ideal of all men being "created equal" of which Thomas Jefferson wrote 180 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks, a memorandum analyzing the proposed bill; an article entitled "Public Seen Ready To Contribute \$75 Million to Political Parties," written by Dr. George Gallup and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 11, 1956; an editorial entitled "Sequel to the Case Affair," published in the New York Times of February 17, 1956; an editorial entitled "Influence on Congress," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956; an article written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956; and an editorial entitled "What's a Bribe," published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of February 9, 1956.

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

**EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED "FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS ACT"**

The Federal Campaign Contributions Act proposed by Senator NEUBERGER is designed to relieve candidates for Federal elective offices of their present dependence on large, private campaign contributions to finance election campaigns. To accomplish this, it would make available Federal funds, in equal amounts to each major political party, to be used for legitimate Federal election campaign expenditures. It would not supersede or conflict with Federal corrupt practices legislation, and it is consistent with S. 636, Senator HENNING'S bill to modernize the Federal election laws, which is now before the Senate.

**ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION**

Section 1 sets forth congressional findings that it is in the national interest to prevent the dominance of large campaign contributions, and disproportionate inequality among financial resources of candidates of different political parties, in Federal elections; and that Government contributions to campaign financing as suggested by President Theodore Roosevelt offer the best remedy for these conditions.

Section 2 defines a major political party which could become eligible for Federal campaign contributions as any party which has polled 10 percent of the total popular

vote in the last preceding presidential or congressional election. (Votes cast for Delegates to Congress are counted in the Territories, which do not vote for presidential electors.) (Historical records show that, in modern times, only the Bull Moose Progressive ticket in 1912 (27.4 percent) and the LaFollette Progressive Party of 1924 (16.6 percent) would have qualified for Federal contributions in their next subsequent election campaign. Except for these, the high point for third parties was reached by the Socialist Party in 1920 with 3.4 percent. In 1918, the Progressive and States Rights tickets each received 2.4 percent of the total popular vote.)

Section 3 establishes the administrative machinery for handling the Federal campaign contributions. A Board of one member of each major political party, appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, serving on a per diem basis, choose one \$15,000-a-year Administrator to administer the program.

Section 4 authorizes the Administrator to make the payments established by the act.

Section 5 (a) states the formula for determining the amount of the Federal campaign contribution to be allocated to each major political party:

"In 2-year periods—from April 1 to April 1 in odd-numbered years—in which a presidential election will be held, 20 cents per voter for the average total vote in the two preceding presidential elections;

"In such 2-year periods in which non-presidential Federal elections will be held, 15 cents per voter for the average total vote in the two preceding nonpresidential Federal elections."

Section 5 (b) states that Federal contributions are to be made to the national committees of each major political party, from time to time, for legitimate campaign expenditures on behalf of the candidates nominated by that party for Federal office.

Section 5 (c) specifies that the statements certifying these expenditures shall conform to regulations under the act.

Section 5 (d) provides that not more than two-thirds of the Federal contribution authorized for a 2-year period shall be turned over prior to the election in that period; the remainder is to be withheld until all reports of all campaign expenditures for that election have been completed and reviewed in accordance with legal requirements.

Section 6 places two limits on financing from private sources:

"(a) To qualify for Federal campaign contributions, a major political party must certify that no individual has contributed more than a total of \$100 to it or its candidates; and

"(b) The total of all expenditures from private contributions on behalf of Federal candidates of a political party may not exceed the amount authorized for the Federal contribution under the act, or the Federal contribution is reduced by the amount of the excess."

Sections 5 and 6 are designed to follow the familiar matching fund principle by making Federal campaign funds available as a substitute for large private campaign contributions (over \$100 per person), if the major political parties will limit their expenditures from private contributions to not more than equal the Federal contribution. In the administration of these provisions, the proposed bill presumes the adoption of legal reporting requirements such as those of Senator HENNING'S S. 636.

Sections 7, 8, and 9 provide penalties for false applications or reports and wrongful use of Federal campaign contributions; authorize the Administrator to promulgate necessary regulations; and authorize appropriations to carry out the program.



[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 11, 1956]

**THE GALLUP POLL: PUBLIC SEEN READY TO CONTRIBUTE \$75 MILLION TO POLITICAL PARTIES**

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., January 10.—The American public has some \$75 million ready to contribute to the campaign chests of 2 major political parties—if the parties want to work hard enough to get it.

That sum is about five times as much as was reported spent in the election of the present 84th Congress—when the GOP and Democrat candidates together spent in the neighborhood of \$13.7 million.

It would also mean gathering contributions from about five times as many families as actually contributed to the campaign funds of the 1954 congressional elections.

Making a door-to-door, community-by-community type of canvass, with definite quotas set for each county in the United States, the 2 parties would find some 15 million American families willing to contribute \$5 to the party of their choice.

Anything short of this type of canvass—patterned after ones that have been used successfully by organizations like the Red Cross and Community Chest—would probably result in about the same number of contributions made by families to the 1954 campaign funds. An institute survey following the November election indicated that 2.7 million families made contributions to 1 of the 2 major parties.

The parties, therefore, have a real opportunity to change from the present system of contributions from rich men who may be looking for favors in return, to one where a substantial number of voters would each chip in a small sum.

The question, by which experienced institute interviewers determined the willingness of America's 48 million families to donate to the political party they preferred, was phrased as follows:

"If you were asked, would you contribute \$5 to the campaign fund of the political party you prefer?"

The results, translated into number of families:

**Willing to give \$5**

	Percent	Families
Yes.....	31	15,000,000
No.....	56	27,000,000
Don't know.....	13	6,000,000

Nearly 4 out of every 10 Republicans questioned in the survey (39 percent) said they would be willing to chip in \$5, but only about 3 out of 10 Democrats (29 percent) said they would contribute.

[From the New York Times of February 17, 1956]

**SEQUEL TO THE CASE AFFAIR**

The furor stirred up by the announcement made by Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, that an oil and gas company had offered him a campaign contribution of \$2,500 came at a bad time for some politicians but at a good time for the general public in this presidential year. The special bipartisan committee of which Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, has acted as chairman found enough in the Case episode to indicate that an impropriety, at the very least, had been attempted. Most of us, regardless of party, would like to think that this kind of impropriety, or something worse, will not be repeated on a larger scale during this year's campaign.

The four-member George committee will presumably wind up its work on the Case incident next week. Another Senatorial

group, a three-member subcommittee of the Rules Committee, yesterday announced its intention to undertake a broad investigation into any attempt to influence future legislation by campaign contributions. Its chairman, ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, promises a thorough study of "contributions to election campaigns, Federal elections and such evidences of corrupt practices as may be revealed." He is apparently set to begin as soon as he gets a go-ahead signal from the Senate, plus a little money for expenses.

This newspaper estimated in mid-October 1952, that the presidential campaign of that year would cost about \$80 million, as contrasted or compared with about \$50 million in 1948. We may compare these figures, if we like, with the total expenditures reported by the national committees of the two major parties in 1952—\$17.5 million. The trouble is that many contributions in a national election are never handled by the national committees. There are many ways of promoting a candidate or a party that do not require entries in ledgers.

We may hope that the Gore committee will be less interested in putting the finger on scapegoats than in finding ways to improve the system of paying the expenses of political campaigns. We don't doubt the honesty of practically all Members of our National Legislature, but there is no sense in permitting gifts, if we can avoid it, that will even unconsciously influence their thinking and voting.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956]

**INFLUENCE ON CONGRESS**

The emphatic language of President Eisenhower's veto of the gas bill should give the Senate additional incentive to press ahead with a thorough investigation. The honor and dignity of the Senate require that is expose every aspect of the efforts of the gas lobby to influence the vote through political contributions—both those made recently and those made before the bill was under active consideration.

At the same time, this newspaper hopes there will be widespread recognition that the primary purpose of such washing of dirty linen ought to be to remedy a general condition that cries for rectification. All of us are in a sense to blame for permitting a situation to arise in which the rules for political expenditures and campaign contributions are dangerously unrealistic. The activities of the gas lobby afford merely a flagrant and distasteful illustration of the dependence upon large contributions. Election to public office has become so expensive, and the means of evading the restrictions have become so complex, that honest efforts to campaign within the rules and render a complete accounting are all but impossible.

The Senate need not await a new investigation to know that this a disgraceful condition that tends to produce a kind of moral corruption even in legislators of the highest probity. Point one in effecting a remedy, in our opinion, ought to be prompt passage of the Hennings bill to amend the Corrupt Practices Act and revise expenditure limitations. It may be necessary to make some concessions and changes in order to accomplish this. Senator HENNING'S proposed allowance for campaign expenditures of up to 10 cents per vote in the last election, with a cutoff at \$250,000 for senatorial candidates and \$25,000 for contestants for House seats, would be an improvement over the present absurd limits of \$25,000 and \$5,000, respectively. But even the revised allowances would be far, far less than what now is actually spent.

Senatorial campaigns in large States are known to cost as much as \$3 million, despite the legal limit. In the recent mayoralty race

in Chicago the defeated candidate, who sought to give a forthright accounting, had expenditures of nearly half a million dollars. The \$12 million allowed each of the national committees under the Hennings formula of 20 cents per vote in the last election probably would not meet more than a third or a quarter of the total expenditures in the 1956 presidential campaign.

If a satisfactory formula cannot be found for making the permissible limits correspond with actual expenditures, it might be wise instead to concentrate on stringent requirements for reporting contributions. We think it important that the Hennings bill cover primaries as well as general elections. Periodic reporting of actual amounts received and spent during campaigns is the essential thing. Despite the proposed requirement that all contributions of more than \$100 be listed by the donors, there probably is no way in which to cover all private activities undertaken on behalf of candidates. But if candidates and their campaign managers could honestly report all direct contributions and the sources, this would do a great deal to eliminate unsavory influence. The public itself would be the best judge of when contributions were excessive.

Two practical additional steps are imperative, it seems to us, to accompany the amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act. One is to enact the separate Hennings-Udall bill permitting donors to deduct political contributions of up to \$100 for income tax purposes. This would encourage Americans to respond to their privilege and duty of supporting candidates of their choice, and it should stimulate large numbers of small contributions. The more numerous such contributions, the less any candidate would be dependent on large gifts from firms or individuals seeking favors.

The second step is to amend Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act so as to permit television and radio stations to extend free time to major candidates in presidential campaigns without being required to give equal time to fringe or frivolous candidates. With television bills in presidential campaigns now running into many millions of dollars, this amendment would make an enormous difference in the cost of campaigns—and dependence on illicit funds. Radio and TV stations are ready and willing to furnish such time provided that they can be relieved of the burden of giving time in equal amount to the Vegetarians and Prohibitionists. (There were only two real contenders for the Presidency in 1952, but technically there were 18 candidates.) A simple change permitting stations to make free time available to candidates of parties that polled, say, 1 million votes in the last election or could muster 200,000 signatures, would suffice to bring the law up to date.

None of this detracts in the slightest from the vital need for a full investigation by a Senate committee. Congress ought to recognize, however, that whatever recommendations the committee may have can be implemented and supplemented by beginning the chain of reforms now. The whole procedure will go more smoothly and will gain more cooperation if there is acknowledgment at the outset that the basic purpose is not punitive but corrective.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1956]

**MATTER OF FACT**

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

PANDORA GORE

Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, Tennessee, who heads the three-man committee which will investigate the use of money in politics, is a born evangelist. The subject of money in politics is the political equivalent of Pandora's box, which released all the evils of the

world when Pandora opened it. Yet GORE is apparently determined to play the role of Pandora.

"I know I have a bear by the tail," GORE says, with evangelical fervor, "but I can't let go. The mass movement of money between the States for political purposes threatens the very foundations of our political system."

GORE plans to ask the Senate for some-thing on the order of half a million dollars for his investigation. With the money he intends to have half a dozen or more trained investigators to unearth the whole story of money in politics.

As presently planned, his first order of business will be to recall the Superior Oil Co. officials who tried to slip Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, South Dakota, \$2,500 in \$100 bills, and find out what their other political-financial activities have been.

If he is as good as his word, he will go on from there, investigating the political use of money not only by the oil interests, but by all other industries with a big political stake. The Republican Member of the Gore committee, Senator CARL CURTIS, Nebraska, has been promised a Republican counsel and Republican staff Members, and he will concentrate on the financial contributions of labor unions. These contributions of course go almost entirely to Democrats.

Thus what is in prospect is a tremendous public washing of the dirty linen of both parties. The extreme political sensitivity of the subject to be investigated is suggested by the trouble GORE has already experienced in his search for a qualified committee counsel. He has had a number of turn-downs—one prospect remarked that "any lawyer who would take on a job like that must have rocks in his head."

Even to mention campaign contributions has long been considered as bad form in the Senate as talking about sex in a Victorian drawing room. There is hardly a Senator who has not received important contributions from special interests of one sort or another. In the television era, with a single broadcast running well up into five figures, it is impossible to wage an effective campaign without such contributions.

It is also impossible to wage a winning campaign under the limitations laid down by the Corrupt Practices Act. Thus there is probably not a man in the Senate outside the safe seats in the South, who has not connived at circumventing the act by the accepted technique. A candidate, especially in the big industrial States, who did not so connive simply could not be elected.

It is therefore not surprising that the vast majority of Senators regard the prospect of the GORE investigation with scarcely concealed loathing.

There is a strong bipartisan effort, spear-headed by both the Republican and Democratic leadership, to enlarge the committee and dilute it with reasonable men, to limit its scope, or to take the curse off it in some other way. The effort may well succeed. But it will not be easy. Since President Eisenhower, in a political master stroke, vetoed the gas bill because of arrogant use of money for political purposes, it will be politically dangerous in the extreme to be caught trying to sweep the whole unpleasant subject under the rug.

The dimensions of the subject are suggested by the results of a 2-year study of money in politics, undertaken at the University of North Carolina. After the most careful analysis, this study established that the 1952 campaign cost a staggering \$150 million, give or take a few million, in straight out-of-pocket expense. A considerable proportion of this sum was certainly under-the-table money, as it is known in the trade.

It is no use trying to control the big business of politics by putting a ceiling on expenditures, since ceilings will always be

broken through one way or another. What is needed is some means of bringing the business into the open, so that the voters should really know who gets what, and from whom, and so that a man can go to the United States Senate without conniving at circumvention of the law. If Senator GORE's opening of Pandora's box results in legislation to this end, it will serve a most useful purpose, despite the present anguish on Capitol Hill.

[From the Eugene Register-Guard of February 9, 1956]

#### WHAT'S A BRIBE?

Debate on the natural gas bill ended with a "sensational" charge by Senator FRANCIS CASE, of North Dakota. The Senator said he'd received a \$2,500 campaign contribution and that there had been a string on it. The string had been that he'd vote for the bill removing gas producers from the list of businessmen whose prices the Government can control. The Senator spoke of this as a "bribe."

Probably, strictly speaking, it was not a bribe. It was just another contribution of a type that is being made every year to office holders of both parties. But the Senator's mention of the money opens up a serious problem of political ethics.

It costs money to run for office. Even here in Oregon Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER's friends spent more than \$100,000 to elect him to the Senate. And the friends of Senator Guy Cordon spent half again that much in their futile attempt to return him to the Senate. This money has to come from somewhere. It comes from people who are interested, for a variety of reasons, in seeing one man elected or another man defeated.

The interest these contributors have in the candidate's success may be described as a "string." The Senator or Congressman knows who put up the money, where the support came from. He knows how the contributors feel about natural gas, foreign aid, Taft-Hartley repeal, farm prices, and a number of other public issues. The temptation is always present to refrain from biting the hand that feeds.

That's not bribery. But it's an anything but subtle form of pressure. And it goes on all the time. The contribution to the CASE campaign is not exceptional.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished senior colleague.

Mr. MORSE. I highly congratulate my distinguished colleague, not only for the very sound bill he has introduced but also for the very able argument he has presented in support of the bill. I am proud to be one of the cosponsors of the bill under his leadership.

In addition to this particular bill, and in addition to the investigation of possible lobby evils which confront the parliamentary processes of America today, I believe it is very important that we have early consideration of another bill I have urged upon the Senate for many years. I refer to a bill which seeks to make it a requirement that Members of Congress and other high Government officials file each year for public disclosure a statement showing the sources and the amounts of their income.

I believe the American people are entitled to know the sources and the amounts of income of public officials, so that they can be their own judges as to what extent, if any, such income

may influence the kind of public service they get from their elected officials.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my senior colleague. I should like to remind him that I am a cosponsor of his proposal to provide that the various sources of income of public officials be disclosed to the public.

I wonder if the senior Senator from Oregon does not agree with me that many candidates for office, in both parties, would feel a great sense of relief if the whole matter of private contributions could be abandoned and if each of the parties were entitled by law to receive contributions from the Federal Treasury, as Theodore Roosevelt advocated, without any strings whatever being tied to the contributions?

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator's observations. I believe we must do something—and do it quickly—to reassure the American people that the financing of our political campaigns is above the level of corrupt influences.

I have said before that if I ever do any writing on the subject of politics as it is practiced in America and write a chapter on political financing, I am sure I will be discussing one of the major sources of corruption in American politics.

I believe it is very important that we proceed without delay to enact legislation which will reassure the American people that they are not the victims of a campaign financing program which results in kept politicians.

I was very much interested in my colleague's discussion of the financing of his campaign. I shall never forget what was an amusing and at the same time a rather sad incident in my 1950 campaign. It is a story which illustrates the need of another kind of legislation which should be passed very soon, namely, a complete revision of the Corrupt Practices Act. I say on the floor of the Senate today that in my judgment the Corrupt Practices Act is the cause of much corruption in American politics. The Corrupt Practices Act is an inducement to dishonesty in the reporting of campaign contributions and funds. It does not in its present provisions give the American people the truth or assure them that they will get the truth about the costs of political campaigns.

That is illustrated by an incident which occurred in my campaign in 1950. I was campaigning so fast and so hard that I forgot, as did also my staff, that 10 days before the end of the campaign it was necessary to file with the Secretary of the Senate a report of campaign contributions and expenses. I was speaking on the coast of Oregon at noon on the day which was the 10th day before the end of the campaign, when my administrative assistant rushed up to me and said, "The Oregonian is trying to find out if you have filed your report on campaign contributions and expenditures, and we have not done it; we have forgotten all about it."

To make a long story short, Mr. President, my Portland office worked in hectic fashion all afternoon to get the report into shape and brought it to me at a town in Oregon where I was speaking



that night. I asked my assistant to bring a notary public with him, because if we could get the report notarized and postmarked in the post office before midnight we would be within the law. Although the Secretary of the Senate was contacted and he said that under the circumstances if I could get the report mailed by the first of the week it would be acceptable, I nevertheless wanted it to be mailed before midnight on the day that the law required it to be mailed.

I was in the midst of an open-forum discussion at the meeting that night when my assistant and the notary public arrived. I thought it would be a good bit of political education to illustrate to the audience one of the problems we have as candidates. So I explained the situation and proceeded to notarize the report in front of the audience after my assistant assured me that in the preparation and contents it met all the requirements of the corrupt practices law. However, when my report reached Washington along with reports from other senatorial candidates it was discovered that I led the Nation in the matter of contributions and expenditures. Now of course I did not in fact but other candidates simply followed the letter of the Corrupt Practices Act and did not report all of the contributions and expenditures that they knew had been made in their behalf to their various campaign committees.

What my assistant had done was to show all my primary contributions and expenditures, all my general election contributions and expenditures, including contributions to every Morse for Senator Club in the State. As the result, I showed a total of contributions of a little over \$53,000, whereas the next highest amount reported by any candidate for the Senate in the United States was a little over \$7,000, in one of the most populous States; in another, a little over \$5,000; in another State, a little over \$4,000, and all of them were States which have several million population as compared with the small population of Oregon. The Senator can imagine what my opponent did in a statewide radio broadcast when those figures were published. He sought to give the people of my State the impression that my campaign financing was exorbitant.

What I had done was to give a full and honest report as to every dollar which had been contributed to my campaign and every dollar of expenditures of which we had any record.

What did I need to report, Mr. President? Under the corrupt practices law, I needed to report only the amount that had been contributed to me personally. I did not need to report a single cent that had been sent to any Morse for Senate committee.

The only money I had received as a candidate personally was a check for \$600. I had used that money to pay my hotel, travel, and meal expenses, but, under the corrupt practices law, I did not have to report those expenditures at all. Instead of reporting contributions of a little over \$53,000, I could have reported \$600, without reporting any expenditures whatsoever. However that would have

not given to the people of Oregon the information to which I felt they were entitled.

Mr. President, I say that any law which permits that kind of a situation is itself an inducement to corruption. I have been proposing amendments to the corrupt practices law year after year. We should rewrite it so that candidates for office will have to tell the American people the facts about the amount of money raised in their behalf and the amount expended in their behalf.

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

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to say that I see on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who has been one of the great advocates of rewriting the Corrupt Practices Act to put teeth into it. She is of the opinion that a candidate should not only be compelled to report contributions, but that they should be reported on his income-tax blank by the contributor, under penalty of law, so that there would be a double check. The act should be rewritten and modernized to take care of a new method of campaigning, which, in effect, would help the electorate to understand the principles and platforms through the medium of television and radio. In that way there would be a proper recognition of what a campaign costs in connection with the program of the candidate.

Mr. MORSE. If my colleague will permit me, I may say that, so far as I am concerned, I should be perfectly willing to appoint the Senator from Maine to rewrite the Corrupt Practices Act. By her record in the Senate she has demonstrated that she believes we have the obligation to enact such legislation as will give the American people the truth about campaign funds. I think it is very important, and I hope that such legislation can be passed at a very early date.

Mr. MONRONEY. I also feel that one of the most important provisions which must be written into any Corrupt Practices Act is a prohibition against the interstate shipment of campaign funds in large amounts. I feel that campaign funds sent from one State into another should be limited to \$100 per person. Otherwise, we are going to have sums of from \$5,000 to \$10,000 sent from New York or California or Illinois or Texas to influence the election of Senators in, for instance, the States of Montana, Maine, Oklahoma, or other States, to punish a Senator for action which he has taken on the floor, or money will be contributed by persons from outside the State to elect a candidate of their choice, through the use of huge sums of campaign money. We should consider how the interstate movement of campaign money can be used against the right of the States to have a free and open choice of candidates.

Mr. MORSE. If my colleague's bill should be enacted, the problem would be solved in even a better way.

I may say to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] that I think there is another loophole in the Corrupt Practices Act which should be plugged up. It was a great surprise to me to discover, after I

ended up with a deficit in my 1944 campaign—and a substantial deficit it was, too—that when the campaign was over and the deficit was made good we did not have to report the contributions to the deficit. I insisted that they be reported, and I was rather amused when one of the persons trying to raise the campaign deficit for me said, "Wayne, I can get you plenty of money from people who will try to beat you in 1950, but who are willing to help raise your deficit now." But I said that I did not want their money. It is as important to know who contributes to a deficit as it is to know who contributes to the campaign in the first instance. However, under the present corrupt practices law a candidate can run up a deficit and then after the filing dates for reports are over the deficits can be raised and no public record of the contributions need to be filed. I think that such a policy increases the danger of corrupt practices in campaign financing. It has the potentiality of leading to some very bad practices, unless a Senatorial candidate does as I insisted on doing in 1944, namely, file a final deficit contribution statement with the same authorities with whom the original contribution statement was filed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I had not known, until the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and my colleague mentioned it, of the proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Maine. But I believe that requiring individuals who contribute to campaigns to list their contributions on their income-tax forms might be a very useful way of seeking to solve this whole vast problem.

I was amused when my colleague spoke about our reports from Oregon. I thought I had a rather underfinanced campaign this past year of 1954. I did not have a single billboard. I was hit all over the head by superior amounts of newspaper advertising space, and so forth. But, lo and behold, when I looked into the records, I discovered I had filed an amount for campaign expenditures greater than the amounts expended in some of the most-populous States.

But the essential thing I mentioned in my remarks on the bill is this: I believe the vast majority of our candidates want to get out from under the terrible yoke of having to raise huge campaign funds. I believe the men and women in politics are the victims of this practice, rather than the masters of it. It is my opinion that no greater solution could be made toward freeing our whole political process than to do something to make it possible for men and women to run for high office, without having to turn to the agonizing problem of raising vast sums of money.

A great many speeches have been made in recent weeks about the sinister nature of the political contribution made by the political-education funds of certain trade unions. Those contributions are very obvious. They are publicized. They are the one-seventh of the iceberg which is above water.

But I shall be interested to see, when the test comes, which group of men in public life favor allowing the Federal Government to take over the financing of political campaigns, so as to outlaw



the huge contributions from big business, big industry, and the unions. Who will favor doing that? Will it be those who have been making speeches bewailing the campaign contributions made by the political-education funds of the trade unions? I shall be interested to see, because I think that will be the real test of the sincerity of some of the speeches which have been made.

It is my belief that Congress should adopt this reform, which was proposed half a century ago by Theodore Roosevelt, to free everyone from the acceptance of large contributions, whether they come from the political-education funds of labor unions or from big business or big industry. I shall be interested to see if those who are so disturbed about union contributions will vote for a bill which will also outlaw contributions made by big business and big industry.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to have joined with the junior Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of the bill which he has introduced. I think ultimately it may well prove to be necessary as a means of financing political campaigns, to take further steps in order to solve the many difficult problems of administration, of which the Senator from Oregon is well aware.

I wish to address this question to the Senator: It is sometimes said that it has now been made illegal for corporations to contribute to national political funds, and that, therefore, we need not worry about the attempts of corporate wealth to influence elections. I wondered if the Senator from Oregon would comment on that contention, which is sometimes made.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think the facts which are now being brought out before the select committee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in some measure very vividly and dramatically answer the Senator's question. While I am not wholly familiar with the operations of these big campaign funds, never having been the benefactor of them, it is my opinion that if there is to be a very extended and widespread investigation of where such huge amounts of money come from, some very interesting things will be disclosed.

I do not believe the Senator from Illinois was on the floor when I quoted from a New York Times editorial, in which that great newspaper estimated that \$80 million was spent in the national campaign of 1952. Think of it—\$80 million. So relatively recent as 1860, the first Republican President, a man who came from the State of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, was elected with a total campaign fund of \$100,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that in a very interesting, but little noted, St. Louis case of some years back, involving certain gentlemen who have since become nationally eminent, it was discovered that a big private utility company had paid large fees to certain groups of lawyers, and that the lawyers in turn had made contributions to political can-

didates and to legislators, apparently with the knowledge of the directors of the company? At least, the directors of the company did not accompany their fees, or gifts, with explicit directions as to how they were not to be used.

Is there not sufficient evidence to indicate that very frequently money is given by corporations to attorneys for undisclosed purposes, which money can be called legal fees, and that the attorneys then act as middlemen to distribute sums to political candidates for the corporation's purposes?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I was not familiar with the St. Louis case cited by the Senator from Illinois, whose experience is so much greater than mine, but I am sure of this: That if a dissection were made of the \$80 million cited in the New York Times editorial—where the money originated and where it went—some very interesting and significant facts would be disclosed.

I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois another question, if I may, because I know his experience, not only in active public life, but also in studying this matter as a political scientist and economist, goes back so much further than my own experience. Does not the Senator believe that if some basic reform should be adopted, whether it be the one I have proposed today or something else, it would free the people who run for office from the necessity of raising huge funds; and in greater or lesser degree would not almost everyone in public life feel a great sense of relief and a new freedom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure that is true.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the bill which the junior Senator from Oregon has introduced today. The Senator has stated that a recent editorial published in the New York Times estimated that \$80 million was spent in the 1952 Presidential campaign. May I ask the Senator if the New York Times made any estimate as to how much money would be spent in the coming Presidential campaign?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not recall, but I believe there was some discussion of the fact that the very costly, expensive medium of television is so much more widespread today than it was in 1952 that it is logical to presuppose the amount which will be spent this year will make the \$80 million spent in 1952 seem perhaps relatively trivial.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has anticipated my next remarks about television, because only this morning I heard of a senatorial candidate in Ohio, in the last general election, whose expenses for a 15-minute statewide television broadcast amounted to more than \$21,000. Where are we going to get that kind of money if we are to compete on that basis?

I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon has introduced this measure. I assure him that not only am I happy to be a cosponsor of it, but, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which it will be referred, I

shall do my best to see to it that it is reported.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Montana. I wish to say one word in conclusion. It is interesting to note that it was Theodore Roosevelt who made the original suggestion in 1907, at a time when the entire Presidential campaign cost about \$500,000. I wonder what Teddy would say today if he were confronted with an \$80 million campaign?

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the fact that the St. Louis incident and other incidents have indicated that it is possible for corporations to pay what are ostensibly fees to lawyers, and for lawyers then to distribute such fees, in whole or in part, as political contributions, how does the Senator from Oregon feel about the effectiveness of barring large interstate contributions? Would it not still be possible for corporations having branch offices in a given State, although directed centrally from New York or some other location, to hire local attorneys at large fees, and to expect the local attorneys then to distribute the money to the local candidates? That would be an ostensible operating expense conducted within the State, and would not be treated as an interstate shipment of campaign funds. That could be extremely effective although in reality it would be an interstate contribution.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As I remarked to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, I am not as well acquainted as I ought to be with all the modus operandi of campaign contributions, but I believe there is one very great peril connected with what presumably is a good idea. To illustrate, that idea is that with respect to so-called interstate donations, in a Western State like that represented in part by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], or the State which the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I represent, many of the industries in the State are absentee-owned. For instance, the vast utilities in our State, and some of the largest lumber companies and some of the railroads, are perhaps from 80 to 95 percent owned outside the State of Oregon. Yet if a ban should be placed on interstate contributions, it might be possible to evade the ban by having the great absentee-owned utility, timber, and railroad corporations locally make very substantial contributions to the political life of Oregon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even though those contributions might not come from the big corporations directly, they could be made indirectly by paying them as fees to lawyers, and then having the lawyers distribute them as contributions.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Or they could be made by the local officials of large corporations that were actually under the domination and control of the absentee owners, who lived outside the State of Montana or the State of Oregon, or whatever the State concerned might be.



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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have been sitting here, listening. I am rather amazed by the knowledge the Senators seem to have about the way the contributions are handled. How do the Senators have so much knowledge of the subject?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have been watching our opponents.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it from experience, or observation? I am getting an education on how these things are done.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the distinguished Senator from Indiana had listened to me, he would have heard me say that I was not fully familiar with the modus operandi.

Mr. CAPEHART. Was it the Senator from Illinois who was familiar with it?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I said I was offering a bill to free all major political parties—there are two now—parties of all forms of political persuasion, whether they be liberal, conservative, or in between, from the necessity of raising the huge campaign funds which have been raised in the past. I have left the bill on the desk open for further cosponsorship. I should be extremely happy if the Senator from Indiana would care to become a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Having had no experience in these matters myself, I wondered what great experience the Senators had had.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We should be very happy if the distinguished Senator would join in cosponsoring a bill which would bring into effect an idea of a great Republican, the 26th President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As one who spent about 4 years on the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, I can say that experience shows that there is a need to revise the Corrupt Practices Act and a need to enact legislation which will prevent practices in one State which seek to influence elections in other States.

I certainly agree with the position of the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] that we ought to require donors to report their contributions on their income tax returns, so that there will be a double check on them, because if the stream of Government is polluted at its source, which is the electorate composed of the people, the whole body of the Government will be polluted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree 100 percent with what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, but I cannot conceive of a Senator being so small as to accept contributions in return for promises to vote in a way which will not be in the best interests of the Senate and the country. Perhaps it does happen, but I cannot personally conceive of it. I do not understand the workings of a mind which thinks that a Senator can be bribed, or that the things which have been referred to occur.

Mr. MONRONEY. Donations which run into thousands of dollars can be inimical to the actions of the Senate. Senators should have a right to vote on and decide questions without being subjected to any extraneous influence. I sincerely hope the proposal will move forward and that long-awaited action will be taken.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection to whatever Congress may do. I shall help in every way I can. The point I am trying to make is that we do not need to legislate against honest men. What has been indicated cannot happen if the Senate is composed of honest and honorable men. When such a proposal is made, it might carry the presumption that every Senator present, as well as every other Senator, participates in the kind of thing being talked about. I do not believe it. I do not believe Senators accept bribes. Because a person makes a contribution to a Member of Congress for his campaign, I cannot concede that there is necessarily anything evil connected with it. I do not wish to cast aspersions on my colleagues. I am not aware that the sort of thing which has been mentioned happens. That is why I wondered, as I listened, where the Senators who seemed to know so much about the operations they were describing got their experience. I, myself, cannot understand them.

Contributions have been made to my campaign. I suppose I shall receive further contributions, but I presume it will be my friends who will contribute, and I presume it will be persons who contribute because they like my record. I am certain my enemies will not contribute to my campaign, and I am certain that people who do not like my record will not contribute.

I say to the Senator that if anything can be made out of it, go ahead. I am not referring particularly to myself, but to other Senators. Everyone knows that persons do not make contributions to those they do not like and to those whose voting records they do not like.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I might say to the Senator from Indiana that possibly contributions might come into the State of Indiana from people who do not like the Senator from Indiana; people from other States might try to defeat the Senator because they do not like his voting record, and that feeling might have no relation to how people in Indiana feel.

When in his message on the natural gas bill the President of the United States stated that he based his veto on the fact that perhaps campaign contributions were influencing the vote on the bill, then I think it is high time that the Senate not wait for the White House to disturb itself about the matter, but that we, as the greatest legislative body in the world, ought to concern ourselves with modernizing a hopelessly obsolete Corrupt Practices Act which lends itself to this very type of thing.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is there any semblance of evidence that there was a contribution other than the \$2,500 which the

Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] himself said was not a bribe?

Mr. MONRONEY. The junior Senator from Oklahoma knows of none, but when the Chief Executive says a certain bill is a good piece of legislation, that it points in the right direction, that he finds no fault generally with the bill or with the industries affected by the bill, but vetoes it because of things which have just been mentioned, then I think we are getting on very thin ice, and that this body should be free to legislate without fear of Presidential veto.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel very sorry that because of the contribution of \$2,500, it is said there is a need for the legislation which is being proposed to the Senate.

Let each Senator take a good look at himself in a mirror; he knows whether he has a clear conscience.

I have the highest regard and respect for all Senators, and I am not going to intimate in any way that Senators can be bribed. I do not think that can be done, and I do not think that campaign contributions necessarily are bribes.

Such contributions have been made for 170 years. How else is a candidate going to handle his campaign if he does not obtain contributions from his friends, or put up all the money himself? Who says that every contribution is made for some ulterior motive? I say shame on any Senator who makes such a suggestion.

Let us proceed with the business of the Senate; and let each Member be the sole judge of his own honesty, because that is what will have to be done in the end, anyway.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in commenting on the remarks of the Senator from Montana, I should like to say that in the New York Times of yesterday, Sunday, a very responsible correspondent, William S. White, wrote that it cost approximately \$1 million for a senatorial campaign in a large, populous, industrial State. I do not know whether that is correct. Neither do I know whether the U. S. News & World Report was correct when it said, in its current issue, that it cost \$200,000—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Not at this time; I shall finish this statement first.

Mr. CAPEHART. I can tell the Senator from Oregon where the figure \$200,000 came from; it came from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. NEUBERGER. At any rate, the U. S. News & World Report said it cost \$200,000 in a typical State. I believe that the Alsop brothers, who are responsible columnists, said today that it cost \$1 million in a large industrial State. If we examine the filings of campaign contributions in the various places—whether in Washington, D. C., or in the State capitals—we find that those funds in such amounts are not listed. Yet we raise hob because some little bureaucrat receives a baked ham or a deep freeze.

I sat here and listened to speeches about Mr. Talbott and about a conflict of interest, and everything about Mr. Talbott and his various connections was out on the table. He had to resign, and

very probably he should have resigned. But how can we sit here and fail to take action when responsible publications in our country state that it costs \$200,000 to be elected from a typical State, and \$1 million to be elected from a large State, and no one knows where the money comes from?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Certainly.

Mr. CAPEHART. The U. S. News & World Report quoted the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as saying that it cost \$200,000.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from Indiana deny that?

Mr. CAPEHART. It was so stated in the article. So in that respect, the information came from the Senator from Illinois.

Of course, it costs money to be nominated and elected; all of us know that to be so. But my point is that the fact that a contribution is made to my campaign does not mean that I am under any obligation to the contributor, other than because of the fact that we are friends.

The Senator from Oregon tries to leave the inference that every person who makes a contribution, in some way, somehow, wants something in return for it. I do not agree at all with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Has the Senator from Indiana been on the floor when Senators on the other side of the aisle have spoken about the "iniquitous political-education funds of the trade unions"?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, and I do not agree with them. The Senator from Oregon has not heard me make such a statement.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have not heard the Senator from Indiana disagree with such statements.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am one of those who believe that the people have a right to come to Washington and that includes trade unions, manufacturers, millionaires, poor people, fat people, thin people; all the people have a right to come to Washington—to try to educate the Members of Congress. All the people have a right to be on one side or the other of proposed legislation, and all the people have a right to work for or against such measures as vigorously as they wish, so long as they do so honestly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But the general public does not know the source of every nickel that goes into those funds.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator from Oregon referring to the campaign funds?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know about Oregon; but in Indiana, statements about all such contributions are filed, and there is no secret about them. The statements regarding all contributions and expenses for senatorial campaigns are filed with the United States Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Including the funds and expenses of all committees?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; so far as I know.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is that true in the case of all the committees?

Mr. CAPEHART. In Indiana, the candidate files a statement and the committees also file statements. I do not know whether that is true in Oregon, but all the committees in Indiana file.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We filed a statement for every nickel we spent in my campaign; and, as a result, I found that I was one of the largest spenders among all senatorial candidates in the United States. Yet I come from a relatively small State in population; Oregon has 1 percent of the national population and does not even have as many people in the entire State as there are in individual cities in many of the other States. Yet I found that, on the basis of the contributions which were filed, I was one of the largest spenders, or the committees backing me were among the largest spenders.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where are contributions in Oregon listed? I do not know about the situation in all the other States; but, in my State, all the committees list their contributions and expenses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Considerable light was thrown on the situation in the 1950 campaign, particularly in the campaign in that year between the late Senator Taft and his Democratic opponent, Joseph T. Ferguson, for election as United States Senator from Ohio. Subject to subsequent correction in the RECORD, let me say that I think the testimony indicated that the various independent committees which were supporting the late Senator Taft spent over \$500,000 and additional large sums were devoted to his campaign out of the receipts of the Ohio Republican Finance Committee which totaled approximately \$1,250,000. It developed that even these were probably not the entire amounts, because a multitude of citizens' committees had been built up on a county basis or on a nationality basis or on an occupation basis, and reports were not made for them. I think all of us recognize that Senator Taft was an honorable man. But that Ohio situation indicated the large amounts of money which were spent in an industrial State. It was on the basis of that situation and on the basis of my knowledge of the record regarding other campaigns, that I arrived at the figure of \$250,000, and believed it was a moderate overall figure.

All of us know that in practice what happens is that, whereas a Senator from a big State is limited to the expenditure of \$25,000 for himself, plus travel expenses, plus certain printing and postage, and so forth, generally his friends form independent committees for him, and those committees do not have to make reports. All of us know that is what happens.

So I am surprised that my good friend, the Senator from Indiana, who has had a distinguished career in the United States Senate for 12 years, is ignorant of these facts. I had thought that what we knew

as men, we should not pretend to be ignorant of as Senators.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not question the statement of the Senator from Illinois; but we shall never know how much money is spent, because we never know how much money our individual friends may spend in traveling and in participating in other ways in such campaigns.

My point is this: Why point a shotgun at every Member of the Senate, and why take the time of the Senate in this way, when so many other important matters await our consideration? If there are any bad eggs among us, why not deal with them individually? Why must we cast aspersions upon all other Senators and all Members of the House of Representatives, and try to leave the impression that everyone but ourselves is crooked?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that if he would take the time to read the remarks I made here on the floor, in introducing my bill, he would find that, in the first place, I was not throwing eggs at anyone.

I do not know why he is so concerned about this matter. What I said in my speech, in connection with the introduction of my bill—which I regard as major legislation, and I hope other Senators will similarly regard it—was that I felt the vast majority of our people are basically honest and have great integrity; but I said I thought that everyone disliked the yoke of large campaign contributions.

The Senator from Indiana has been critical about taking the time of the Senate. Yet I point out to him that a great President of his own party took the time of the 60th Congress by addressing it in a special message on this subject, at a time when campaign funds were trivial, in terms of dollars and cents, as compared to their size today.

The bill I introduced today—and in that connection, I did not throw eggs at anyone; and if the Senator from Indiana will read my speech in connection with the introduction of my bill, I believe he will find that is true—was for the purpose of carrying out that President's recommendation that the Federal Government take over the financing of the campaigns of the political parties, so that individual candidates could be relieved of the responsibility of raising such funds. What fault does the Senator from Indiana find with that bill? What is the Senator objecting to? Does he call that "throwing eggs"?

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that every Senator knows in his own heart whether or not he is legislating honestly. To me it is that simple. It is also a simple proposition that if people do not like a particular candidate, they will not contribute to his campaign. People who do like him probably will contribute. Upon one occasion when a candidate is running he may have little opposition, and little need for money or other help. The next time he runs—as was the case with Senator Taft in Ohio in 1950—the situa-



tion may be entirely different. Labor organizations all over the United States were fighting him. So I presume more money was required. Whether he spent more money than did the labor organizations and others opposed to him, I do not know. I know that both sides spent a great deal of money. No one will ever make me believe that any money spent in behalf of Senator Taft ever influenced him one iota on the floor of the Senate. No one can make me believe that any campaign contributions given to any Senator are going to influence him one iota on the floor of the Senate. I cannot conceive of such a thing. I do not believe that such a situation exists.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that he read the Life of Roy U. Cullen, of Houston, Tex. I refer to page 367 of that volume. Because 17 of us voted for the reappointment of Gordon Clapp to be head of the TVA, on page 367 of this book he states that he dedicated himself to the defeat of us 17 Senators. He sent money into North Dakota to keep the Senator from North Dakota from being reelected.

I compliment the Senator from Oregon for introducing his bill. I think it is one of the best pieces of proposed legislation that has been presented to the Senate in a long time. I do not care whether it takes a day, a week, or a month of the time of the Senate. I hope the subject will be thoroughly discussed, and that we will arrive at some legislation which will prevent millionaires such as Roy U. Cullen from sending their money into various States to defeat Senators who vote their honest convictions.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The other day I was placed on a list by labor leaders, along with nine other Republicans. They said to the world that they were going to defeat me. They were going to spend their time and money to that end. I have no particular objection to that. I wish they were for me. I wish they had not done it. It would have been much easier for me. But I do not deny them the right to do it. Everyone has a perfect right to be against me or for me. Everyone in Indiana has a perfect right to contribute to my campaign fund or not, as he chooses. If anyone in Indiana thinks he can influence me one iota by any contribution he may make to my campaign fund, he has another think coming. I feel the same way about every other Senator. I would not deny anyone the right to make a contribution or not to make a contribution.

It is true that in Indiana contributions are all listed. I do not think it ought to be possible to make them secretly. However, I would not deny any man the right to make a contribution or not to make a contribution.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Whenever a man enters the service of the Federal Government a great hullabaloo is raised about his disposing of stocks in this company or that company, if it has any dealings with his department. Apparently it

is presumed that he would be unable to reach an honest decision in the Defense Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Interior Department, or some other department, if he held stock in some company which might have dealings with that department. Yet, on the other hand, it is presumed that every Member of the Senate feels no influence, inhibition, or restraint if he receives thousands of dollars in campaign contributions. Are we of superior honesty?

Mr. CAPEHART. One of the reasons why I would permit an individual to make contributions—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to complete my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I ask, How can we set different standards of honesty for Senators than we set for others? Why should we presume that because some clerk or bureaucrat accepts a garment as a gift for his wife, a baked ham, or a trip, he is, ipso facto, dishonest, and influenced thereby to grant the minor favors at his disposal in the executive department, and, on the other hand, say that United States Senators can receive, in their campaigns, unlimited thousands of dollars without feeling any obligation? Are we a superior race of people?

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not say such a thing. I say that a man has a right to contribute or not to contribute. The main reason, in my mind, why we should permit people to make contributions to Senators' campaign is that if we do not permit it, the poor fellow who has no money cannot run for the United States Senate. How is he going to make a campaign?

Mr. NEUBERGER. My answer is to invite the Senator from Indiana to become a cosponsor of my bill. It is being left open. We want to have the Federal Government make these contributions so that the same source will be available to everyone. Everyone will have equal access to the funds.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not debating the merits or demerits of the bill. I am merely saying that we are casting aspersions on every Member of the United States Senate when we operate on the theory that a United States Senator has not enough honesty and integrity to prevent his being influenced, so that if someone makes a small or a large contribution to him, he will vote the way the contributor wishes him to vote. I think it is silly and ridiculous to argue such a proposal. I am amazed that men would spend their time thinking in such terms. The Senator's bill may be all right. I have no objection to it at the moment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator rose in his place and stated that I was throwing eggs. He admitted that he had not read the bill. He did not hear the remarks with which I introduced it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was talking about the colloquy with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in which the Senator was discussing ways and means by which people could evade whatever regulations might be established. I merely

rose and said that the Senator must have had some experience along that line; otherwise he would not know anything about the subject.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Oregon recall my reply, to the effect that we had learned these things by observing the actions of our opponents?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that, so far as my own particular personal viewpoint is concerned, lists have been sent to the press galleries referring to various Senators who received funds from the political-education funds of trade unions. My name was on such a list. It appeared in a column the other day. I do not recall the exact sum, but I think the various committees in my behalf benefited by approximately \$23,000. I had to allow my committees to take that money or I would have been completely obliterated, so far as financing in the campaign in Oregon was concerned.

Mr. CAPEHART rose.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will ask the Senator to resume his seat. I wish to finish this statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to answer the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would have become completely obliterated, so far as reaching the public is concerned, if my committees had not accepted that money. My opponent, who was a very fine, honorable man, was the beneficiary of far greater contributions, from the big lumber companies and other big businesses in my State.

Let me state my viewpoint. In the interest of good government, I do not believe that I should have had to arrive here having received \$23,000 from the political-education funds of trade unions. Had I been defeated, I do not think my successful opponent should have arrived here indebted to the owners of the big lumber companies and the other big businesses in my State for large sums of money. I do not believe that is in the interest of free government. I do not believe that it is in the interest of the kind of government the American people want. I say to the Senator now, that when he stands on the floor of the United States Senate and says it is perfectly all right for one group of men to be indebted to political-education funds of trade unions and another group of men to be indebted for much larger benefactions to big business and big industry, I do not see how he can say to a minor employee of the Government—for example, to the traffic officer on the beat, that he cannot take \$10 to allow a man to park in a no-parking zone.

What I think we should do is to free everyone, whether he be a liberal, a conservative, or a middle-of-the-roader, from having to take substantial benefactions from any private group, whether it be associated with labor, lumber, utilities, gas, or any other interests.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad the Senator received the \$23,000. I have never

criticized him for that, and I never shall. I am certain that he does not feel under any obligation, by reason of the \$23,000 contribution, to vote in favor of the labor organizations which gave it to him; and I am sure that, had his opponent won, his opponent would not have felt under any obligation to the lumber interests, which, the Senator said, contributed to his campaign fund.

In other words, I believe Senators are beyond that sort of thing. I cannot quite understand what the Senator means.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator why it is that benefactions going to senatorial campaigns presumably have no influence, but that benefactions going to bureaucrats who own stock in corporations, or to assistant secretaries who are executives in certain companies, presumably do have great influence.

Mr. CAPEHART. The difference between a contribution to a campaign and the giving to a traffic policeman, as the Senator has put it, of a \$10 bill, is of course, that a contribution is listed, and everyone knows about the contribution. A contribution is given for the purpose of electing a man to public office. I do not believe the Senator's comparison is very apt.

So far as the other matter is concerned, I am one who does not believe that we ought to go as far as we have gone with respect to having a person divest himself of all outside interests, and of everything he owns. I do not believe that it is possible to legislate honestly, or that when a person divests himself of such interests the Government necessarily thereby gets a better man. I have more faith in the honesty of the average person, perhaps, than most other people have. Perhaps I do have more faith in the average person. However, having been a businessman and having been in the Senate, and having been in the world for about 58 years, I must say that I have found most people honest. I like to look upon them as honest, and I do not like to cast aspersions on them by saying they are not honest. I do not go so far as the Senator from Oregon goes, in that I do not believe that persons coming into Government should divest themselves of their holdings. I do not believe that by doing so the Government necessarily gets honest people.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator mentioned contributions.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe every man in government is fundamentally honest, just as a judge is honest, in the sense that if a matter comes before him which is in conflict with his own interests and his own conscience, he will disqualify himself from taking any action on it. I believe if we put men on their honor in connection with such matters, we will get much better administration in the Government. We will get much better government. We will have much better Senators and Representatives in Congress, and we will generally have more honest people in government. As I understand, the Senator's bill would require the Government to pay the

expenses of political campaigns. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is substantially correct. The Senator's statement is a simplification, but it is substantially correct. The Senator from Indiana mentioned contributions being known to all the people. If he will read the New York Times editorial of Saturday, he will find that that great newspaper said the campaign of 1952—I must recall these figures from what I read, because I do not have the editorial before me—cost approximately \$80 million, but that only a total of about \$17,500,000 had been reported. Therefore, that leaves a very substantial amount not reported.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. One of the things that many of us are becoming a little tired of in the United States is broad statements like that, that someone has said \$80 million has been spent but that only \$17 million can be accounted for. Why do people publish that sort of thing, if they cannot be specific? Why do they publish such things or say such things about someone if they cannot prove what they say or write? Why do we have so much of that sort of thing today? Why is there going on today so much tearing down of the character of people, so much assassination of character?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The New York Times is usually considered to be a very reliable newspaper.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is a reliable newspaper, but I still reserve my right to criticize it, and I do criticize it in this instance.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is obvious that the Senator from Indiana—

Mr. CAPEHART. I do criticize the New York Times for publishing anything like that. If it published what the Senator says it published, that it is estimated \$80 million was spent in the 1952 campaign and only \$17 million has been accounted for, I do criticize the New York Times for it. If the newspaper does not know that to be a fact, why does it arouse the people of the United States to dislike and hate their Government and their Representatives in Congress, by saying that \$63 million was not accounted for although it was spent? Certainly I reserve my right to criticize anyone who makes that kind of statement.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When the President of the United States took office, he said he wanted the Government to be as clean as a hound's tooth. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I feel Congress, which is the supreme policy-making body of the United States, is in a very difficult position when it tries to criticize the ethics of anyone in Government while huge sums of money are spent in the election of its own Members.

As I said in my speech—and the Senator from Indiana and I agree on this point certainly—I believe all Senators are honest and they all are men of integrity. I said that several times.

But I believe that the yoke of campaign contributions is a very undesirable one in the minds and hearts of many Members of Congress. I believe all of

us would be relieved if it were not necessary to raise huge sums of money. However, let me ask the Senator this question: How many Representatives in Congress who received a benefaction from a certain economic group in the country would ever again receive a benefaction from that group if they voted against its desires or interests?

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator were to vote against the interest of a labor organization, does he think he would get so much as another dollar in his next campaign from the labor organization?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have no way of knowing.

Mr. CAPEHART. I submit that the Senator has answered his own question.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Indiana: Does he believe it is desirable for one man to go into office after receiving substantial contributions from a political-education fund of trade unions, and for another man to go into office after receiving even more substantial contributions from various segments of industry and business?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator's question is whether I believe that a Senator will necessarily be honest if he does not accept such contributions. My answer is that if he is an honest man and has integrity, such contributions will not influence him in any way. I do not believe they do. I do not believe anyone can buy the Senator from Oregon, or buy me. Neither do I believe that such contributions can buy any other Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator says nothing at all about—

Mr. CAPEHART. Contributions come from one's friends, and they come from people in one's own political party, and from people who, generally speaking, concur in the candidates' philosophy of government.

So far as my own experience is concerned, campaign contributions have never been given in return for a specific vote or for supporting a specific piece of legislation. If the Senator from Oregon has had any such experience, or if any other Senator has had such an experience, then they have experienced something that I definitely have not experienced.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My experience in the Senate has been very limited. However, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I believe the entire nature of campaign contributions, particularly when they reach the size they have reached in this country, is inherently inimical to democracy, no matter from what source they may come. I believe it is not consistent with democratic government. That is not my opinion alone, I may say to the Senator.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me finish this one statement. It was the opinion also, as I said earlier, of a man who was so dedicated to democracy as Theodore Roosevelt. He said that at a time when



campaign contributions were trivial, compared with what they are today.

Mr. CAPEHART. They were trivial because men running for office in those days did not have to use television or radio, and they did not have to pay the high cost of newspaper advertising. That is why they were trivial, although actually they were in proportion with today's value of money. In fact, they may have been higher than they are today, in proportion. Certainly today one gets very little time on television for \$1,000, as men who ran for office recently will testify. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I am sure, can tell us about that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Theodore Roosevelt was concerned about campaign contributions as far back as 1907. Does the Senator from Indiana believe that people in public life have changed since Theodore Roosevelt's time?

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that a person can be just as crooked for \$10 as for \$1,000 or for \$20. I am not talking about the amount of money involved. I am talking about integrity and honesty, and that it is impossible to legislate either.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Indiana is not answering my question.

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that a person is either honest or he is dishonest, and that a great deal of money or a little money will not make any difference.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Why does the Senator think Theodore Roosevelt felt concerned about it in 1907? He certainly was concerned about good government. I am sure Theodore Roosevelt understood people as well as the Senator or I understand them. Why does the Senator believe Theodore Roosevelt was so concerned about the matter?

Mr. CAPEHART. There was a great deal about Teddy Roosevelt that I never understood. I never understood, for example, why he ran in 1912, when he defeated the Republican Party. I do not care to discuss either Roosevelt, Teddy or the other one.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am sure we have used up sufficient time of the Senate, but I hope the Senator will examine my bill at the desk.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not quarreling with the Senator's bill at the moment. I shall read it and study it. I am talking about the general subject of honesty and integrity. We cannot legislate such things. Every man knows in his own soul whether he is or is not honest. I do not believe the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator can be bought.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Indiana believes that the Members of the Senate are honest and have integrity. So do I. But I wish to make it easier for them to exercise their natural honesty and integrity by freeing them from these campaign contributions. I hope the Senator from Indiana will be a cosponsor of my bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be glad to read the Senator's bill, but I will not cosponsor it.

#### NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the natural resource development was dis-

cussed last week before the Joint Committee on Economic Report by Secretary of the Interior McKay and his immediate predecessor, Oscar Chapman.

Inasmuch as Mr. Chapman's statement before this Joint Committee has been introduced into the RECORD by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I hereby request unanimous consent for reproduction in the RECORD of the statement made by Secretary McKay.

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

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DOUGLAS MCKAY BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT ON FEBRUARY 17, 1956

I appear today before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President in response to your invitation, to discuss the subject of natural resources. I appreciate this opportunity to set forth our views in this field and to support the legislative recommendations included in the President's Economic Report.

In highlight, the report finds every evidence of progress and general prosperity. High levels of production, employment, and income are expected to be sustained during the coming year. Underlying conditions are expected to remain favorable to further economic growth. The report recognizes that some groups of our citizens have not enjoyed a full measure of prosperity and proposes remedies for their plight. These remedies include certain farm programs, an Area Assistance program to cope with unemployment in some communities, improving the economic status of older persons, insurance against catastrophic illness, and a flood reinsurance and indemnity program.

I believe that one of the key statements in the President's message is this: "Today, we believe as strongly in economic progress through free and competitive enterprise as our fathers did, and we resent, as they did, any unnecessary intrusion of Government into private affairs." In keeping with this policy, the administration has sought to curtail governmental activities that could be handled as well or better by private enterprise. On the other hand, we have sought just as earnestly to further those programs properly dependent on Federal support and leadership.

A number of factors are recognized as contributing to the strength of our Nation. The main spring of our economy consists of the qualities of initiative, independence, and enterprise of our American people. The President's report gives evidence that the Government's role in the past several years has stimulated our citizens, our local communities, our businessmen, investors, workers, and consumers, to take the initiative and not wait for the Federal Government to do for them what they can do far better themselves.

The economy of the Nation is dependent in the final analysis upon the physical resource base available to our people. For this reason the Department of the Interior, which is primarily concerned with the conservation and development of natural resources, plays an important role in the maintenance of our economic stability and growth. In my remarks I shall refer to our activities in the water, land, and mineral fields, and also touch upon our responsibilities with respect to human resources. In addition, I shall mention briefly the flood control program of the Corps of Engineers, since I believe it will not otherwise be described in these hearings.

#### WATER RESOURCES

In the field of water resources the scope and cost of the needed development are so vast that on this count alone all interests must carry their share. Federal, State, and local Governments and private groups and

individuals all have a responsibility. In many cases non-Federal interests can best carry out needed improvements. In other cases Federal participation is a necessary element in accomplishing broad national aims.

The Federal Government can contribute in a very substantial degree by undertaking those multiple-purpose projects which may not readily be undertaken by others. Where projects are of great size or complexity, or are interstate in character, or where they involve the national interest in such fields as flood control, navigation, reclamation, fish and wildlife conservation, recreation, and pollution abatement, and produce many benefits which are not always assessable against the beneficiaries, there is an excellent opportunity for the Federal Government to supplement the enterprise of others in the work of resources development.

Under the partnership policy of this administration, emphasis is placed on sharing the cost of projects with the groups receiving direct benefits from them. This approach serves to multiply the effect of Federal expenditures in the stimulation of conservation and development.

The President's Budget Message for the fiscal year 1957 carries recommendations for resources conservation and development which are expressive of this policy. Programs for flood control, reclamation, and multiple-purpose water resources development will expand over the 1956 level. In accordance with the policy of encouraging non-Federal responsibility for water resources projects, with Federal cooperation where national interests are involved, the President has supported legislation which would change certain presently authorized Federal projects to partnership projects. Funds for the Federal share of the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma were appropriated for the fiscal year 1956, and construction by non-Federal interests of this project and the Priest Rapids project in Washington is expected to be under way in the fiscal year 1957. Work on the Cougar multiple-purpose project in Oregon, begun as a Federal project in the fiscal year 1956, will continue in 1957 on a basis which, under pending partnership legislation, would permit local public interests to install power facilities and assure adaptation of the power features to the requirements of the city of Eugene.

There is no doubt that the present policy of actively encouraging local interests to assume their fair share of power development has been effective. The willingness of local groups to develop their own power sources is evidenced by the large increase in permits and licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission for the construction of hydroelectric projects since the partnership plan of this Administration started. The tremendous increase in such permits and licenses, from less than 1.2 million kilowatts in 1951 to more than 5.4 million kilowatts authorized in both 1954 and 1955, is a concrete result of our efforts to reestablish non-Federal initiative in the power field.

The President's Budget includes \$20 million under proposed legislation to enable the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to participate, in 1957, in new partnership water developments, such as the Green Peter-White Bridge Reservoir in Oregon, the Brucers Eddy Reservoir in Idaho, and the John Day Reservoir in Washington and Oregon. The proposed legislation would also authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to assist local organizations by means of loans and grants for small reclamation projects.

Budget recommendations also provide for progress in the collection of basic data on hydrology, topography, and other physical factors needed in the planning and design of water development projects. Investigations of proposed projects and advance planning of authorized projects will go forward at rates which will provide for the orderly development of needed water resources.

Specific recommendations in the economic report relating to natural resources, other than those promoting agricultural readjustments which I assume were covered in your hearings on agricultural policy, are discussed briefly as your letter of invitation suggested.

1. The economic report recommends an acceleration of work on flood-control projects: The severity of the floods that occurred last year in the Northeast and the Far West has emphasized again the need for protection against the human and economic losses resulting from such catastrophes. Many private groups and individuals, as well as the Federal, State, and local governments, offered prompt and generous assistance to the communities and citizens struck by disaster. Nevertheless, needs of this type should be reduced in the future, and when they arise should be met more systematically. Toward these ends the economic report recommends that the Federal Government accelerate work on practical flood-control projects, supplemented by a flood reinsurance and indemnity program.

While public works designed for flood control are primarily the concern of the Corps of Engineers, Interior's Bureau of Reclamation includes in its multiple-purpose reservoirs the maximum economical provision for flood control by storage and river regulation. Shasta and Friant Dams, for example, performed this vital service during the recent storms in California which brought tragic floods to unprotected streams.

A supplemental appropriation has been recommended by the President to enable the Corps of Engineers to accelerate its flood-control program. I am advised by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, that in the absence of Federal works, flood damage on main rivers and major tributaries would approach \$1 billion annually. Federal works already constructed serve to reduce this potential damage by about one-half.

The present Federal flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers is of comparatively recent origin, dating from 1928 in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi and from 1936 for the country as a whole. It has been expanded by various flood-control acts of the Congress through the act of 1954, until at present the active flood-control work authorized has a total estimated cost of \$9.1 billion. Congress through fiscal year 1956 has appropriated \$4.1 billion, leaving about \$5 billion required to complete the authorized program. At the current (fiscal year 1956) rate of appropriations, completion of this authorized work would extend over about 27 years.

This program, however, does not represent a complete solution of the flood problem as current investigations are constantly developing additional practical flood control improvements. The recent act of 1954 authorized new flood-control works with an estimated cost of \$300 million. And it may be anticipated that further additions to the flood-control program will result from such studies. It is evident, however, that there will always remain some residual of flood damage, even though the potential may be greatly reduced, as it will probably never be possible to eliminate all flood damage within the limits of engineering and economic feasibility.

At the present time the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army has re-examined its flood-control program for the New England and North Atlantic areas in the light of the destructive floods of 1955 which caused damage of almost \$700 million in those two areas combined. This current acceleration of the flood-control program has been aimed at New England and the North Atlantic area because recent flood occurrences have emphasized the hazard to life and the very heavy physical damage to which those areas are exposed.

Recent floods in northern California, southern Oregon, and in Nevada caused damages of about \$100 million, which would have been doubled without the Federal works now provided in that area.

2. The report recommends authorization of the construction of the Upper Colorado River project and other needed water resources developments: The Upper Colorado River project, which is vital to several States and which involves generation of power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, and other functions, is an outstanding example of the type of project that the Federal Government should undertake. Recommendations concerning this project, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, three other new Reclamation projects, and other needed developments of water resources were presented in the budget message. The estimated total cost of the 5 proposed Reclamation projects is about \$1.1 billion, with 1957 expenditures estimated at \$8.6 million.

Justification of these projects is founded on the national interest in providing economic strength to the West and to the Nation through the development of its natural resources. Water resources developments have been responsible for the settlement and stabilization of important areas of our West. The recommended extensions of this program will bring to other areas the direct and indirect benefits already being produced by the Central Valley project in California, the Columbia Basin project in Washington, the Missouri River Basin project, the Colorado-Big Thompson project, and others. These are long-range investments requiring a number of years for construction and an additional period for settlement and development, before attaining a fully productive status. By careful planning, continuation of a moderate program of long-range reclamation development can be directed to the production of nonsurplus crops so long as this problem remains. Ultimately, as population growth, higher dietary goals, and the limiting factor of water available for crop growth combine in the decades before us to tax our agricultural productive capacity, the reclamation program will complement other efforts to meet the food and fiber requirements of our country.

In addition to the specific recommendations, the Economic Report calls attention to the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 17, 1956. The report is the result of a detailed study of our water problems and of the present powers and activities of the various Federal establishments engaged in water resource development. The policies set out in the report embody a framework within which the Federal Government, with State and local governments and other non-Federal interests, may cooperate to develop our water resources.

The report recognizes fully the responsibilities of the Federal Government for leadership, guidance, and action in this field. At the same time it recognizes that there are a multitude of water developments which are more appropriate for regional, State, or local activity. The report points out that the principles which recognize water rights as property rights should be accepted, and that determinations as to disposition of water should recognize such rights. It recommends that a study be made under the leadership of the Federal Government in collaboration with the States and local entities with reference to property rights to water and the social and economic development of the Nation and the area.

Set forth in the report is a pattern for the widest possible public participation in water resources projects. Organizational changes are recommended to coordinate more closely Federal and non-Federal activity and to make possible more effective

executive guidance. The intent of these proposed changes is to provide the States and local water resources agencies a more adequate voice in the planning and development of projects and facilitate joint participation by all of the affected Federal interests. By this type of cooperative effort we should be assured that all possible uses of water are adequately considered.

In summary, may I say that under our policy in the field of water resources we will encourage State and local responsibility and private enterprise; we will avoid greater demands for Federal investment than our national income will permit; and we will strongly support the Federal Government's proper participation in developing the water resources of the Nation.

#### LAND RESOURCES

This section of my statement is labeled "Land Resources" because that is the name we use in Interior for one of our three general subdivisions, the second being "Water and Power Development" which I have just discussed, and the third being "Mineral Resources." I should point out, however, that in addition to our regular land management functions, land resources includes the related functions of recreation, fish and wildlife resources, Indian affairs, and territories. In a number of ways, these functions have a significant relationship to the national economy.

#### The National Park System

On February 2, I announced that the National Park Service with the approval of President Eisenhower has embarked on the most comprehensive and potentially rewarding program of protection, improvement and development in its history.

The program is outlined in a report entitled "Mission 66," which has been submitted to the Congress. The report, prepared by National Park Service Director Conrad L. Wirth and a special staff, analyzes current critical deficiencies in the park system which is equipped to handle 25 million visitors and last year was overwhelmed by twice that many. The report sets forth detailed recommendations for equipping the system to handle an expected 80 million visitors by 1966. Revised budget estimates sent to Congress by the President would provide funds to get the program under way this summer. The revised budget calls for \$66,238,000 as compared with \$45,029,000 appropriated for the current fiscal year.

It will take 10 years to complete the program because a lot of catching up must be done before we come abreast of current needs. Furthermore, we do not plan a patchwork, piecemeal approach to the problem.

Benefits of the Mission 66 program will spread far beyond the 181 areas of the National Park System.

Of major importance is the provision in this program for the development by 1961 of a nationwide recreation plan aimed at the ultimate establishment of systems of recreational areas and facilities for which each level of Government—Federal, State, and local—will bear its proper share of responsibility. This provides a prime partnership opportunity for keeping abreast of the healthy growing interest of the American people in the great outdoors.

#### Hunting and sport fishing

Public use of the national wildlife refuges, too, is increasing. The refuge areas were used by a record-breaking total of 5,202,260 persons during the year ending June 30, 1955, compared with 4,608,909 for the year ending June 30, 1954. Reports from the various States show that there were 18,580,813 fishing licenses issued during the fiscal year 1954, an increase of nearly a million over the number issued during the preceding fiscal year. Hunting licenses issued during fiscal



year 1954 totaled 14,073,386, as compared with 13,997,115 for the preceding year. The assumption is justified that increases have occurred in 1955 over 1954.

A substantial amount of money is expended each year by these hunters and fishermen in connection with their sports. Since these expenditures are made for a variety of goods and services, they represent income to countless business enterprises throughout the United States. The exact amount of these expenditures is not known but recent surveys by a number of States indicate that more than \$4 billion probably was spent on these sports during 1955. For the first time a comprehensive national survey is being conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine the importance of hunting and fishing to the Nation's economy during calendar year 1955, in terms of time and money. Results of the survey will be available during the summer of 1956.

#### *Commercial fisheries*

As far as commercial fisheries are concerned, the per capita consumption of fish increased from 10.8 pounds in 1953 to 11.1 pounds in 1954. Per capita consumption of fish in 1955 is expected to be near that for 1954. However, it must be stated that the per capita consumption was supported by increased imports because of a decrease in domestic production.

Preliminary estimates indicate that the total catch made by American fishermen during 1955 was 4.6 billion pounds, compared with 4.7 billion pounds caught during 1954. A preliminary estimate of the value indicates that the money paid the fishermen for the delivered catch will be about 10 percent below the \$360 million paid last year. The value of the fishery products originating from our domestic resources during 1955 is estimated to be \$522 million at the processor level, \$738 million at the wholesaler level, and \$963 million at the retailer level.

The capital investment in commercial fisheries increased by about \$8 million in 1955 over 1954.

The productivity of the fishery industries is expected to be increased by the research work presently done under the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act; proposed improvements in skills and in technology, as well as in marketing techniques, if applied by the fishery industries, should have a favorable result on the economy of the commercial fisheries.

The Department endorses the proposal to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. In recent years the increasing pollution in numerous streams throughout the Nation has posed a serious threat to the maintenance of fish and wildlife resources in these waters.

#### *The public lands*

Our expanding economy is creating added demands for the use and development of the public lands and their resources. Individuals and corporations want to use and acquire public lands for grazing, logging, mining, farming, industry, commerce, residence, recreation, and other purposes. States and counties are showing increased interest in acquiring or using public lands for purposes such as recreation, wildlife, and forest management. Expanding Federal programs such as national defense and atomic energy create demands for large areas. The programs of the Bureau of Land Management are administered to harmonize these needs and promote multiple use wherever possible. Of special significance are substantial net revenues to the Federal Treasury. Receipts from oil and gas leasing in fiscal year 1955 were \$209 million, including those from the outer Continental Shelf. Receipts from timber sales reached about \$25 million, mostly from lands managed for sustained yield. Total cash receipts covered into the Treasury in fiscal year 1955 were about \$240 million. Total Bureau expenditures were \$14,660,000.

The work backlog of the Bureau of Land Management represents potential net revenues which can be realized only when the cases are processed. Higher work output is being sought through greater work efficiency and larger appropriations. As the program develops, greater net revenues will accrue to the Treasury than would otherwise be the case.

#### *Territorial resources*

Alaska is a great storehouse of untapped natural wealth in the form of minerals, forests, and waterpower. Tremendous acreages have been placed under mineral leases for oil exploration in Alaska during the last few years by the Bureau of Land Management and a number of test wells have been drilled. In the forestry field, the first of what is hoped will be several large pulp mills in Alaska, completed its first year of operation successfully in 1955 at Ketchikan. During the past 2 years, timber sales have been made or advertised for large blocks of timber of 3 more major timber for pulp or paper developments at Juneau, Sitka, and Wrangell. In each case the timber sales are made by the Forest Service and the investment is by private enterprise.

In the other areas under the general jurisdiction of the Department, there are some resource-development activities on a small scale which may be of interest. In American Samoa during the past year a tuna canning factory was successfully placed in operation through contract with a private canning company. This plant permits use of a substantial resource of the neighboring waters and also provides employment to many Samoans. The Virgin Islands Corporation, a wholly owned Government corporation, continues its work of stimulating agricultural development on the island of St. Croix. Of greatest interest is its program of constructing small dams to conserve the runoff of water and provide a water supply during the dry season.

#### *Improving the Indian economy*

In line with the economic report of the President which proposed area-assistance programs for communities experiencing persistent unemployment, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has initiated an economic-development program for Indian reservations. The objective of this program is to provide additional employment for Indian people by encouraging the location of private industries on or near Indian reservations. The natural resources of many reservations are inadequate, even when fully developed, to support the human population at more than a minimum subsistence level. These are quite frequently areas of chronic underemployment for which comprehensive economic development and voluntary relocation programs are essential.

Adult education is a part of this program. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has initiated an adult-education program to provide elementary schooling for adult Indians who missed the advantages of education in their youth and are now handicapped by lack of ability to read, write, speak, or understand the English language. This program is designed to help these people broaden their opportunities for employment and improve the living standards of their families.

#### *MINERAL RESOURCES*

Referring now to minerals, metals, and the minerals fuels, few people realize how essential these materials are. We are inclined to take them too much for granted, despite the fact that our mechanized economy could not exist without a long list of metals and could not run without energy obtained from coal, oil, and gas.

We have some of these things in abundance, but we should never forget that we have to find a new ton of iron ore or a new barrel of oil for every unit produced. Actually, the extractive industries must do much

better than break even in finding new sources if they are to satisfy the demands of this area of phenomenal economic growth.

Because of the fact that mineral resources are nonrenewable, more and more emphasis is being placed upon methods of conserving them. The term "conservation" has been defined in many ways but to us the most intelligent concept is that of prudent use, not miserly hoarding which stunts growth. The Department of the Interior takes the position that wise utilization of our nonrenewable resources can come about only through increased knowledge in the fundamental earth sciences and their technical applications. The actual job of developing and mining minerals is one for private industry, but the Government fits prominently into the picture because of the extremely wide assortment of forces, in and out of Government, that affect the minerals economy. The matter of bringing mineral deposits into production is a long-range proposition that generally must be preceded by a tremendous amount of fundamental scientific research and appraisal.

In this connection I might say that we took a comprehensive look at our mineral position during the past year and decided that minerals research and development activities within the Department need to be greatly expanded, and I am happy to say that the President's budget for the next fiscal year proposes increases in this direction. If approved by the Congress these dollar increases will be used to accelerate topographic and geologic mapping activities, to initiate new geophysical and geochemical investigations, and to pursue much needed research in mining and metallurgy.

The Nation is now in a sounder position for meeting its minerals mobilization needs than at any time in history despite unprecedented growth in minerals consumption and increased dependence on foreign supply. This is because of a joint program of research, stockpiling, and assisting domestic minerals industries. Mobilization needs, of course, are constantly being revised as industry and trade shifts cause changes in supply.

As a whole the minerals industries enjoyed a prosperous year in 1955. Paced by strong increases in fuels, copper, and iron ore, mineral production in this country jumped approximately 11 percent to a new high of \$15.8 billion. Most of this increased value was due to increases in output, although appreciably higher prices for some materials helped. The bituminous coal mining industry reversed a 7-year downtrend. Actual shortages developed for certain metals in 1955 and a few still persist. For copper, aluminum, and nickel, the Government was able to ease the shortage by diverting to industrial use materials originally destined for the stockpile. In other instances, notably in lead and zinc, it was necessary to accelerate purchases in order to fortify the stockpile position and to stimulate domestic production to levels deemed more satisfactory for mobilization purposes.

There are some trouble spots within the domestic metal mining industry. In most of these instances our resources are of marginal nature and producers must have some kind of Government assistance if they are to compete in the world market. During the Korean emergency, the Government established programs for the purchase of tungsten, manganese, chrome, and other ores at prices substantially above normal world commercial levels. What action should be taken when the present programs end? Each situation must be examined on a case-by-case basis, and we are now in the process of making these studies.

The problem on foreign competition in minerals and metals production will become more pronounced as time goes on. Common sense tells us that we should not become too dependent upon foreign sources. On the other hand, the security and prosperity of



this country is heavily dependent upon international friendship and cooperation. Many of our neighbors and friends count strongly on the production and sale of minerals and other raw materials in order to keep their economies strong. Statesmanship of the highest order as well as good economic sense will be required if we are to keep this vexing problem in proper perspective.

No set formula, for example, can be devised to settle the petroleum supply question to everyone's satisfaction. Imports year by year are supplying more and more of our requirements. Both crude imports and domestic production were up in 1955 and the oil industry turned in another record performance in new drilling. Further, huge sums of American private capital were active abroad. Our appetite for liquid fuels is enormous, and it is my personal opinion that it cannot be fully satisfied without petroleum imported from friendly foreign nations.

The coal problem is being attacked in many ways. Research in production and marketing has been expanded and fundamental research on coal utilization continues to be a large feature of the work of the Bureau of Mines. Special projects are under way regarding the unwatering of anthracite mines, in improving production, and in the partial substitution of anthracite for coke in blast furnaces.

Federal assistance to depressed communities is especially applicable to coal-producing communities. We are confident that the major problems of the coal industry can be met by energetic action on the part of the industry assisted by reasonable action by the Government.

Increased success in exploration is necessary in expanding our minerals resources. It is our view that minerals exploration and development in a commercial sense should be carried out by private mining interests, but the Government assists these efforts by extending financial aid in the search for strategic minerals and metals. The Defense Minerals Exploration Administration processes a substantial flow of applications and has already disbursed more than \$14 million on a sharing basis. More than a million dollars has been recovered in royalties. For each one million dollars invested by the Government in successful exploration projects, it is estimated that approximately \$49 million worth of new potential mineral resources have resulted. The ratio is something like 30 to 1 taking into account the unsuccessful projects.

It is my feeling that the Federal Government can make its major contribution in the research field. The research policy of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey is that of doing the things that the industry cannot readily do for itself, thereby supplementing private efforts. This policy is illustrated by the recent recessing of the Bureau of Mines zirconium plant after private production was finally started, based to a large extent on Bureau research and production technology, and by similar action in titanium and oil shale pilot plant work. Zirconium is on the threshold of becoming a new industry like titanium, in which hundreds of millions of dollars will be invested.

During 1955 we dedicated a new Bureau of Mines Rare and Precious Metals Experiment Station at Reno, Nevada. Here work will be done on a long list of rare metals which are just beginning to receive attention. Research elsewhere continued aggressively and successfully in many directions, including for example: Studies on the treatment of low-grade sources of aluminum, which are widespread in the United States; improvement of light-metal alloys; study of synthetic asbestos; development of a mechanical planer operated by remote control to be used in phosphate mining; and work on special instruments for

the study of large-scale caving methods of mining ore.

Examples of research on fuels include the effects of different drilling fluids on the permeability to oil of reservoir rocks; instability of liquid fuels in storage; retorting of oil shale; hydrogenation of coal; and utilization of nuclear energy in gasification of coal.

A helium shortage was met by unprecedented increases in production and productivity. Work is proceeding in the construction of a new plant, but it appears that still another new plant will be necessary soon because of rapid increase in both civilian and military demands.

The industrial safety program for minerals has been extended, as was also research on fire-damp ignition, mineral, and industrial dusts, explosions and ignitions. A safety campaign to reduce roof-fall accidents has been launched, and safety competitions and associations have been extended appreciably.

The Geological Survey work on topographic and geologic mapping is progressing. The Geological Survey also completed a great many investigations of mineralized areas and on the geological conditions for different degrees of mineralization. Research on methods of geological research and testing continued, with development of several new measures of test criteria and techniques.

The enactment of Public Laws 167, 213, and 359 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), have enabled the Government, before issuance of patent, to manage the surface resources of mining claims and have opened to mining location many areas previously withdrawn for power and water uses. The concept of conservation of mineral resources and their prudent use should continue to provide the Government with a substantial source of net income.

This is an optimistic note on which to conclude a brief account of our stewardship of mineral responsibility. Continuation of these policies should enable the Nation's mineral resources to become a sounder base for defense and to provide for steady growth.

In conclusion, it should be noted that in addition to their economic returns not readily expressible in monetary returns, many resource-development programs yield financial receipts of considerable magnitude. These receipts consist chiefly of power revenues, timber sales, and mineral leases on public lands including the Outer Continental Shelf. In the aggregate, such receipts by all Federal agencies managing public resources are estimated in the 1957 budget to total \$810 million in the fiscal year 1957.

#### SOURCE OF FIGURES USED BY RAYMOND MOLEY WITH REFERENCE TO CERTAIN LANDS AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE HUMID AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in a recent Senate floor speech, I rather thoroughly discussed some claims emanating from southern California water interests relative to some allegedly low-cost lands available for development in the humid areas of the United States.

Inasmuch as these claims were tied in to reference to the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, I sent a sample of the southern California propaganda to the Soil Conservation Service Director and requested a copy of the research report from which the imposing statistical information was compiled.

SCS Administrator D. A. Williams subsequently informed me that no research report had been made by his agency on that specific matter. On the

contrary, he stated that the information obviously had originated from some informal visits paid to his agency's offices by a Mr. John U. Terrell, whom I have identified as an employee of the Colorado River Association of Southern California. Mr. Williams further stated that he had told Mr. Terrell that the figures he had provided him were at least 10 years old and probably unreliable.

Mr. Williams also pointed out that reclamation of land in the area concerned would involve clearing costs of \$50 to \$120 an acre, drainage costs of \$60 to \$150 per acre, and annual fertilizer costs of \$10 to \$60 per acre. Furthermore, he pointed out that some of the land lies in small tracts, inaccessible for efficient use, and other areas must remain as they are until major improvements such as leveeing and mostly drainage outlets are established.

In order that my colleagues can review my remarks in connection with the text of this letter, I hereby request unanimous consent to have this letter from Mr. Williams reproduced at this point in my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,  
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1956.  
Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: I am answering your letter of January 13, 1956, inquiring about substantial areas of idle land in the Midwest.

The map which was attached to your letter was new to me but apparently the figures could be identified as coming from the Soil Conservation Service as the result of Mr. John U. Terrell's visit to my office last September. At that time he asked for figures on the amount of idle land in a number of Midwest and Southern States. I advised him that in 1944 the Soil Conservation Service made a land classification of the United States, based on the use of land at that time, but that these figures were more than 10 years old and probably not too reliable. Then he asked if he could call on some of our field offices to discuss the matter of idle land. I agreed to this request and so advised our State conservationists. I stated to them that since the land facts he desired were obtained from surveys and estimates made with the use of public funds, and that this information was not confidential, they could give it to him. In my letter to them I specifically stated, "We have not agreed to supply any interpretation of those data." A copy of this letter is enclosed.

There was no reason to ask Mr. Terrell to submit the figures he obtained by visiting our State offices and he did not do so. Therefore, we had no indication as to how the data were to be used.

It is apparent, from the acreage figures on the map enclosed in your letter, there is greater variation in the figures between the States than should be the case if conditions in the different States were consistently reflected in the figures on a uniform basis. Since the estimates given were the result of verbal discussions with some 20 individuals or groups, some variation was to be expected. However, with due allowance for such differences, it would appear that in some instances, at least, quite different interpretations as to what data was desired modified the figures used. Some of the State figures are identical with the estimates made in the 1944 survey. On the other hand, we find that some of the States at-



tempted to hurriedly revise these rough, early estimates and bring them up to date based on present land use. Under these conditions the revised figures for Michigan, for example, would not be comparable to the old Wisconsin figures even if similar concepts for idle land were used which appears open to question. The present land conditions in the two States are actually much more comparable than the figures used indicate.

We were not in any way involved in any interpretation placed upon these figures or implications drawn therefrom. In fact, the Service no longer uses the term "idle land" because of the wide variations in what different people consider the term to mean. The Bureau of the Census has had a similar experience with the term.

I am able to supply only very general information with regard to estimated cost of bringing land not now in production into agricultural use. A small acreage of land included in the figures undoubtedly is land that could be put into cultivation for less than \$20 per acre. This is because it has been only temporarily abandoned. However, a much greater amount of this land will need rather extensive treatment before it can be either pastured or cultivated. The estimated cost of clearing land varies from about \$50 to as much as \$120 per acre depending upon the use to which it is to be put. For that land which needs drainage, and a large acreage of it does, the estimated cost would vary from about \$60 to as much as \$150 per acre. To these costs would need to be added, in many places, a fertilizer cost varying from as little as \$10 to as much as \$60 per acre depending again upon the use and kind of crop to be grown.

It should be pointed out that some of this land lies in small tracts inaccessible for efficient use. Other areas must remain as they are until major improvements such as leveling and costly drainage outlets are established.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. WILLIAMS,  
Administrator.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, inasmuch as this information was made a matter of public record on the floor and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, I was surprised to see figures on this subject comparable to those of the southern California water interests injected into a statement by Columnist Raymond Moley, being distributed today, without any reference to this SCS rebuttal or to any source material. The figures are utilized in a statement entitled "The Case Against Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects," contained in a publication released today of the American Enterprise Association, the Upper Colorado Reclamation Project.

After a reference to an article of his own, which, he said, contained abundant reference to "authorities in the Department of Agriculture," Mr. Moley states:

Here I should like to call attention to another survey made from data gathered by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. This shows that there now exists on improved farms nearly 21 million acres of good land lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States. This land is neither woodland, pasture, nor publicly owned. It is located in regions where there is plenty of rainfall, and in most States, where the growing season is much longer than in the upper Colorado region. All that might be needed to bring this land into cultivation would be an expenditure of from \$50 to \$150 an acre when and if there is need for more food and fiber.

Mr. Moley then goes on to list specific acreage figures in some 20 States.

At first, I thought that Mr. Moley's source for these figures and his development costs must be the minority views contained in the report of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the Colorado River storage project, but a check of these report figures, which also were not supported with any specific source reference, disclosed that radically different totals were given for the same States.

Reclamation costs per acre given in the minority views on H. R. 3383 were from \$60 to \$100 per acre.

Reclamation costs per acre given by Mr. Moley were from \$50 to \$150 per acre.

Acreage figures given in the House minority views on H. R. 3383 are as follows:

Alabama	683,000
Arkansas	1,865,000
Florida	1,970,000
Georgia	1,721,000
Illinois	69,000
Indiana	135,000
Kentucky	170,000
Louisiana	2,769,000
Michigan	690,000
Minnesota	874,000
Mississippi	1,272,000
Missouri	323,000
New York	100,000
North Carolina	1,157,000
Ohio	95,000
Pennsylvania	90,000
South Carolina	996,000
Tennessee	242,000
Texas	3,928,000
Virginia	514,000
Wisconsin	316,000

Acreage figures given by Mr. Moley were as follows:

South	
Alabama	823,564
Arkansas	2,723,547
Kentucky	671,673
Louisiana	2,487,300
Mississippi	1,270,691
Tennessee	279,563
Total	8,256,338

Southeast	
Florida	2,037,392
Georgia	972,748
North Carolina	4,264,763
South Carolina	492,309
Virginia	919,307
Total	8,686,519

State	
Illinois	627,185
Indiana	231,780
Michigan	1,761,390
Minnesota	564,702
Ohio	491,098
Wisconsin	124,133
Iowa	50,759
Missouri	143,249
Total	3,994,296

Grand total..... 20,937,153

If Mr. Moley will provide me with the specific source of his information on this subject, covered on pages 67 to 69 in the AEA publication, I shall be pleased to make the information available to the House Interior Committee, and to check it with the source material, if it is available in the Soil Conservation Service.

I do not wish to suggest that the source of Mr. Moley's statistics on humid land

reclamation is the southern California water interests who are trying to defeat development of water in the upper basin. However, in view of my previous action to expose the questionable nature of Mr. Terrell's research on this subject—which must have escaped the attention of Columnist Moley—I feel that the matter should be thoroughly aired in fairness to everyone.

Any factual matter on this subject submitted to me will be brought to the attention of this body, inasmuch as the Members of Congress are sure to be included in the distribution of this American Enterprise Association publication, as a public information service.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is this American Enterprise Association to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. WATKINS. I understand it is a nonprofit organization which tries to do an objective job in reporting and analyzing various pieces of legislation coming before the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Does it have headquarters in Utah, Colorado, and New York?

Mr. WATKINS. I understand the headquarters are in Washington, or possibly in New York. I understand there is no one sponsoring or contributing to the organization west of the Mississippi River. The association is in an area where reclamation is not much of a problem.

#### REPORT ON FINANCIAL OPERATIONS OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have just received from Philip Young, Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, a report on the financial operations of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act for the first policy year ending November 19, 1955.

At a previous session, when I was chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I had the privilege of sponsoring this legislation, and I am pleased that the first year's operation has demonstrated that it is an important part of the Federal worker's program.

During the first year's operation a substantial contingency reserve has been developed, and it must be maintained and augmented to meet future increased charges for which the program is already committed.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

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

UNITED STATES  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,  
BUREAU OF DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS,  
January 30, 1956.

#### REPORT OF FIRST POLICY YEAR OPERATIONS UNDER THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954

The benefits specified in the Insurance Act are provided under a policy of group life and

accidental death and dismemberment insurance purchased by the Commission as authorized by the Act. The period from August 29, 1954, through November 19, 1955, is established as the first policy year. The act provides for an accounting by the insurer at the end of each policy year, showing the amounts of accrued premiums, claim charges, and expense and risk charges. Any excess of premiums over the sum of all charges is held by the insurer as a special interest-bearing contingency reserve to be used only for charges under the Federal group policy.

Premiums to the insurer are derived from (1) withholdings from the salaries of insured employees under age 65, at the rate of 25 cents biweekly for each \$1,000 of group life insurance, and (2) contributions from the appropriations of employing agencies equal to one-half of employee withholdings. The premium paid to the insurer is 98 3/4 percent of the sum of these amounts. The remaining 1 1/4 percent is retained in the employees' life insurance fund to meet other authorized expenses.

As was fully anticipated, premiums for the first policy year exceeded all current charges by a substantial margin. Any other result would have indicated the inevitable need for an increase in premiums, a decrease in benefits, or both. The program did not provide insurance for employees retired at its inception, but grants continuing protection without further cost to employees thereafter retiring on an immediate annuity, for disability or with at least 15 years of service. As the number of insured retired employees increases, claim charges must rise well above the first year level, without a corresponding increase in premium income.

Accrued premiums for the first policy year amounted to \$112,700,000, and the contingency reserve earned interest of \$720,000. Against this total of \$113,420,000, the following charges were made:

Life Insurance claims.....	\$56,248,000
Accidental death and dismemberment claims.....	5,450,000
Conversion charges.....	579,000
Expense and risk charges (including taxes of \$2,204,000)....	3,509,000
<b>Total charges.....</b>	<b>65,786,000</b>

The contingency reserve at the end of the first policy year thus amounted to \$47,634,000, and is available for future increasing claim charges. As previously indicated, this increase will be primarily due to the provision for continuing insurance after retirement.

We estimate that at the end of the first policy year, the liability for insurance then held by retired employees is \$26,500,000. While the act does not require a segregated reserve to cover this liability, elementary prudence requires that it be recognized as a charge against the contingency reserve. No further income from withholdings and contributions is available with respect to insured retired employees.

Employees over age 65 constitute another group in respect to which no further income will accrue to the employees' life insurance fund. There are over 40,000 such insured employees, about twice the number of those retired with insurance at no further cost to them.

There is another facet of the insurance program which must not be ignored in assessing future claims on its resources. Section 10 of the act authorizes the Commission to arrange for the assumption by the fund of the insurance held by members of nonprofit associations of Federal or District of Columbia employees. In their reports on the 1955 amendment which became the present law, the Civil Service Committees of both the Senate and House cited an estimate of \$33 million as the cost of this provision.

While this item is not a direct charge against the contingency reserve held under the group policy, and while the impact of this cost will be spread over a period of years, nevertheless the existence of a substantial section 10 liability requires that the contingency reserve be built up to the greatest extent possible in the early years of the program. This will free a portion of future income to meet the certain costs under section 10.

In summary, the first year's operation of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act has been highly satisfactory, both as a much needed addition to the Federal personnel program and from the financial standpoint. A substantial contingency reserve has been developed; it must be maintained and augmented to meet future increased charges for which the program is already committed. The reserve is by no possible interpretation a surplus which would justify liberalization of the benefits or reduction of income from employee withholdings and agency contributions.

#### GOVERNMENT BEEF GRADING AND GOVERNMENT MEAT PURCHASES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have just received two letters from Mr. A. G. Pickett, secretary of the Kansas Livestock Association, in regard to action taken by the board of directors and advisory committeemen of the Kansas Livestock Association on Government beef grading and Government meat purchases.

The Kansas Livestock Association has a membership composed of most of the livestock men in our State. It has an outstanding record for constructive suggestions in behalf of the livestock industry, as well as the continuance of a sound agricultural economy.

During the past few months my office has received literally hundreds of letters from livestock producers urging that some correction be made in the Government grading of beef, and that the purchase of livestock be stepped up.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two letters to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,  
Topeka, Kans., February 15, 1956.  
Hon. FRANK CARLSON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CARLSON: The board of directors and advisory committeemen of the Kansas Livestock Association, at a meeting Friday, February 10, went on record as believing that present Government beef grading has been one of the greatest market depressing factors the past fall and winter.

Two points are involved:

First, many retail outlets demand United States Choice beef and unless the buyer is certain the animals will grade well up in the Choice grade when slaughtered, as much as \$2 or more is taken off the price.

Second, graders have apparently tightened up on the grades. There seems to be plenty of proof that the past fall and winter it has taken from 30 to 50 days more heavy feeding to make cattle grade Choice than was true in the past. Graders seem to have forgotten that grade specifications were changed a few years ago.

Inasmuch as we have gotten to the place where the United States Choice stamp sets

the price on beef, this situation has caused feeders to take a terrific beating. A little better break on this grading end would have given more actual relief to cattle feeders than any one thing.

Very truly yours,  
KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,  
A. G. PICKETT, Secretary.

KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,  
Topeka, Kans., February 15, 1956.  
Hon. FRANK CARLSON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CARLSON: At the board meeting Friday, February 10, the Kansas Livestock Association went on record as favoring the stepped-up Government meat purchases as recommended by the river livestock market group.

Such purchases for the military, school lunches and foreign outlets should be stepped up immediately if the present depressed market situation is to be relieved.

Very truly yours,  
KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,  
A. G. PICKETT, Secretary.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS CONNECTED WITH THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate Concurrent Resolution 65.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds further with the consideration of the resolution, I should like to offer an amendment. The amendment would simply provide that the expenses of the proposed joint committee, in the amount of \$25,000, shall be paid entirely from the contingent fund of the Senate.

I offer this amendment at the suggestion of the financial clerk of the Senate. He has advised me that the language of Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, as it now reads on page 6, would necessitate the maintenance of duplicate accounts by the disbursing officers of both the Senate and the House. The disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives concurs in approving the proposed amendment.

I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.



The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 11, it is proposed, after the word "paid", to strike out "one-half."

On page 6, lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out "and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives."

On page 6, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "Disbursements to pay."

On page 6, it is proposed to strike out lines 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 65 was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. It was reported with the unanimous recommendation that it be agreed to. It is not a resolution which would effect any change in the Constitution or laws, but provides for a thorough investigation of a great many different subjects, about which there presently is uncertainty which should be resolved.

Under the resolution the committee would decide, in the first place, whether or not the various subjects should be resolved, and, if so, how such resolution should take place.

I trust the concurrent resolution will meet with the unanimous approval of the Senate. It provides a sound basis for the submission and promotion of remedial legislation necessary to make the statutes certain and complete concerning presidential elections, successions, and duties.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There are two principal questions immediately before the country: First, the question of Presidential workload, and, second, disability or inability on the part of the President to perform the duties of his Office.

The Senate Government Operations Committee is currently examining the problem of Presidential workload, and the Senate Judiciary Committee has pending before it proposed legislation on the subject of Presidential disability.

On the House side, a special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee is now studying the subject of Presidential disability.

In view of these activities, will the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, explain the need for creating a new and joint committee to look into these questions and into a whole series of other questions as well?

Mr. GREEN. The reason is the presence of the whole series of other questions. They are all interrelated. The committee would, I assume—it certainly should—assemble the results of the investigations by the other committees. The committee would not wish to duplicate that work. It would get its information wherever it could, and make a composite report, which would doubtless include results of the other investigations. However, the investigation would be much broader than previous investi-

gations. It would involve all other questions which have arisen in our past history and which may arise in the future, so far as we can foresee them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. According to Senate Report No. 1462, which accompanies the pending resolution, the joint committee would examine "but not be confined to," 14 specific problems affecting presidential succession. Among the 14 areas for study are the electoral college, nominations by national political conventions, and the convention processes, the adequacy of the presidential succession law of 1947, and the roles of the Senate and the House of Representatives in choosing a President or a Vice President. The enumerated areas are so vast that a real question arises as to whether the joint committee could produce any recommendations in time for congressional action this year.

I might point out to the distinguished Senator that I believe there is on the calendar at least one of the so-called Mundt constitutional amendments, and perhaps two others. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has a little different approach to the question dealing with the subject of the electoral college.

In view of those facts, I was wondering if the Senator did not feel there would be considerable duplication, and whether he is convinced that between now and June 30, in view of all the demands on the time of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and of other Senators, a committee would have an opportunity to hold hearings and make a report in time for Congress to act at this session.

Mr. GREEN. That is a good question. I do not know whether it would be possible, but it has seemed to me that it would be well to provide for a termination date with reference to the existence of a joint committee. For that reason the concurrent resolution itself provides that the committee shall make its final report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1956. Thereupon the existence of the joint committee would terminate. Of course, that would not prevent Congress from extending the time, when the termination date arrived, if Congress deemed it worth while to continue the committee. But I think definite progress would be made.

The recent illness of the President has brought to the fore a number of questions which are involved. They have to do not only with the death of a President, but with a great many other questions, such as the incapacity of a President at any time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, I am not unmindful of the importance of the subject matter with which the resolution deals, but I am frank to say I am very reluctant to see a joint committee created. I think there are certain fields in which a joint committee of the House and Senate is justified. It was certainly true in the field of atomic power. It was a new subject, and there was a need for a committee which could have full access to all the information available, so it could be a kind of watchdog for the Congress in dealing with that new subject.

The joint committee was created by statute, and it has worked very well. I think the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has had a definite field for study.

However, I am very reluctant to have a joint committee created on the subject matter covered by the concurrent resolution, particularly when one considers the list of the subject matters involved. I do not pretend to have any crystal ball, but I think, as certainly as that I am standing here, it will be necessary to adopt a resolution to continue the joint committee. Then that might be followed by an attempt to have a permanent joint committee created, which would take much time and attention of Members of Congress. It is very difficult at times to arrive at a meeting date which is suitable for Members of both the House and the Senate, whereas that kind of problem is not involved in the case of a Senate committee.

Mr. GREEN. On the other hand, if a joint committee is established, the measure establishing it will have to be adopted by both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and thus the joint committee's recommendations will carry a great deal more weight with the Members of the House of Representatives.

This measure deals not only with the death or incapacity of the President or Vice President, but also with the failure of candidates for President to receive a majority of the electoral college votes. It is very desirable to have these questions settled. What will happen if a candidate dies shortly before the election, but after the nomination has been made? All such questions have remained unanswered.

I know the Senator from California is an ardent student of American history, and he must realize how fortunate we are that a crisis has not arisen because of our failure to provide for the steps to be taken in the event of certain very likely occurrences—occurrences perhaps in the near future. The longer we put off deciding these questions, the worse the situation may become.

From time to time in the past, efforts have been made to settle these questions and to provide for the taking of the proper steps, but those efforts never have succeeded. I have hoped that now we might make a start in the direction of making the proper arrangements. Perhaps the proposed committee could submit a partial report, and it might recommend that the remainder of the work be done at a future time or by a future committee. But I believe it important that the attention of the public be drawn to these questions which remain unanswered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur in the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island regarding the desirability of directing the attention of the public, as well as the attention of the Senate, to the very important questions he has raised—just as, some time ago, we directed the attention of the Senate and the attention of the House of Representatives to the constitutional problem which would be involved in the event the House

of Representatives were wiped out by atomic attack.

If the Senate were wiped out, constitutionally the Senate could be reconstituted very promptly, because practically all the States have made provision for the governor to make temporary appointments to the Senate. So the Senate could be reconstituted in a matter of days, at the most. However, that is not true in the case of the House of Representatives, because under the Constitution, appointments to the House of Representatives cannot be made in that way. Thus, in the event of such an occurrence, the Government might have only one legislative arm able to function. Although that problem was not solved, at least it was called to the attention of both Houses, by means of measures, which some of us introduced some time ago, calling for certain constitutional amendments.

Similarly, I think the questions the Senator from Rhode Island raises are very much alive.

On the other hand, the Judiciary Committee is, under the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, supposed to have jurisdiction in the field of constitutional amendments. One of the questions involved in connection with this measure is whether, insofar as that field is concerned, it is intended that the proposed joint committee take over the functions of the Judiciary Committee, as regards constitutional amendments which might be necessary.

Mr. GREEN. I think it would be very difficult to provide for that; but I am sure that any committee which undertook to carry out the provisions of such a measure would seek to avoid any duplication of the work done by another committee.

On the other hand, I think it might be very helpful to have such investigations and advice and recommendations in connection with the conventions preceding the elections.

I now read from the committee report:

The joint committee, in its studies, also would examine, but would not be confined to, such questions as—

- (1) The electoral college.
- (2) Nominations by national political conventions, and the convention process.
- (3) Vacancies occurring in the nominations for President and Vice President.
- (4) The roles of the Senate and the House of Representatives in choosing a President or a Vice President.

(5) The necessity of a constitutional amendment to resolve by popular vote, rather than by vote by the House of Representatives, the failure of candidates for President to receive a majority of electoral college votes.

(6) The adequacy of the presidential succession law of 1947.

(7) The differences, if any, between the status, powers, and privileges of an elected President and an individual succeeding him to the office of President.

(8) The feasibility of a new presidential election to coincide with the next election of the House of Representatives, when an individual succeeds to the Presidency during the first or second year of a term for which the President had been elected.

(9) The nature, extent, and duration of the inability of a President to discharge his powers and duties, and how such inability shall be defined.

(10) The relation of the Vice President to the duties of the office of President during the inability of a President to discharge his office.

(11) Provisions to define similar disabilities affecting the Vice President, or other individuals, acting during the inability of a President.

(12) The differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President, and of any other individual executing his office during the President's temporary disability.

(13) The burdens now existing in the office of President, and whether or not the pressure of such burdens requires the establishment of an office of Executive Vice President; and

(14) Review of the act of October 31, 1951, providing generally for the delegation of Presidential functions.

These are important questions; unless they are answered, the situation might easily become very confused. Not only the safety of the parties, but also the safety of our Government itself, might be affected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the resolution, the proposed joint committee would have legislative power, would it?

Mr. GREEN. No; it would not have any legislative power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It would not have any legislative power?

Mr. GREEN. No. It simply would have power to make an investigation and submit a report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The committee's recommendations would have to be acted on by the regular legislative committees; is that correct?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, this measure would cover the situation which would develop if a President-elect were assassinated. In that connection, let me refer to the effort which was made to assassinate Franklin Delano Roosevelt when he was in Florida. It was on that occasion that Mayor Cermak was killed. That attempt to assassinate the President-elect occurred only a few weeks before the inauguration of Mr. Roosevelt, did it not?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. This measure covers such situations both before and after presidential elections.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, this measure covers the entire field, does it?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I read this measure, I observe that it is divided into three chapters. The first deals with the manner and means of electing the President and Vice President.

Mr. GREEN. Actually, there are four.

Mr. ELLENDER. Four?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the subject dealt with by the first chapter has been fairly well investigated by the Senate, as a result of the introduction of certain bills dealing

with the question of whether the electoral college should be continued?

Mr. GREEN. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand this measure, a further study would be made by the committee to be selected.

Mr. GREEN. Yes. I think the committee would invite those whom it would regard as experts, and who could be helpful to the committees, to come before it and testify and give advice.

Mr. ELLENDER. Unfortunately, many persons regard themselves as experts.

Mr. GREEN. If the Senator from Louisiana were reluctant to appear in person, he could submit his views in writing.

Mr. ELLENDER. The trouble is, I am not an expert on this question.

Since the committee is to be a joint committee, to be composed of Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate, why is it proposed that all the cost be borne by the Senate, instead of having half borne by the House of Representatives—as is usually provided in the case of such situations?

Mr. GREEN. This measure originally called for an equal division of the expense between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. Why should that proposal be changed?

Mr. GREEN. Because the financial authorities of both Houses said it would be very difficult to make such a division between the House of Representatives and the Senate. So they advised that the entire expense be borne by only one branch of the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the reason for the present proposal, is it?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. That matter was carefully studied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Monroney
Beall	Gore	Morse
Bender	Green	Mundt
Bennett	Hayden	Murray
Bible	Hennings	Neely
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bridges	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bush	Holland	Pastore
Butler	Hruska	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kerr	Sparkman
Curtis	Knowland	Stennis
Daniel	Kuchel	Symington
Dirksen	Langer	Thurmond
Douglas	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Welker
Ellender	Malone	Wiley
Ervin	Mansfield	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McCarthy	



Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, as amended.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.*

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain and complete as to the presidential election, succession, and duties. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

I. As to the election of the President and Vice President—

(1) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college, as at present, and if so whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(2) Whether or not candidates for President and Vice President should be nominated by national political conventions, as at present, and, if so, recommendations which should be made to the parties for improving the convention process, and, if not, a method which would be preferable.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the presidency or for the vice presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(4) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it, and for the case of the death of any

of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it.

(5) Whether or not a constitutional amendment should be proposed under which failure of candidates for President and Vice President to receive a majority of the electoral votes shall be resolved by popular vote rather than by the House of Representatives.

II. As to succession to the office of President.

(1) Whether the provisions of Public Law 199 of the 80th Congress, approved July 18, 1947, relating to presidential succession, adequately provide for all possible contingencies occasioned by the removal, resignation, death, or inability of both the President and the Vice President.

(2) Whether there are, or should be any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and of any other individual succeeding to the office of President.

(3) Whether or not the term of the Vice President or other individual succeeding to the Presidency should be limited to a duration of approximately 2 years, a new presidential election to coincide with election of Members of the House of Representatives where such individual succeeds to the Presidency during the first or second year of the term for which the President was elected.

III. As to inability of the President to discharge his powers and duties—

(1) How it shall be determined whether the President is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office; and how the extent and duration of such inability shall be determined and defined.

(2) How it shall be decided that the inability requires the constitutional discharge by the Vice President of the powers and duties of the office of President, or results in the succession of the Vice President to the office of President.

(3) What provision should be made to determine a similar inability affecting the Vice President, or other individual, acting during the inability of the President.

(4) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, power, duties, and privileges of an elected President and of any other individual executing the office of President, during a period of temporary Presidential inability.

IV. As to the powers and duties of the President—

(1) Whether the heavy burdens of the Presidency necessitate the creation of an office of Executive Vice President; whether the establishment of such an office requires a constitutional amendment; and what powers and duties of the President should be assigned to such office.

(2) Whether the act of October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 712), which provided generally for the delegation of Presidential functions should be modified or extended.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, including drafts of any legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1956, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence,

books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, during the quorum call I was asked how the members of the committee stood, and whether they were in favor of the resolution.

By looking at the records, I am able to state that a committee meeting was held on January 25 last. On that occasion all nine members of the committee were present, and all members, regardless of party, voted for the resolution.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM AND POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1478, Senate Resolution 153.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 153) extending the time for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service System and the Postal Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an additional amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was to strike out all after "Resolved" and insert:

That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(2) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was on page 2, line 18, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(2) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service met and voted unanimously to report the resolution to the Senate. It will be noted that the committee is asking for \$75,000, and that in our report to the Committee on Rules and Administration we stated that last year the committee was given \$75,000.

We did not finish with the investigation undertaken at that time, and we had remaining from the original appropriations from last year the sum of \$49,000. Therefore we are asking this year for only \$26,000 with which to conclude the investigation.

We did not get started with the investigation until very late, and at the present time we are still carrying on the studies. We have also appointed men from various sections of the United States to work with us. Many of them are giving us advice without charge, the only payments to them being payments to cover their expenses, but not on the regular per diem basis of \$12 a day.

It will be noticed, also, that we are working with the Civil Service Commission in trying to ascertain how we can regulate the postal rates, procedures, and employees' relations. Research is in progress in an effort to see if we cannot economize to a greater extent in the operation of the post offices.

It must be borne in mind that the Post Office Department is not a small concern. It is the biggest business in the United States. It employs 500,000 persons regularly, and there are approximately 500,000 others who are called into service at various and sundry times. So there are approximately a million employees.

There are about 39,000 post offices in the United States, so Senators can well imagine that many requests are coming in, and we are trying to check on them. Our staff is working daily to see if we can make ends meet, or at least bring them nearer together.

There will be a deficit in the Post Office Department of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500 million during the year 1956. It will also be noted that it costs almost \$3 billion to operate the Post Office Department. So, Mr. President, we are not dealing in small figures, as can be readily seen.

Mr. President, this is a very important matter. We are just in the midst of an investigation, and we feel that we have done a great deal of good work already.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to check with the distinguished Senator with reference to the figure of \$26,254.16. It is true that last year we authorized \$75,000, but we thought it was not unreasonable, under the circumstances, particularly in view of the fact that the money is over and above the regular allocations for standing committees under the Legislative Reorganization Act, that the amount be made \$50,000, which is almost double what was used last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I must say that we need the amount we have stated. It will be noted that every subcommittee of which I am a member has returned money to the Treasury.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, we wish to return some money to the Treasury, but we also desire to cut down the expenditures for committees which year after year have increased from a million and a half dollars some years ago to approximately \$3 million, and, finally, with the amounts suggested for the special committees at this session, to over the \$5-million mark. I hope we shall receive some support on both sides of the aisle in making some modest reductions which will not interfere with the work, but merely cut down the top-side level. In all cases we have suggested the amounts the committees had last year, but we are willing to go a little beyond that. I do not think that is an unreasonable request, under all the circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer the Senator's

comment. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will verify the statement that we did not get under way until June, and then a great deal of expense was built up. We cannot figure by considering what was spent last year and say what will be spent this year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My information is that there are 977 postmasterships in connection with which even the preliminary cards have not been sent out.

It seems to me that every committee has its primary obligation to carry on the work which comes within the constitutional responsibility of Congress and carry on its normal legislative load. I do not mind committees getting off into additional fields, but it seems to me that under the circumstances we should have some cooperation. The sum which I have suggested as a possible amendment, though I have not offered an amendment yet, is not unreasonable, in view of the record of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to reply to the Senator with regard to the cards which he has mentioned. They have all been ordered out, but they were not sent out until the latter part of last week. I am sure the Senator will find his card in his office at the present time. A batch of appointments were sent down about 2 weeks ago. We always make a check to see whether the Veterans' Preference Act has been violated. We do that before we send the cards. The cards were sent out to every Senator last week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I correctly understand that all the cards have gone out for the appointments pending before the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have just been informed by the staff director to that effect. They went out last week.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us whether the subjects investigated have broadened since the investigation started?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, they have.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent? Into what other subjects is the committee looking, in addition to what was in contemplation when the resolution of last year was adopted?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. One of them is the investigation of post offices and postmasters, and we are checking into postal rates at the present time. We were waiting on the House of Representatives, and for that reason we could not move for a time.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the committee did not get under way last year until about May.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was the latter part of May before we got under way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee the same number of employees now it had from May to January last year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No. We had to search for people to come in.



Mr. ELLENDER. I notice from the budget estimate that the committee expects to employ eight persons.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that is true, including the staff director, who will be employed by the day.

That is two more than we have at the present time, and we expect to employ them. There are not that many employees now. There are two on the list whom we have not employed, because we did not know whether the money would be forthcoming, and we first wanted to make certain.

Mr. ELLENDER. The budget calls for the employment of eight persons, does it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator does not expect to employ more than that number, does he?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No more than that at any time.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I was pleased that the distinguished chairman of the committee made the statement he made to the Senator from California [Mr. Knowland] in regard to the mailing of cards by the committee in connection with the appointments of postmasters. My office during the past few days has been bombarded with calls in regard to the postmastership appointments. As I understand, the cards have been mailed, and we can anticipate some action being taken by the committee on these appointments in the very near future.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; the cards have gone out. As the Senator from Kansas knows, he having been chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, when a thousand postmaster nominations are received at one time, it is not an easy job to process them and to send out the cards. It is necessary to do certain work on the nominations prior to the time the cards are mailed.

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely appreciate the work of the chairman and the committee staff. I know that he is giving the matter earnest attention. There are at present 977 postmaster nominations before the committee, of which 585 were renominated from last session and have been before the committee since January 25, 1956.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to serve in the minority for 14 of the 18 years I have been a Member of Congress. I have never held up a single postmaster appointment on the basis of politics to embarrass a Member of Congress or his appointments, or the people of the community from which it originated. I firmly believe in the civil-service procedures, rules, and regulations. I know that it is the policy of the chairman of the committee to follow those procedures and rules. It was the policy which was followed when I was the chairman of the committee for 2 years.

I sincerely hope that we may get action promptly on the postmaster nominations now before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I feel that the committee has done a pretty good job on the nominations.

Mr. CARLSON. I give the chairman credit for the work which has been done. There are problems to be solved, and I know the pressure the chairman receives. However, either one believes in the civil-service method of the appointment of postmasters, or he does not. So long as we have these procedures, rules, and regulations, I think that members of both the minority and the majority of the Senate should follow through on that basis.

I sincerely hope the minority leader will not press his amendment for a reduction in the amount sought. While last year the committee spent only \$26,000, the committee appointed Mr. Jim Watson, director of the National Civil Service League, to assist in its work. Everyone who is familiar with the civil-service work will recognize that he and his advisory group will do an outstanding, nonpartisan job in trying to supply the committee with information which is needed in connection with the solving of civil-service problems.

On that basis, and also on the basis of the appointment of a very substantial number of outstanding citizens, whom the chairman has appointed as advisers to the Subcommittee on Post Office Affairs, I think the funds which the chairman has requested are warranted, and I sincerely hope they will be approved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Kansas. Last year the committee considered 1,400 nominations of postmasters. Of that number, 1,100 were reported favorably by the committee, and 2 or 3 were rejected on the floor of the Senate. A good many of them were received during the last few days of the session and were held for investigation.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator realizes, does he not, that the Senate last year made extra help available to the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was done in order to take care of situations similar to the one referred to by the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To what extra help does the Senator refer?

Mr. ELLENDER. The extra clerical help, four persons in number, which, I understand, was authorized to the committee last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, under the Reorganization Act, as do all other committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. As in the case of other committees, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has four professional assistants.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee also has six clerical assistants.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition, the committee has a few other employees; does it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It has one, a girl stenographer; that is all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Only one?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, when the matter was considered last year—I was trying to locate in the RECORD the colloquy between us—I believe a statement was made to the effect that the committee expected to complete its special work by this year. Now the committee is asking for additional funds. I wonder if the Senator can give us an estimate of when the investigation will be completed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly hope it will be completed on time. That is what we are working toward. The matter of looking over an organization as large as the Post Office Department is an almost continuous process. I think everyone will acknowledge that, including the Senator from Louisiana. But so far as this particular kind of investigation is concerned, I hope it will cease after the present investigation has been concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean this will be the last time he will need to ask for funds?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am hoping it will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why cannot the Senator tell us that it will be the last time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, the Senator knows I cannot do that. However, I shall do my best to try to bring the matter to a conclusion.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Am I properly informed that even though the request is for \$75,000, approximately \$25,000 is new money, with \$50,000 carried over from last year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is exactly what has happened.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Actually the amount will be eleven-twelfths of the \$75,000, with approximately \$50,000 of the amount carried over as unexpended from last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. We spent \$25,000, and \$50,000 was carried over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 18, it is proposed to insert the word "prior."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 3, line 4, to strike out "\$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$60,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California to the committee amendment as amended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment. The committee needs every cent asked for in the resolution before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 2, line 14, to strike out the word "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March"; and on page 3, line 4, to strike out the figure "\$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$68,750."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 14, to strike out the word "February" and insert in lieu thereof the word "March"; and on page 3, line 4, to strike out "\$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$68,750."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 153), as amended, was agreed to as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(2) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and

Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$68,750, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1479, Senate Resolution 154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 154) extending the time for a study of the Government employees' security program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was to strike out all after "*Resolved*" and insert:

That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the administration of the Government employees' security program.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to July 31, 1956, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than July 31, 1956.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$49,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, on page 2, line 12, after the word "the," where it appears the first time, to insert "prior", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under

sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the administration of the Government employees security program.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to July 31, 1956, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than July 31, 1956.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$49,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it will be noted that in the resolution the committee asks for \$49,000. We expect that from last year's appropriation, so we are asking for no new appropriation at all.

The reason why the committee did not complete its inquiry is that the departments were not able to furnish us with the data which the committee requested. The departments are working up the data, and will furnish them to us at a later date.

It will also be noted that a great many hearings were had concerning the subject matter of the resolution. I think a great deal of good has been accomplished. Even the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Young, stated:

I think that the work of this committee, the work of Senator HENNING'S committee, the Humphrey Commission on the security program will all be helpful in throwing new light on developing new ideas as to how a security program can be handled.

Certainly, I am not one who has a closed mind with respect to this program or that program or that it is perfect and say it can't be improved.

He said further:

I would like to see your thinking and the thinking of this committee directed in the channel of how the program could be modified or made simpler in terms of dealing with the ordinary applicant records or screening 27,000 people coming into the Federal service a month.

The investigation disclosed that each department operated differently from the other departments. It was disclosed by the investigation that good practices engaged in by one department were unknown by other departments.

I believe the facts developed by the investigation will be of help to the people of the United States. Great cost was incurred in the firing and rehiring of employees. It was learned that in one department alone 416 employees had been fired and rehired, at a cost of \$970,029.61. That was an average cost of \$2,331.80 for each suspension in the system. I believe a great many employees



would not have been fired and rehired if a better system had been in effect than that which is now operating.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, during the last session of Congress the committee received \$125,000 to complete its work. By reappropriating \$49,000, it will mean the Senate committee will be able to complete its work on the basis of the \$125,000 which has already been appropriated. In other words, this amounts to a reappropriation of unexpended balances of last year's funds. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I hope so.

Mr. ELLENDER. And a report is to be made not later than July 31 of this year. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to clear up one technical point. In considering previous resolutions which provided for committees for a year, the acting majority leader, because of the passage of time before consideration of the resolutions, reduced the amounts originally asked for by one-twelfth. Inasmuch as the committee now under discussion was established to operate for 6 months, I assume the understanding is that the amount requested will be reduced by one-sixth.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I had not discussed that matter, but I was hopeful that the committee would be able to use the \$49,000 requested. The committee had to reduce its operations somewhat, and I did not know what was going to happen.

Mr. KNOWLAND. One month has elapsed even under the terms of the extension resolution. If a committee which is to serve for 1 year has its request reduced by one-twelfth, it seems to me that a committee which will serve for 6 months should have its appropriation reduced by one-sixth.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can see the Senator's point from a mathematical standpoint.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is also from a practical standpoint.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator will yield at that point, I should like to explain that originally the \$49,000 item would have expired on July 31, 1957. The resolution, as proposed to be amended by the committee, calls for a termination date of July 31, 1956. Therefore, the \$49,000 would have to be apportioned in such a way that it could be spent by July 31, 1956, instead of by January 31, 1957.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that. But under the continuing resolution, 1 month of that period has passed. On that basis, in the case of similar resolutions, the total amounts have been reduced by one-twelfth, if 1 month of the 12 months' period had passed. My point

is that since 1 month of the 6 months' period has now passed, the amount should be reduced by one-sixth.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. Of course, on that basis, any part of the \$49,000 not spent by July 31, 1956, would be returned; I think that is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, aside from the technical point involved, I wish to ask whether this resolution will call for a duplication—and perhaps an unnecessary duplication—of the study the bipartisan Commission is making of the same subject matter. That Commission was established under action taken at the last session of Congress, and the Commission is now functioning.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is difficult to answer that question. Certainly many things have happened since the Commission was appointed and since it began its work under the authority given by the resolution creating it.

Our committee began its job, but has not completed it. Certainly we shall try to complete it by July 31, and certainly it is very important that the work be completed.

As I stated a while ago, perhaps when the Senator from California was not in the Chamber, Philip Young, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has commended our committee for the work it has done; and he has said that our work will be of a great deal of help to the Civil Service Commission, in coordinating such activities on the part of all the Government departments. The Civil Service Commission has found that each of the Government departments has been engaging in a different kind of loyalty program.

In the course of its work, our committee has been able to point out some of the difficulties which have been encountered, and has been able to contribute to a solution of the problem, with the result that the program may be able to function in a more perfect way. I think the other groups will profit by the work our committee has done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had thought that was the reason why the bipartisan Commission—established under the resolution submitted, as I recall, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], was created, namely, to do that very job. In that connection, I recognize that there is responsibility on both sides of the aisle and among Senators on both sides of the aisle in the case of the Committee on Rules and Administration, through which the resolution has to pass.

But I hope we shall avoid unnecessary duplication in the very field of activity which, so far as I recall, is precisely the one with which the bipartisan Commission was established to deal.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me read what Philip Young has said about this very matter:

I think that the work of this committee, the work of Senator HENNING'S committee, the Humphrey Commission on the security program will all be helpful in throwing new light on developing new ideas as to how a security program can be handled.

I think that answers that particular question.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina to the fact that the bipartisan Commission on Government Security, created under the resolution submitted and sponsored by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], has been organized and is functioning, and is at present appealing in the usual manner to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress for sufficient funds with which to conduct its work.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I am not suggesting that that is necessarily a reason for curtailing the splendid work of his committee. In fact, the hearings held by his committee have been used by, and are most valuable in connection with the work of, the Commission of which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and I happen to be members.

I should like to state for the RECORD that the Commission on Government Security is composed of 2 Senators, 2 Members of the House of Representatives, 2 Under Secretaries or Assistant Secretaries from the Government departments, and 6 private citizens. The Commission is charged with reporting at the end of this calendar year. The Commission is working not only on the subject of studying the Government employees' security programs, but, along with that study, on the general security program of the Nation.

I repeat that the splendid work done by the Senator's committee is being made use of by that Commission, will continue to be used by it, and will be most useful to it. I assume that the money now being requested is necessary in order for the Senator's committee to be able to publish the results of its work. I hope that if we approve this resolution, we shall not embarrass or hamper the work of the bipartisan Commission. Inasmuch as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is not at present in the Chamber, let me say that I hope the granting of the funds requested by the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina will not result in a duplication of the work of the bipartisan Commission, will not militate against having the Commission receive the full support of Congress, and will not prevent the Commission from finishing its work. Certainly the Commission should not be hampered, but should complete its work. It was created by unanimous vote of the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hope there will be no interference with the work of the Commission. I trust it will make full use of our committee's records and hearings which I hope, will be very helpful to the Commission. I think the Commission has already acknowledged that they have been helpful.

The resolution under which our committee is proceeding was adopted by the Senate before the bipartisan Commission

was created. Our committee began its investigation before the Commission's investigation was begun. However, I did not object to the Humphrey resolution, calling for the creation of the Commission, because the Commission was to be bipartisan in nature, and was to be composed of Members of both Houses.

We shall be glad to have the Commission use our records. I believe it likely that the reports of the two groups will be somewhat similar. Certainly two reports of that sort will have more force and effect than only one would have.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Is the money now under discussion to be used for completing the report of the Senator's committee, or will it be used to hold further hearings?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. Last year we had \$125,000. Of that amount, we spent \$76,000, and had \$49,000 left.

The present request is to enable the committee to finish the work it has begun. We have even limited the time to July 31.

Mr. COTTON. My question is whether it is contemplated that the funds now requested will be used to hold further hearings, or whether they will simply be used to prepare the report on the work the committee already has done.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. These funds are for the purpose of the preparation of the report, and also to enable the committee to digest the reports which are coming in from various governmental departments. If some other matter is brought to our attention, of course there will have to be additional hearings. No one can tell whether further hearings will be necessary; I do not know whether they will be. I hope we shall not have to have any more hearings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to discuss a little further with the Senator from South Carolina that very point, and I should also like to discuss it with the distinguished minority member of the committee. Originally the committee was to make its report, presumably, by January 1956; and now an extension is being requested in the case of the unexpended funds, amounting to \$49,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have some assurance on behalf of both the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee that if such a continuation is made—particularly in view of the fact that there is a certain amount of duplication with the work of the bipartisan Commission—it will result in the completion of the work and the making of the report, so that in June or July we shall not be faced with a request for

further funds and further extensions. I think it is important both to the Senator and to his committee, as well as the staff, to know that the termination date will be July 31.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can speak only for the committee. When we were drafting this resolution we knew that the termination date in all the other resolutions was January 1 of next year. The committee voted unanimously to make this termination date July 31, 1956.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may I inquire of the minority member [Mr. CARLSON] as to his understanding?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am sure the chairman will agree with me that the resolution, as originally introduced, provided for an expiration date of January 1, 1957, and that \$10,000 additional was requested. Our committee, on my own motion, adopted an amendment providing that we continue to request the balance of \$49,000 which was left in the fund, and that the work terminate as of July 31, 1956. As the chairman has stated—and I know he will agree with me—it was stated in committee that it was not planned to hold further hearings. However, I think he is correct in stating that if something should develop requiring the attention of the committee, it ought not to be in a position in which it could not hold additional hearings. It is not our intention to hold additional hearings. It is our intention to get together the information. As stated by the chairman, the reports from various agencies have been delayed to some extent. So I think the chairman is on solid ground.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We asked for those reports months ago.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is correct.

I, for one, feel that the termination date should be July 31, 1956; and so far as I am concerned, it will be.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank both Senators. On the basis of the discussion on the floor I withdraw the objection which I had to the resolution. When the discussion is concluded, at the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment on page 2, line 8, to change "February" to "March," since the month of February will have passed; also an amendment, in conformity with our previous colloquy, on page 2, line 22, to change "\$49,000" to "\$40,833.34."

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Pursuant to what the Senator from California has just stated, as the resolution shows, the figure of \$49,000 is for 6 months, beginning February 1. Inasmuch as the committee has already obtained money for a month from the contingent fund of the Senate, money for only 5 months of operations should be required. The appropriation would be, in round figures, about \$8,000 a month. For 5 months, in round figures, the appropriation would be \$40,000; no more should be needed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can see the mathematics involved. How-

ever, the work of the committee will be slightly crippled.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee has already been paid out of the contingent fund for this month.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I realize that.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I am saying. So enough money to operate for 5 months should be sufficient.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not objecting to such an amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume the minority leader will offer it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall offer it at the appropriate time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly there should be no objection to such an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the additional amendment reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 12, in the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, after the word "the", at the beginning of the line, it is proposed to insert "prior."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated, to the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the word "from", it is proposed to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on the same page, in line 22, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "\$49,000" and insert "\$40,833.34."

The amendments to the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as amended, were agreed to.

The amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 154), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the administration of the Government employees security program.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1956, to July 31, 1956, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than July 31, 1956.



SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$40,833.34, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### STUDY OF MINERALS, MATERIALS, FUELS, AND CERTAIN OTHER MATTERS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1477, Senate Resolution 183.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 183) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a study of minerals, materials, and fuels, and certain other matters within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, after the words "with the", to insert "prior", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) minerals, materials, and fuels;
- (2) irrigation, reclamation, and power development;
- (3) public lands;
- (4) Indians;
- (5) Territories and insular affairs;
- (6) national parks; and
- (7) resource management and development.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$177,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### SHIPMENT OF TANKS TO SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I intend to speak only very briefly—probably for not more than 7 minutes—on a subject which I think is of very great importance not only to the Senate, but to the country.

The attention of the country, and indeed of the entire world, continues to be riveted on the Middle East. We have, indeed, witnessed a most disturbing spectacle—a spectacle of indecision, a spectacle of seeming insincerity, a spectacle of apparent secretiveness on the part of the Department of State.

I refer, of course, to the shipment of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia. When the news came out, it seemed incredible. It was almost, as the New York Times called it, preposterous. And at this point, I should like to insert into the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the Sunday edition of the New York Times on this question.

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

##### ON JORDAN'S STORMY BANKS

There is just one kind of adjective for the project revealed and interrupted early Friday morning to send 18 United States tanks to Saudi Arabia. We might use the word preposterous. Somebody blundered in sanctioning this arrangement. Somebody blundered in the apparent belief that the tanks had already been shipped. Somebody blundered even more egregiously in keeping the whole matter secret until it chanced to be exposed. Senator GEORGE suggests an investigation—it seems a good idea.

It is not that there is anything illegal in getting rid of some surplus military equipment. It is ingenious rather than sinful to consider, as we seem to have considered, as the British apparently still believe and as the French may have thought, that equipment of this sort will under no circumstances be used for aggressive purposes and will somehow contribute to the cause of peace.

The tragic irony of the episode is partly in its revelation of a kind of befuddlement in our Near Eastern foreign policy. We have been hesitating to send arms or money for arms to the little State of Israel, whose Government fears the power of its Arab neighbors when that power is fortified by jet planes, tanks, guns, and submarines provided by Communist governments. But certainly we do not improve this situation when we increase the military strength of a country that can easily threaten Israel from the east as Egypt threatens it from the south and east.

The truth is that there can be no security in arming both sides in the Middle East, or even in arming one side against the other. Let us suppose that we try to keep the balance even between the Israeli and the 40-odd million Arabs whose rulers would like to see the State of Israel destroyed. Let us suppose that the Moscow-dominated Communist states have committed themselves to the opposing policy of giving the Arab States military superiority. The end of an arms race on this scale is likely to be war, and the outcome of a war in the Middle East could be the one thing we all so greatly dread, a war on a vaster scale. Out of such a conflict, whether limited or expanded, there could come no good for anybody. Israel would be wrecked. The Arab States would be less vulnerable only because they are less developed—only because of the technological backwardness which keeps their populations in poverty and which it ought to be the ambition of the Western World to relieve.

Chairman Nahum Goldmann of the Jewish Agency for Palestine indicated a more hopeful future in a statement given out toward the end of the week after his return from a trip to Israel. It is true that he pleaded for a new supply of "defensive weapons" from the United States. But he went on to say: "The desire for peaceful settlement of

its outstanding issues with the Arab States and primarily with Egypt has never been stronger in Israel than it is today. . . . The establishment of good neighbor relations and creative manifold cooperation between the Arab States and Israel on the basis of equal and mutual self-respect would be a boon for all the peoples of the Near East. It would indeed provide the foundation for an unprecedented development of the entire area."

Political considerations alone stand in the way of an extensive development of the power and water of the Jordan and the Yarmuk Rivers. If peace were reasonably certain over a long period of time, if Western capital investments could be guaranteed, if Western grants could be wisely spent without interruption, if provision could be made for the permanent resettlement of nearly a million Arab refugees and their children, if these ancient lands at the eastern crossroads of the Mediterranean could be opened fully to Western civilization—if all this could be done there could be peaceful and fruitful competition between the people of Zion and their Arab neighbors.

This possible development has been indicated by Secretary Dulles of the United States and by Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld of the United Nations and by others. It stirs enthusiasm. Who could feel the same rejoicing in millions of dollars dissipated on fighting planes and other instruments of destruction? What can weapons do that an American-backed guaranty against aggression cannot do?

Of course we settle nothing by pinning down 18 tanks on the Brooklyn docks. We would settle nothing by pouring \$50 millions, more or less, into armaments for Israel. But money spent and services rendered to save the water, to create power and to make the desert bloom might make a future for democracy in a large part of the world where there has been little democracy in times past.

Mr. LEHMAN. First it was suddenly disclosed that these 18 tanks were being shipped to Saudi Arabia. This disclosure came as the tanks were on the pier, at the ship's side, ready to be shipped out of the country to Saudi Arabia—a country which has declared its undying enmity for Israel, a country whose supreme leader and monarch has declared that it was worth the lives of millions of Arabs to destroy and extinguish Israel—to cut it out of the Middle East like a cancer, he said.

On orders from the White House, the shipment was stopped. Then on Saturday, the orders were reversed and the shipment has been allowed to go forward. When the shipment of tanks to Saudi Arabia was stopped, our State Department apparently thought it would be a clever move to stop simultaneously the shipment of spare automobile parts and other equipment, to the value of \$100,000, to Israel. This is what this administration calls a policy of impartiality.

Now the tanks are on the high seas, on their way to Saudi Arabia, and the few crates of automobile parts and other miscellany have been allowed to proceed to Israel. This is impartiality, in the view of this administration.

I am not going to quarrel at this point—I think it is too late—about the shipment of these tanks to Saudi Arabia. The fault for this lies in the original negotiation of the arrangement for the shipment of these tanks to Saudi Arabia and for the continued toleration of this contract arrangement

during this period of increasing tension in the Middle East, when it has been apparent to all that the slightest spark might create a tragic conflagration in that area.

The fault further lies in the fact that the State Department had withheld information with respect to this arrangement from the American public, and had tried to guard it, and only let it out at the very last moment when these tanks were on the dock ready to go, and when news concerning the shipment had already leaked out.

This is but another illustration of the consistent policy of this administration of failing—indeed, of refusing—to take the public into its confidence. But of course the real trouble goes far deeper and involves much more than the question of shipping 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia.

We have a tense and dangerous situation in the Middle East, a situation which threatens the peace of the entire world, and which threatens our vital interests in the Middle East—a situation in which the security of the tiny sister republic which we helped to establish, and to defend, and to launch upon the ways of nationhood, is sorely threatened. We face a situation in which the whole security of the Middle East—the whole situation in the Middle East—has been radically changed by the injection of Soviet and Communist influence into this area by the negotiation of a deal whereby vast quantities of arms have been, and are being, shipped to Egypt by the satellite state of Czechoslovakia. Great numbers of Soviet technicians now walk the streets of Cairo and Alexandria. The Soviets have arrived in the Middle East!

Egypt and Saudi Arabia are allied by treaty. They are allied by common purpose. One of those common purposes—perhaps the chief one of those common purposes—is the destruction of Israel.

What do we do to counter this development, the shipment of arms to Egypt by the Communists? We proceed to ship tanks to Saudi Arabia.

Could anything be more preposterous? Could anything be more incredible? Could anything be more ill advised?

Instead of moving posthaste to redress the balance of forces in the Middle East by supplying arms to Israel, while at the same time moving by every means within our power to put limits on the arms race in the area and to bring this threat to the peace of the world under control, we add fuel to the fire. We increase the imbalance of forces in the area. We strengthen the forces and the temptations of Saudi Arabia and of Egypt to seek a military solution of the problem—a solution that would drag the whole free world into war.

I know the justification that is made for the supplying of these tanks to Saudi Arabia—that we have a base in Saudi Arabia and that the maintenance of our base is related to the agreement on our part to supply some equipment to Saudi Arabia.

Mr. President, I am not a great military expert. I am in no position to judge the importance of any particular base or to sit in judgment on the merits of an

arrangement whose details are unknown to me, with the government of Saudi Arabia.

I do know, however, that it is extremely shortsighted to make our plans and designs on the basis of narrow strategic factors, without taking into consideration the much broader, the much more important factors of political reality.

What good will it do us to have a base in Saudi Arabia if thereby we so muddy the waters in this area that we cannot see right from wrong, nor distinguish what our real interest is?

Our real interest is in peace. Our real interest is in security for all countries in this area. Our real interest is in the preservation of the Republic of Israel, a pilot light for democracy in this entire area. Our real interest is in the economic liberation of all the peoples of this area from feudalism, poverty, hunger, and ignorance.

That is where our interest lies, Mr. President, and that is what we ought to be concentrating on. For the moment, we must supply arms to Israel. But even as we do so, we should bring to bear every available energy and resource upon the main problem—the problem of stability, the problem of peace, the problem of security, and the problem of eliminating the hostility and antagonism in this area, rather than of feeding its fires.

By such devices as this sale of tanks to Saudi Arabia, and by the Baghdad Pact—two very inconsistent policies, by the way—we do not accomplish anything which adds to our security or which resolves any central problems. We do not in this way neutralize the Soviet influence in this area.

Quite the contrary. We intensify the effects of the Soviet intervention. We attach ourselves as a tail to the Soviet kite.

We need a bold policy, a long-range policy. We need, above all, a policy. That which we are now pursuing has none of the earmarks of a policy. It has all the indications of a haphazard collection of programs, narrowly conceived and awkwardly executed. Our prestige, I am told, in the Arab countries, has fallen to a new low point. Our prestige in Israel has dropped dangerously.

I believe, Mr. President, that this whole situation needs to be investigated. I think it needs to be exhaustively reviewed, from one end to the other, by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Secretary of State, and his chief lieutenants, need to be subjected to the test of justification and cross-examination by the members of the Foreign Relations Committee in order to determine what they think we are doing in this area. They should be required to justify before our colleagues, who are experts in foreign relations, the various bits and pieces of programs now being pursued in this tense and perilous part of the world.

I hope the Foreign Relations Committee, without the loss of another minute, will undertake an investigation of the whole terrible and explosive and unjustifiable and inexcusable policy, or lack of policy. I pray that the Foreign Relations Committee will take the matter in hand without any further loss of time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], with regard to the very serious Middle East situation. I believe we ought to ponder now the statement that was reportedly made by the Secretary of State not so long ago in which he advocated taking the Middle East issues out of foreign policy debate. That statement, in my judgment, now takes on new meaning, particularly when it is remembered that the statement was made at a time when the State Department had knowledge that the shipment of tanks was in the offing and that it was only by chance that public disclosure of it was made.

I agree with the Senator from New York that the matter should be very thoroughly considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have made known to the chairman of the committee that I believe not only Mr. Dulles but also Mr. Allen and Mr. Hoover should be brought before the committee for a thorough discussion of our foreign policy in the Middle East.

I cannot accept the proposition that the tanks are being sent to Saudi Arabia in order to help keep down internal disorder, anymore than I could previously accept—and I protested at the time—the statement that the shipment of arms to Iraq was for the same purpose. I cannot escape the fact that we are dealing with totalitarian governments in these instances. Our Government ought to be supporting free nations, not totalitarian nations. We do not help the cause of freedom any by supporting Communist governments or Fascist governments or any other form of totalitarian governments. I am against supplying arms to totalitarian governments under the pretext of helping them keep down internal disorders.

When we talk about internal disorders, I have the suspicion that if I happened to be a citizen of such a country probably I would be among the dissident groups. As a liberal, I probably would be fighting for human freedom and against totalitarian procedures that keep down human freedom in such totalitarian regimes.

Therefore, I am not impressed by the argument of the State Department to the effect that arms are being shipped to the Arab States in order to assist a totalitarian government in keeping down internal disorder. We don't help the cause of freedom by supporting governments that throttle freedom. Arabian oil isn't worth such a price. Further, I fear that these military shipments to the Arab States increases the possibility of war in the Middle East.

Likewise, Mr. President, and I cannot accept the alibi of the State Department that it will lift the embargo on airplane parts and other equipment for Israel. That cannot be considered to be a course of impartiality with regard to our policy in the Middle East, particularly—if I am reliably informed—when proposed shipments of military equipment to Israel will be of a value of \$100,000 and when the cost of 1 tank to Saudi Arabia is as much as \$135,000.

Furthermore, I believe we need to have answers from the administration to some



questions with regard to how valuable and feasible an airbase is in Saudi Arabia. I am not particularly in favor of maintaining airbases which may not be militarily feasible. I understand that there is some question now as to the feasibility for defense purposes of this particular airbase in Saudi Arabia.

I should like to know some facts about that situation. Neither am I particularly enthusiastic about the possibility of getting into a conflict in the Middle East over British colonial economic chestnuts. I am not desirous of following a course of action which might lead to sacrificing American boys in support of British economic colonial policy.

Therefore, I believe, there are many questions that should be asked of Mr. Dulles. As I have been heard to say before, there is no substitute for full public disclosure of American foreign policy. I believe it is highly desirable that we reduce Government by secrecy in this country and that more public disclosure be made as to what our foreign policy is.

I should like to know what, if any, understandings about which we have not been informed were entered into with Mr. Eden when he was in this country in regard to the Middle East. I do not find it particularly acceptable, if the releases which have been issued are correct, that there was an understanding that the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Foreign Minister of France should get together and decide upon what they think would be a good course of action in the Middle East. I question such a procedure because it constitutes a circumvention of the United Nations. I thought we entered into the United Nations with the understanding that we were going to use it as an instrumentality for preserving peace. I hold no brief for, nor do I condone the violation of any true or any international understanding on the part of Israel. If Israel has violated any of her international commitments, I hold no brief for her. However, such issues should be adjudicated before the United Nations, through its juridical processes. Our Government should be taking the lead in raising the Middle East issues before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

What a great change would take place if the United States would use its good offices to insist that the United Nations go into a full-dress debate and consideration of the Middle East tensions which are a threat to world peace. I would have much more confidence in such a procedure than I would have in any understanding reached by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Foreign Minister of France in respect to the Middle East. I think any arrangement reached by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Secretary of State of the United States and the Foreign Minister of France would subject us to more and more criticism around the world as to our international policies.

I hope that such problems as I have discussed will be raised by the Foreign Relations Committee with Dulles, Allen, and Hoover of the State Department. I

think as many public disclosures as may be possible should be made available to the people of the United States, because it is the American people who will die by the millions if Dulles stumbles off the brink and into war in the Middle East. I have no confidence in his equilibrium. I think he is following a dangerous warlike course in his foreign policy. That is why I think we need a new Secretary of State, and quickly, until such time as we can have a new administration that will follow a foreign policy that is not running the great risk of war that this administration is running. We are confronted with not only this great trouble spot in the Middle East, which is a tinderbox, but we are faced with other trouble spots. I think the American people should know all the facts about American foreign policy, including the editors of America who are prone to write so many editorials about it but who know very little about it. Nor can they know very much about it until we stop Government by secrecy in foreign policy.

Mr. President, I think one of the most terrifying experiences I have had in a long time I had a week ago Sunday night. I was a guest at the home of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. He had invited for a briefing and a discussion a former Member of this body, Bill Benton, of Connecticut, and Mr. Stewart Alsop, of the Alsop brothers, who discussed their trip to Russia this past summer. On the basis of that evening of enlightening discussion I should like to comment on a terrifying impression I carried away with me as to what is happening in Russia educationwise, when it comes to the matter of training scientists.

I am sure Mr. Benton would not object to my saying, because he said something to the same effect in a public speech downtown, that probably the greatest education need we shall have in the next 15 or 20 years will be the training of scientists—brainpower trained in the sciences. He pointed out the great emphasis in Russia, in its educational program, on training physicists, chemists, and engineers.

We know we are already suffering in this country from a great shortage of engineers and scientists. I have not had it checked by the Congressional Library, but I think it is probably a very accurate figure when I say that almost half the high schools in the United States today do not even offer a course in physics and chemistry. Yet, if we make a plea for an adequate Federal program for aid to education it is spoken of as being creeping socialism. We must recognize before it is too late that we must keep ahead of Russia in brainpower in this great struggle of the century between freedom and totalitarianism.

It was pointed out by Mr. Benton that when in Moscow he desired to find some place to put his 13-year-old son in school for a time so that he could make some observations on the Russian educational system. He wanted his son to enter a school where at least some of the courses were taught in English. The American Embassy in Russia did not know there is a school in Moscow that teaches every class from the first grade through high school, in English; that there is another

school which teaches every class in German; another school which teaches every class in French; another school which teaches every class in Italian; and another school which teaches every class in Spanish. The students are selected for a long-term education program, to do what? To be trained as scientists and technicians for export into the areas of the world, where we must win this fight for freedom against Russia. Russia is planning a training program of expert personnel so that she can export them to every part of the world where she hopes to subvert the people of backward areas to communism.

What are we doing? We are falling behind already in the training of scientific brainpower.

I said at that meeting, as I have been saying for a long time, that we ought to keep ahead of Russia in brainpower. I said, "Does this mean we have reached a point where we are no longer ahead?"

The reply was that we are still ahead, because the Russian program has been going on for only 10 years. But, give Russia another 10 years, and let these students get through their scientific training program, and we shall be behind. Already there are many projects in this country that are being delayed because we do not have enough engineers to do the work on the problems involved.

So I say, Mr. President, the time has come not only for a reappraisal, not only for a reexamination, but, in my judgment, for a complete reformation of our policies in this country which are so directly connected with the future of our foreign policy.

The incident in regard to the Middle East is but a symptom of what I think is wrong. So I sincerely hope the Foreign Relations Committee will go forward, as the Senator from New York has suggested, into the kind of investigation we need, but with public disclosures made to the American people. I think it is a tremendous mistake for us to be failing to give the American people the facts about their foreign policy.

Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has just handed me an editorial published in today's Washington News, entitled "Off Again—On Again," from which I should like to quote a paragraph or two:

Ineptness of American foreign policy in the Middle East never was more shamefully exposed than during the recent off-again, on-again, gone-again shenanigans over the shipment of 18 light tanks to Saudi Arabia.

The White House panicked when advised by the press last Thursday that the tanks were being loaded on a ship in New York—yet the United States Government had made the deal with Saudi Arabia last August.

Last Thursday, when the attention of the State Department was called to the matter, the reply was that they had forgotten about it. All I want to say is that we need a State Department with a memory. Just give me a State Department with a memory, and I shall feel a little more secure. If the State Department can forget this kind of a sale. I wonder what else it is conveniently forgetting.

But, to get back to the editorial:

The President intervened personally. His press secretary called an extraordinary press conference at Thomasville, Ga., after midnight Thursday to announce a temporary embargo on all shipments in the Middle East until Mr. Eisenhower could find out what the tank sale was all about.

Friday and Saturday were crisis days at the State Department. Israel screamed that it would be a foul if the tanks were permitted to go to Saudi Arabia while the United States refused to sell major arms to Israel. The Saudi Arabians screamed foul just as loudly about the embargo and mumbled menacingly that the agreement on the American airbase at Dhahran is up for renegotiation this spring.

I think the editorial does very well to point out the vacillation which has come to characterize so much of State Department policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

#### OFF AGAIN—ON AGAIN

Ineptness of American foreign policy in the Middle East never was more shamefully exposed than during the recent off-again, on-again, gone-again shenanigans over the shipment of 18 light tanks to Saudi Arabia.

The White House panicked when advised by the press last Thursday that the tanks were being loaded on a ship in New York—yet the United States Government had made the deal with Saudi Arabia last August. The President intervened personally. His press secretary called an extraordinary press conference at Thomasville, Ga., after midnight Thursday to announce a temporary embargo on all shipments to the Middle East until Mr. Eisenhower could find out what the tank sale was all about.

Friday and Saturday were crisis days at the State Department. Israel screamed that it would be a foul if the tanks were permitted to go to Saudi Arabia while the United States refused to sell major arms to Israel. The Saudi Arabians screamed foul just as loudly about the embargo and mumbled menacingly that the agreement on the American airbase at Dhahran is up for renegotiation this spring.

At 7:30 p. m. Saturday—only 43 hours after the embargo was imposed—it was just as quickly lifted, giving a green light to shipment of the tanks.

This spectacle can only give the impression of indecision and already is provoking extremists such as Congressman Celler, of New York, to all kinds of ridiculous charges. It can only complicate the highly dangerous situation in the Middle East—where the State Department's top expert, George V. Allen, only last Wednesday publicly declared that there was serious likelihood of war.

The belated State Department explanation of the tank deal shows that it is not something extraordinary. The United States has a military agreement with Saudi Arabia. We got the use of the huge Dhahran airbase in return for agreement to supply that country arms for training its military forces. There is a United States military mission in Saudi Arabia. The agreement to sell the tanks was part of that arrangement.

It is unfortunate that the actual shipment coincides with a crisis in the area which threatens war. It might have been prudent if United States officials had tried to postpone actual shipment at least until the current American-British-French talks on the Middle East were completed.

Eighteen light tanks are not a major arms deal and are not going to be militarily deci-

sive—but handled as they have been, they could be psychologically decisive.

The American people properly can complain about the way their leaders have handled this incident. They have a right to hope that in event of another war in the Middle East their leaders will be more aware of what's going on and better prepared to act with decision, confidence, and dispatch—none of which qualities were evident in the tank incident.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this Middle East fiasco is somewhat on a par with the statement made by the Secretary of State about Goa. He made the statement, in effect, that he thought Goa should stay with the Portuguese, although I drew from him in examination—and it is permissible for me to say this—the admission that the overwhelming percentage of the population of Goa is Indian and is inseparably connected with India.

But when Mr. Dulles was pressed as to why the statement was made about Goa, it was found that the presence of the Portuguese Foreign Minister in the United States had something to do with it, and that we were in negotiation with him concerning the Azores.

Have we reached the point where our foreign policy, as conducted by the Secretary of State, follows the techniques and tactics of David Harum? Or is our foreign policy based upon principles conforming with the historic foreign-policy principles of the United States? I think the Committee on Foreign Relations should find out.

In foreign policy, as in every other issue, when principle is compromised, no principle is left. When an expedient course of action is adopted, ideals are sacrificed. I have no confidence in the policies which are being followed by our State Department. The last fiasco involving the Middle East is only the latest proof of what I think is the sorry record of Mr. Dulles as Secretary of State. What he has done has been backed up by the President, who, time and time again, has underwritten him and has pointed out that, in his opinion, he is a great Secretary of State. The President can have him, but I do not think the American people ought to have to suffer him.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks. I am in full agreement with them. I have watched the situation, has has the Senator from Oregon, for a very long time. I have reached the same conclusions. There is no question that the whole sorry transaction was achieved under the veil of complete secrecy. I doubt very much whether any Senator, or even any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, had any knowledge of the proposed shipment of the tanks until they were loaded on the ship in Brooklyn. Certainly 3 or 4 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, whom I have interrogated, have told me they had no prior knowledge of it whatsoever.

I again point out what I think is one of the grave dangers to our entire system of Government, and a grave menace in the situation which is now confronting us. Every effort has been made

to put a damper on—yes, to stop—any discussion with regard to the explosive situation in the Middle East. A vigorous effort has been made to keep the American people in ignorance of what the situation is, and appeals have been made to them not to discuss or to debate the issue, although no issue could be more important.

This is a serious matter. It is something which I think does irreparable harm to our form of government and to a reasonable, deliberate consideration by the American people, who, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, are the ones of main importance and who have the greater interest in this matter. The action by the State Department has kept them from knowing anything at all about the situation, from debating it, from reaching their conclusions, and from advising their representatives of their will.

I am indeed happy to note that Senators, like the senior Senator from Oregon, and others in whom I have great confidence, as I have in all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, are now interesting themselves in the situation. I hope that an exhaustive, complete, and thorough study of the entire foreign situation as it affects not only the Middle East, which is the area of immediate concern to us, but all other vital areas of the world will be undertaken without any loss of time.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York, and I am pleased to associate myself with him in this colloquy.

#### DEATH OF HON. WILSON MCCARTHY

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, a message received last week announced the death of the Honorable Wilson McCarthy, onetime member of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and one of the West's outstanding citizens.

Mr. McCarthy was a native of Utah and made great achievements in many walks of life. He took part in many economic moves which have brought greater opportunities and prosperity to the Intermountain States.

I met Mr. McCarthy at Columbia Law School, where we were both students. We became fast friends, and several years later served together as assistant county attorneys in Salt Lake County, Utah.

I learned to admire and respect Mr. McCarthy for his integrity, ability, and loyalty to his friends, and for the kindly, gentle friendship he extended to all with whom he came in contact. As a prosecutor, he was always fair in treatment of those being prosecuted, and that was true even though he was a vigorous and efficient prosecutor. At the time Mr. McCarthy was assistant prosecutor in Salt Lake County, the late Judge Harold M. Stephens, chief justice of the District court of appeals, was also one of the assistant prosecutors of Salt Lake County. The friendship which grew up between Wilson McCarthy, Judge Stephens, and myself endured over the years.



Mr. McCarthy not only distinguished himself as a prosecutor, but he later became an outstanding State judge in Utah. His activities covered a wide range—attorney, district judge, State senator, RFC Director, and various business and livestock-company directorships. In all of these fields he distinguished himself.

Early in his career he was an active Latter-day Saints Church worker and missionary. Mr. McCarthy was greatly beloved by the people of the Intermountain West, and his passing has brought sorrow to the people of that area. Funeral services were held in Salt Lake City, Utah, where a large assemblage gathered to pay tribute to him.

Mr. President, the press of the State of Utah commented editorially upon the passing of Wilson McCarthy, and I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the Salt Lake Tribune, Deseret News-Salt Lake Telegram, and the Ogden Standard Examiner be included at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of February 14, 1956]

**WILSON MCCARTHY, A GREAT UTAH SON, PASSES**

Wilson McCarthy, a native of Utah, a distinguished citizen of the West and a man of achievement in many walks of life, has passed away at the age of 71.

A remarkable individual, Mr. McCarthy carved for himself a career that brought him renown as a lawyer, jurist, business leader and railroad executive.

To say that he enjoyed the respect of persons in all walks of life, from section hand to statesman is a compliment to which Mr. McCarthy was justly entitled, for he was as much at home in the maze of Washington's governmental affairs as he was with the little fellows for whom his concern was well known.

But for those who knew him he was Judge McCarthy, a warm, quiet, selfless man whose devotion to family and friends far overshadowed the estimable position he had earned for himself among business associates.

Although he had been adopted by Colorado as a result of his position as chief executive of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, Mr. McCarthy's heart remained in Utah where he was born and reared and where he maintained his home and family.

His beginnings were humble, a circumstance he cherished dearly throughout his lifetime. He was reared in the livestock industry and there established the cornerstone of his diversified career. And livestock retained a consuming interest with him although his acumen carried him into many other fields, not the least of which was politics.

He had a flair for politics which means, simply, that he liked people and understood human nature. In 1914 he was appointed assistant Salt Lake County attorney, and subsequently served as third district attorney, third district judge, and in the State senate. In all these activities he won the respect and admiration for his ability and fairness. He was widely known in Washington and in government generally.

As a young man Mr. McCarthy operated extensive ranching properties in western Canada. He knew the cattle business intimately, not only its basic problems, but also the character of the men who engaged in it. In later years, as president of the Western Livestock Show, he spearheaded

the drive for \$3½ million coliseum in Denver where the show—in many respects the outstanding one in the country—now is held.

As a member of the Reconstruction Finance Commission, appointed by President Hoover in 1932, Mr. McCarthy played an important role in meeting the challenge of the dark days of panic by reason of his daring, courage, and realistic approach to the many problems involved. He pushed through a policy of extending loans to livestock men at a time when every other avenue was closed to them. For this service, and also for his efforts in behalf of banking institutions, the West—indeed, the whole Nation—owes him a debt of gratitude.

His work on the RFC was followed by his greatest achievement, the rehabilitation of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad which over the years had gone through a series of bankruptcies and receiverships. Appointed cotrustee of the line by the late United States District Judge J. Foster Symes, Mr. McCarthy faced almost insurmountable obstacles and powerful opposition, but he rode it through and became president when the railroad emerged from receivership in 1947. Mr. McCarthy directed the rebuilding and reequipment of the Denver & Rio Grande Western with modern motive power until today it stands as one of the country's great railroads. This he leaves as a monument to himself.

As a railroad executive, Wilson McCarthy was keenly interested in building the area which the line served. The Geneva steel plant was, in a way, the child of his brain, for in the early days of World War II he envisioned the possibility of developing local iron ore, coal and limestone deposits into a vital industry. He saw it brought to fruition when United States Steel built and operated Geneva Steel for the Government. And in the days after the war, when the issue hung in the balance, he helped influence the United States Steel Corp. to bid for the Geneva plant, thus helping establish a permanent steel industry.

Wilson McCarthy had a marvelous personality and the faculty of getting men to do their best. He was a great leader and organizer, who set his goal and then saw that it was attained. He was an indefatigable worker who never spared himself. And above all, he was a gentle, kindly man who never cared for show, preferring the simple things. He loved Utah and always maintained a residence in Salt Lake City, though business usually kept him away.

The Tribune mourns his passing. To his family, who were ever first in his mind, we extend our sincerest sympathy—we share in their loss.

[From the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, of February 14, 1956]

**JUDGE WILSON MCCARTHY**

Wilson McCarthy was a solid citizen of absolute integrity and of great ability. In his 71 years he became one of the foremost representatives of American railroading and also one of the foremost advocates of the unlimited potential in western industry.

In his many professional fields—attorney, district judge, State senator, RFC director, and various business and livestock company directorships—Mr. McCarthy always dignified the interests he represented. His work in bringing industry to the West was enormously effective over several decades, and under his leadership, the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad rose from a depression-bankrupted organization to become one of the important railroads of the Nation.

Despite his financial and legal genius, Mr. McCarthy's crowning trait was probably his understanding and his magnanimity toward his fellows. He never forgot a friend;

he had a warmhearted interest in all of his associates; he knew well how to get along with people; he was a kindly man with an abundance of Irish wit—indeed, Judge McCarthy was human all the way. Perhaps nothing was more remarkable about him than was his gift for friendship and the ease which he did things for others.

In addition to his many business, law, and civic contributions to his own intermountain country, Mr. McCarthy had also served the LDS Church as a missionary, as a member of the Granite Stake High Council, and as a member of the Liberty Stake presidency at a time when it was perhaps the largest stake in the church with 18,000 members.

Until he was stricken 2 weeks ago, Judge McCarthy had the good fortune to work actively and in robust good health into his 72d year. That was the West's good fortune, too. A man of his caliber will be sorely missed by the community.

To his family and his unnumbered circles of friends, admirers and associates, the News extends its condolences and its appreciation for his humanitarianism and his worthwhile services.

[From the Ogden Standard Examiner]

**WILSON MCCARTHY**

Wilson McCarthy, native Utahian, whose leadership contributed to the solid rehabilitation of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, died Sunday in Salt Lake City at the age of 71.

Mr. McCarthy was favorably known in several fields, including ranching, the law, and politics, but his greatest contribution to the western region was in a field totally new to him, railroading.

The rejuvenation of the D. & R. G. W. has been described as spectacular. Comparison of the road's equipment, traffic, and earnings today with the figures at the time he became cotrustee will show why the adjective is justified. The improvement began even in the severe depression days and have been continuous.

Wilson McCarthy was a man of good will who built up friendships as well as the railroad he headed. His work will have a lasting effect in this region, where he will be long remembered.

**STUDY OF MINERALS, MATERIALS, FUELS, AND CERTAIN OTHER MATTERS**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 183) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a study of minerals, materials, and fuels, and certain other matters within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The question is in agreeing to the committee amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 10. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 16, to

strike out, "\$177,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$140,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from California.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$177,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$140,000."

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

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the amendment which has been proposed is to be acted upon now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is under consideration now. It is debatable.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to make a statement.

Mr. President, this resolution would authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to, first, minerals, materials, and fuels; second, irrigation, reclamation, and power development; third, public lands; fourth, Indians; fifth, Territories and insular affairs; sixth, national parks; and seventh, the management and development of all public resources.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course the activities the Senator from Montana has stated are the activities of his committee as set forth in the Legislative Reorganization Act; and for those activities a regular allowance is made by Congress each year.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That allowance amounts to in excess of \$111,000.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation coming before our committee falls into 16 different categories, as established by the Reorganization Act; and such matters are handled by 5 standing subcommittees. I may add that these subcommittees now handle the same legislative proposals which, before the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act, were the responsibility of five standing committees of the Senate. Members of the Senate are familiar with the organization and operation of the various subcommittees, and I need not dwell on the difficulties confronting the committee members in their efforts to handle expeditiously the work load on the committee level.

Last year the committee received \$137,750. This year we are requesting an additional amount to increase the total to \$177,000.

The committee is seeking this increase this year because we have added responsibilities during the present session. Several programs of great significance are being referred to Congress, and they will be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As an example, I cite the national water policy which President Eisenhower has submitted to Congress. It has been under consideration for more than

3 years in the executive branch, and it warrants a most thorough analysis.

The National Park Service is preparing to launch "Mission 66," a long-range operational program for our national park system. Millions upon millions of dollars will be spent to implement this program, if it is adopted. I do not think it unwise for the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to spend some extra funds in making a thorough examination of the recommendations submitted by the executive branch in connection with that program.

Our national resources are worth billions of dollars. It is the responsibility of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to see that those resources are conserved, wisely managed, and properly developed. No member of this body will be able to convince me that the expenditure of \$177,000 to assist in the execution of such a program is an example of waste in Government.

Mr. President, when the pending resolution was prepared, it was submitted to each member of the subcommittee, and was studied very carefully by each of them. Then the resolution came before the full committee. The full committee approved the figure of \$177,000 as being necessary for carrying on the work. Then the resolution was reported to the Senate and was then referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which approved it.

Therefore, I submit that the resolution should be adopted, as it is, by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, here is another example of a committee which has subdivided itself into many subcommittees. As I pointed out several days ago, that has become a standard practice for many of the Senate's committees.

Last year the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had five subcommittees. The resolution before us today would add 2 more subcommittees, to investigate 2 additional subjects.

As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from California, the Interior Committee has, under the Reorganization Act, certain subjects coming within its jurisdiction. In order to carry out its delegated functions, the committee receives, as a standing committee of the Senate, the usual \$111,440, as I recall the figure, with which it can employ up to 4 professional assistants and 6 clerical assistants.

In the last 3 years, the Interior Committee has been obtaining from Congress, in addition to its standard allowance, the following amounts:

During the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the committee obtained \$37,500.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, the committee obtained \$46,500.

Last year—as my friend, the Senator from Montana, has indicated—the amount received by the committee was increased from \$46,500 to \$137,750; and that amount as I have previously pointed out, was in addition to the more than \$111,000 which the committee regularly obtains, as a standing committee of the Senate, for its professional staff and its clerical staff.

This year, more subcommittees are sought to be added.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator from Louisiana is mistaken when he says that additional subcommittees are being added. That is not true.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am reading from the committee's report.

Mr. MURRAY. That does not refer to subcommittees; it refers to seven different divisions of the committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but the Senator from Montana says, in his letter, which he has signed—

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Montana says:

We continue to function through operating subcommittees to handle legislation in five major categories.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct—five. But the Senator from Louisiana said seven.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year the Senator's committee had five. If the Senator from Montana will examine the resolution, he will see that his committee is adding two more.

Mr. MURRAY. Where does the letter refer to two more?

Mr. ELLENDER. The letter refers to minerals.

Mr. MURRAY. But that is not in reference to subcommittees; that has reference to the different subjects over which the committee has jurisdiction, and not to subcommittees.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator proposes to add 2 more, making a total of 7.

Mr. MURRAY. Two more subjects.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are seven categories.

Mr. MURRAY. But those figures do not represent subcommittees with separate staffs. There are the same number of subcommittees, carrying on the activities which are necessary to cover new categories.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator is not proposing to create additional subcommittees, why the additional money? Why is the Senator asking for an additional \$40,000?

Mr. MURRAY. Because there is additional work to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. By the same subcommittees?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; but there must be technical staffs to do the work. Is the Senator familiar, for example, with the activities of the Subcommittee on Irrigation, Reclamation, and Power Development? Can the Senator tell me how much of a staff is necessary to handle that problem? Is the Senator familiar with minerals, materials, and fuels?

Mr. ELLENDER. To some extent.

Mr. MURRAY. How would the Senator handle the problem? How much of a staff would he have?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not so many as the Senator has suggested.

Mr. MURRAY. I will ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], what he thinks about this argument.



Mr. ELLENDER. I have the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to make inquiry of the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Montana can occupy the floor in his own time.

I realize that a great deal of work can be found here and there to put additional employees to work. I am not arguing that point. However, I am calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Reorganization Act of 1946 has provided for every standing committee a specific amount of money with which to operate. If that amount is not sufficient, let us amend the Reorganization Act. Let us make another study of the problem, as was done by the Senate when it adopted the Reorganization Act. If the money we have provided to operate the committees of the Senate is not sufficient, let us provide more funds, but let us provide it in the regular, orderly way, not by haphazardly creating new subcommittees here and there.

It has become the custom in the past 5 or 6 years for most of the committees of the Senate to increase the number of staff members. As I have pointed out, the Committee on the Judiciary is the worst offender. During the past 2 or 3 years the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has increased the number of professionals on its staff.

The Committee on Banking and Currency is also employing additional staffs far various subcommittees.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall gladly yield in a moment. As I pointed out, the Judiciary Committee is one of the classic examples. That committee obtains \$159,000 through its regular appropriations, and we are providing for \$1,083,000 in addition to the sum which that committee regularly obtains.

The Banking and Currency Committee obtains \$111,000 under the standard staff authorization. Last week we provided \$100,000 for it to operate the housing subcommittee. In a little while it will come forward with a request for another \$100,000 to operate other subcommittees.

We now have pending before us the request of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As I have pointed out, there has been a gradual increase by this committee over and beyond its standard authorization. First it obtained \$37,500 additional, and then \$46,500. Last year the additional amount was \$137,750. For this year \$177,000 is being requested. This is not for a special committee or subcommittee which is being appointed to investigate a particular subject and then will go out of existence. I presume these subcommittees will remain with us from now on.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to hear the Senator speak as he does. To add material for thought in this debate, I should like to ask the Senator if he realizes that under the Reorganization Act this committee was allowed 4 pro-

fessional and 6 clerical members on its staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In addition to those, under special resolutions it has 7 more professional and 4 more clerical workers. Senate Resolution 183 seeks 3 more professional staff members at \$10,734.41 a year, or a total of \$32,203.23; and it asks for 1 additional stenographer at \$5,323.61, a total of \$37,526.84 for staff members which we do not now have. We have doubled the number of staff members required by the Reorganization Act. I say, as a member of the committee—and I say it in all fairness to the chairman of the committee—that these men are not being utilized properly, or we would not need as many as we have today. I am glad to hear the Senator from Louisiana fighting for some sense in the allocation of money for these committees.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out, if this appropriation is approved for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it will have a substantially larger staff than was provided under the original Reorganization Act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. By more than double.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not that much; but there will be quite a few more.

As I have stated, there has been an increase in the committee's staff from year to year. These additional funds are not to operate special committees to make investigations of a particular subject, report to the Congress and then disband. They are to be used to finance continuing subcommittees, which will stay in business year after year, studying the same subject matter over and over. In other words, Mr. President, this is not a 1-year proposition that we are voting on. It is for a permanent corps of workers who will have to be kept on year after year. For that reason, I hope the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will be agreed to.

#### GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT REQUIRES APPROPRIATE INCREASES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think we could point out, if we investigated the situation from the top down, from the President of the United States on down, that there have been increases all along the line. A few years ago, as I recall, we increased the salary of the President of the United States from \$50,000 to \$75,000, and gave him 6 or 8 special secretaries and an assistant to the President. We did so because the job had grown.

All the Departments of Government, from the Department of State on down, have grown. No one is objecting so long as they do their work.

I do not know about the Judiciary Committee. I am not a member of that committee, but I believe that it would not ask for more money than it needed. I intend to vote for such requests, whether they be for \$1 million, half a million, or \$200,000.

#### WORK OF EASTLAND COMMITTEE PRAISED

My friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is doing grand

work on his committee. I do not ask him what he proposes to spend. The question I ask him is whether or not he is doing his work. I think he is.

There was an understanding during the week of Lincoln's birthday that there would be no important votes. A day or so ago a resolution was approved providing funds for the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I was not present. I understand that there was no yeay-and-nay vote. If there had been, I would have hoped to be paired on that vote in favor of granting his request. He is doing wonderful work. If he needs more money and submits an estimate, I intend to support it. All I ask is that he do the work and make the results available to the Senate.

#### FURTHER INFORMATION ON MINERALS, FUELS, AND PUBLIC LANDS NEEDED

Mr. President, I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for nearly 10 years. The Senator from Louisiana is correct in stating that this request represents an increase over the amount originally allowed. It is my business to know something about the engineering which is required in connection with minerals, oil, and public lands. In my opinion, there was never enough money available to do the job correctly, and to make available to the Senate the information it needs for the action it must take.

I am not objecting to an additional staff member or two. I shall discuss the problem with the distinguished chairman of the committee and help him in every way possible. All I insist upon is that the committee do the work which is laid out for it. I have some information in that connection.

#### SENATE REPORT ON STRATEGIC MATERIALS SERVED IMPORTANT PURPOSE

Until the last 3 or 4 years there had never been an investigation made of the availability of strategic minerals and materials. It must be borne in mind that there are not only minerals. There are also agricultural products and other agricultural materials. That subject is covered in a report, and the work which served as the basis for that report was begun under the chairmanship of the late Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Butler].

If the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will investigate the work that has been done by this committee and regularly presented to the departments of Government and to the President of the United States, in which report there is shown the availability of these materials, he will find that the report is worth every cent it cost. I superintended the preparation of that report, and we did the work while we were short of money.

#### WESTERN HEMISPHERE SELF-SUFFICIENT IN CRITICAL MATERIALS

For nearly 40 years statements have been made on the floor of the Senate in behalf of the administration that we had to cross major oceans in order to get many of the strategic materials we need. I maintain it is not necessary to cross major oceans.

As a result of the work of the subcommittee—and the report of the subcommittee was submitted to the Senate by the full committee—it is evident that we can make this hemisphere self-sufficient in every one of the critical materials if we consider substitutes and replacements. If we do that, we do not have to cross major oceans to get anything. At the same time we can protect those industries in the Western Hemisphere.

That alone is not only worth what the distinguished chairman is asking for today, but it is worth hundreds of millions of dollars. The situation is similar to my making a mistake in the law by quoting the law as it is written, but without taking into consideration an amendment that has been made in the law about which I am not familiar. The same thing is true in this situation because people failed to take into consideration laboratory experiments which are going on all the time. It is like considering an engineering report. Experiments go on all the time.

#### MANGANESE SUPPLY IN UNITED STATES AMPLE

For example, as a result of investigations, manganese is available in Minnesota and in Maine. At this moment it is possible to build manganese plants in this country, and if we are willing to pay the price differential between the wage standard of living in this country and that of the chief competitive countries, we can get all the manganese we need right here in the United States.

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

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. For the past 4 or 5 years the senior Senator from Nevada, both as chairman of the subcommittee and as the ranking Republican member of it, has conducted extensive hearings not only in this country but in many foreign countries to ascertain the extent of the availability of strategic materials essential to our national preparedness. The Senator from Idaho has commended the Senator from Nevada on many occasions for his work.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Idaho has been very helpful.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have commended the Senator for the extensive work he has done. I wonder whether at any time there has been a lack of funds or of staff personnel and consultants to carry on this extensive work, the results of which so far, as I understand, are presently available, in statistical and factual form, in 15 principal items. Is that correct?

#### INVESTIGATION OF CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC MATERIALS SHOULD CONTINUE

Mr. MALONE. The hearings are published in about 12 volumes, but the digested part is contained in one report. That report contains the conclusions and findings of fact and recommendations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Has not the investigatory work in that connection been completed by the subcommittee?

Mr. MALONE. No; it has not been completed, and I will tell the Senator from Idaho why it has not been completed. It is like many other studies,

which involve laboratory work. Laboratory work and inventions constantly change the situation.

For example—and I do not know where I said this, but I said it in the right place, I am sure—several years ago I said if we treated our taxpayers half so well as we treat foreigners, uranium would be running out of our ears in two years. Everyone knows that now. However, that development was brought about through investigations. Investigations with respect to other metals are constantly taking place.

#### STUDIES BEHIND IRON CURTAIN CITED

I conducted investigations like that even behind the Iron Curtain. The distinguished Senator from Idaho was there. As a matter of fact, I have a picture in my office, as the distinguished Senator from Idaho knows.

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

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. In Bulgaria there is discernible material available. I knew that. Therefore I was interested in going behind the Iron Curtain to make sure. I went behind the Iron Curtain, even though the State Department objected very much to my going there. However, I had to know where those materials were. I had to know whether they were in the area around Russia or in Russia itself, and whether Russia could become self-sufficient in uranium. I am here to state that I believe it can become self-sufficient in uranium.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Press reports indicate that the Senator from Nevada went behind the Ural Mountains and made extensive investigations of the availability of strategic materials in the Soviet Union. Does the Senator from Nevada entertain any hope that we will be able to get any of the strategic materials in the Soviet Union for use in our preparedness program?

#### EUROPE MAINTAINS PIPELINE TO RUSSIA AND SATELLITES

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that not only is there little likelihood that we will get any of it under present conditions, but that if we keep on selling the material and building plants in Europe, we will furnish to Russia everything they need. I have stated many times—and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is bringing out that fact now—that everything we send to Europe is available to Communist China and to Russia.

There has been some talk about Austria, too. Trainloads of the material have gone to Austria. Of course, it is said that we must help Austria. However, sometimes a train with that material on it does not even stop in Austria.

Only a short time ago the Senator from Arkansas brought out in his committee the fact that millions of pounds of copper wire went to Russia with the consent of our State Department. I hope I am not misquoting the report. I shall read it later.

Mr. President, those shipments are not confined to copper wire.

#### BRITAIN'S JET ENGINE SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA RECALLED

When I was over in the northeast corner of the floor, as far as I could get away from the middle of this distinguished body, I said that England was sending jet engines to Russia in 1947. It was bitterly denied, even by the Secretary of Defense. Everybody knows it now, because the planes that fought our boys in Korea were made on the pattern of the English jets that Britain had sent over there.

#### UNITED STATES TRADING WITH RUSSIA THROUGH INTERMEDIARIES

Everything we send over there is available to Russia. Therefore, when we ask whether we should trade with Russia, it is already a fact that we are trading with Russia.

To say that the submission of one report is the end of the matter is like saying that no one can speak so convincingly on any subject as the person who is entirely unhampered by the facts.

I am for economy. I never voted, and I never will for the billions of dollars which are being used to build plants in Europe, and which will all be available to Soviet Russia.

When a chairman of one of our committees—whether it be the Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], as chairman of a subcommittee—asks for money, I have confidence in the Senator's integrity, and I know he will not spend money uselessly; and I also know that if his committee does not need all the money, he will turn it back.

#### SOME PREFER GRIM FACTS BE CONCEALED

I do not believe that we have ever fully realized the importance of the problem. When, as was the case with the Senator from Arkansas, anyone wants to make an investigation of where the materials are being sent, some of the press jumps down his throat, because they do not want anyone to find that out.

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

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to supplement the statement which the Senator has just made, which is one of the most important statements made in this debate. There is not sufficient knowledge in Congress or in the country as to what the public-land States of the United States contain. There is no knowledge of the vast acreage in this country which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Take, for example, these figures which I have jotted down:

In the State of the Senator from Nevada 84 percent of the entire area, or approximately 59 million acres, is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The Senator from Nevada knows that to be a fact, does he not?

Mr. MALONE. I think that is correct; certainly that much acreage is Government land.



Mr. O'MAHONEY. Seventy-two percent of the total acreage of the State of Utah is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and that includes 37.9 million acres.

As to the State of Idaho, 65 percent of that State is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. That amounts to more than 34 million acres.

Why should not the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has the power and the jurisdiction as granted by the Constitution and by the Reorganization Act to supervise the handling of these millions of acres, have the money which is necessary to enable the committee to do the work which is involved?

In my own State 52 percent of the area is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. It amounts to 32,700,000 acres.

If Senators will open the Congressional Directory they will find that 10 pages are required merely to list the bureaus of the Department of the Interior and the names of some of the principal officials of that Department.

Either we are going to be fully equipped to enable us to handle these matters, or we are not, and the work will be carried on by the officials and employees of the Department of the Interior. If we are going to make the United States of America at all self-sufficient in minerals the committee must operate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that less than 1 percent of the area of the United States has had geological surveys made or has been investigated by geologists so that we can say with some degree of authority that there are certain minerals or that there are not certain minerals in a particular area.

FORMER INTERIOR SECRETARY ACCEPTED FALLACIOUS HAVE-NOT THEORY

We had a Secretary who for 20 years thought we were out of oil, out of tungsten, out of manganese, out of practically every mineral. He died thinking we had none of them in this country.

One of the reasons why I ran for the Senate was to assist in making information available to this distinguished body so it could intelligently judge.

I will say to the distinguished Senator that there is enough tungsten in the State of Nevada to last this country 50 years. I am not the first engineer who ever said that. Because of competition with low-cost labor throughout the world, in 1953 we tried to fix the price on titanium and certain other minerals, through the Malone-Aspinall bill, in order to make up the difference between the wage standard of living in this country and that of the chief competitive nation as to each of the minerals involved. It had to be done by a special act of Congress, because in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act we had repealed that very provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unless the committee does this necessary legislative work the work is not going to be done.

EXTENSION OF MALONE-ASPINALL PURCHASE PROGRAM ESSENTIAL

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. Not someone like the distinguished Secretary

to whom I have referred, the late Mr. Ickes. I think he was one of the most honest men I ever knew, but he did not have the necessary information, and died without proper information concerning the mineral situation; at least, not so that anyone could understand it. He said we had run out or were fast running out of these minerals.

Unless the Malone-Aspinall Act is extended, and I have just introduced a bill to do that, the purchase program for tungsten authorized in the bill will end about next June. The producers of tungsten in this country, of which there are many, will be shut down, and by 1958 other producers of critical and strategic minerals will be shut down.

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

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] wants to ask a question about something I have said. Am I correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was about to make a comment in reference to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, because long before it was my honor to come to the United States Senate, on numerous occasions I appeared before the committee when the Senator was chairman, and I always had great admiration for the way in which he conducted the committee.

I should like to ask the Senator if there has been any material change in the Federal ownership of lands in the Western States during the past 10 or 20 years?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not a great deal. There has been a fundamental change in the use of the land, such as the extension of oil and gas leases, of coal leases, and of other mineral leases all over the West and in other sections which has increased the work of the Department of the Interior and has increased the responsibility of the committee.

The Senator from Arizona himself joined with the speaker just a few days ago in introducing a bill to authorize a 10-year program for the development of our national parks.

There are 181 such parks and monuments throughout the United States, and more than 280,000 people are employed in the National Park Service alone. We need to be fortified with a staff to enable us to carry on the work.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall not take the floor, but I think we have made it clear that there must be a tremendous expansion of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in order to do the great work that must be performed.

With reference to the Indians, alone, I have one person on the staff to deal with that subject. There are 200 reservations in the United States. In California there are 76 rancheros. In Nevada there are 15 colonies. In New

Mexico there are 18 pueblos. There are 16 assorted communities in the State of Arizona. There are very serious Indian problems.

The appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1954 was approximately \$82 million. The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1957 is \$89 million. We have been debating all afternoon about \$40,000.

Mr. President, I feel that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In response to the argument proposed by the Senator from Wyoming, I maintain that the situation in the Department of the Interior has not changed materially since the days when the Senator so capably served as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We had Indian problems then. At that time the Federal Government owned and operated 49 million acres in Arizona. There has not been any great amount of acreage added to what I think are too many acres owned by the Federal Government in this country. In those days the Senator from Wyoming was able to carry on a very capable administration with a staff personnel of 10.

In the last two Congresses in which it has been my pleasure to serve, that staff has been increased by 11, and the work seems to have been done.

There has been great concern about the mineral lands in this country. Under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], one of the most comprehensive surveys in the history of the United States has been completed, for all intents and purposes, with respect to the study of minerals. Yet the staff has been retained almost intact, as I understand.

I do not say that 10 persons are too many or that 21 are too many. I say that they are not being used properly if it is necessary to come before the Senate and to ask for four more now. There are plenty of persons on the staff who are capable of doing the work which is required.

I hope we have finished the hearings on the Al Sarena case. But certainly if ever there was wasted manpower in the history of the Senate, it was in connection with that investigation.

I have heard that the committee plans to investigate timber holdings. Timber, I have always understood, comes under the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I maintain, in answer to the argument made by the Senator from Wyoming, that the situation has not changed to the extent that it is necessary now to add four staff members at a cost of \$37,500. There is no justification for doing so. No investigation is proposed which the present staff cannot handle in a perfectly competent manner.

I sincerely hope the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader will be agreed to. While it is true that we are talking about \$40,000, when the budget for the Bureau of Indian Affairs is \$80 million, still it is the small items of \$40,000, to which we pay no attention in connection with these matters, that add to the unbalanced budgets year after year.

## BUDGET UNBALANCED BECAUSE FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES UNCHECKED

Mr. MALONE. I do not wish to disagree with my distinguished friend from Arizona, who comes from a neighboring State, but, in my opinion, the budget is unbalanced because of the \$5 billion to \$7 billion this Government has sent to Europe without any accounting whatsoever.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator from Nevada in his last statement.

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the Senator's suggestion that one report will finish the job, I maintain that it only lays the foundation. I wish to correct the Senator to that extent. It lays the foundation so that the laboratory work can be continued and encouragement can be given by the committee to inventions and discoveries each year.

## FURTHER REPORT ON HEMISPHERE RESOURCES FORTHCOMING

I myself did not look at the manganese deposit in South America, but I asked one of our committee engineers to do so. It took him 11 days to get up the Amazon and to look at the biggest manganese deposit in the Western Hemisphere. We really investigated further what we knew about it at the time.

Another document will be issued soon, Senate Document No. 83, which was authorized by this Congress. It will throw additional light on why we are not producing more of the critical materials in the Western Hemisphere.

The workload has just begun. These reports are foundational reports.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not like to be in disagreement with my good friend from Nevada, but I think he and other Members of the Senate realize that the bulk of the staff is needed when an investigation is started. That is one of the troubles. We assemble staffs to do a special job, and they remain forevermore. They are employed to do one job, but they remain and go to something else.

We have on the staff at present a mining engineer at \$12,500 a year. We have a member of the professional staff at \$10,800 a year. We have three stenographers. I presume they are all working on mining, because these particular men are familiar with mining. The 3 stenographers are employed at \$5,300 each. So there are total salaries of almost \$40,000 in this 1 field.

The report has been completed. I agree that the work has to go on. But when these persons have finished their work in the field of mining reports, let them do some other work. The work is not so unrelated that an expert in mining cannot do something else of a similar nature.

The committee has another engineer who receives \$13,600 a year. It has 4 members of the professional staff, each making more than \$10,700 a year.

I do not object to those salaries if the members of the staff produce results. But why, in the name of commonsense, when we are not doing any particular investigative work at present, is it necessary to ask for four more staff mem-

bers at an additional cost of \$37,500? I see no justification for it. I serve on the committee.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Every year when the committee prepares its budget, the budget is submitted to each member of the committee. Did the Senator from Arizona ever get up in a committee meeting and object to the budget?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Montana may remember that I was unable to attend the meeting at which this matter was discussed, but I sent my proxy to vote against it, and I believe my proxy was executed in that direction.

Mr. MURRAY. Every year the budget is submitted to the members of the committee, and the members of the committee go over it and approve it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This particular budget was not approved by the junior Senator from Arizona; otherwise, he would not be arguing against it today. I asked the staff, for instance, for certain information, which I thought should have been readily available. I do not have it yet.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator will receive even less information if the committee does not obtain sufficient funds with which to carry on its studies.

It is immaterial to me whether this particular budget is approved or not. No constituent of mine is on the list of staff experts we are talking about. So far as I am concerned, whatever will happen, will not injure me, but it will injure the committee and its activities, and will prevent the committee from doing the work which is necessary to be done.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Montana and I are in complete disagreement on that point, because I feel that the present staff, if it be properly used and its duties properly outlined, is perfectly adequate to handle the work which the committee is doing today.

I wish to comment upon the remark by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] about his staff of one on the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. I see that gentleman in the Chamber. He is one of the most competent staff members on the Hill. He does his job. I have not heard him come around begging for assistants. I think that he, more than any other member of the committee staff, might use assistants. But I see no provision made for them. I say again that I believe the present staff members can do the job.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I had one of the staff members, I would send him to Arizona and California to help me in connection with the Indian problems.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The junior Senator from Wyoming himself is one of the greatest helps the Indians of this country have ever had. Coming as I do from the State having the largest Indian population in the United States, I, on behalf of the Indians, thank the Senator from Wyoming for what he has done for them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Arizona is very kind.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Arizona has complimented our good colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, who has served for many years as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and who was chairman of that committee during the 81st and 82d Congresses. We who have served under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Wyoming believe he did outstanding work.

The Senator from Wyoming has pointed out that much work remains to be done. It may be of interest to point out that in the first year of the 81st Congress, when the Senator from Wyoming was chairman of the committee, during the first 6 months the committee had 12 members on its staff, and 9 members during the remainder of the year.

In the 2d session of the 81st Congress, the committee had 10 members on its staff during the first 6 months, and 14 members during the last 6 months.

In the 82d Congress the committee had 13 members for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1951, and 16 members during the latter half of that calendar year.

In the 2d session of the 82d Congress, the committee had 13 members on its staff during the first 6 months of 1952, and 14 members during the last 6 months of 1952.

In the calendar year 1955 there were 29 members on the staff.

It seems to me that, completely ignoring all political phases—and this is a political year—we ought to be able to carry on the work of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with a staff of 29 members, which is the number we had during the past year.

I want the work to be done in an efficient manner. I think the chairman of the committee in the 81st and 82d Congresses, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, did effective, outstanding work. I do not understand why, with a staff which has already grown twice as large as it was when the Senator from Wyoming was the chairman of the committee, we must now increase our budget by \$40,000. I yield to no member of the committee—and I have had the privilege of serving on it for 6 years—in my sincere desire to conduct all the necessary investigative inquiries to find out what should be done to improve the operations and functions of the various agencies in the Department of the Interior. On the other hand, I do not think we can justify the wasting of any money or personnel on our staff to carry on work which could be done in a very efficient and competent manner, if we want to do the work, without increasing the budget for the next year.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The junior Senator from Nebraska is not a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but he had occasion to investigate the Al Sarena matter. To my mind, that was the most shameful waste of



the taxpayers' money one could imagine. For months the investigation strung along, and encompassed a great portion of the United States. Representatives of the Interior Department were never called as witnesses to appear and tell their case. When they did, that ended the investigation. The matter was handled according to law, and in the only way it could be handled. The Department's story could have been told in the beginning, and could have saved a lot of time and expense.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say. I yield the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask a few questions of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I ask these questions also on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], who is very much interested in the creation of new subcommittees. As I understand, the chairman of the committee has indicated there is no increase in the amount.

There is a subcommittee on minerals, materials, and fuels. Is it not true that a few years ago a subcommittee on that very subject was created?

Mr. MURRAY. That action was taken several years ago.

Mr. WATKINS. There is a subcommittee on irrigation, reclamation, and power development. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. Then there is a subcommittee on public lands.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. That subcommittee handles matters affecting the national parks and such timber as the Secretary of the Interior has under his jurisdiction. He has some O. and C. lands in the State of Oregon.

Mr. MURRAY. There are five separate subcommittees.

Mr. WATKINS. I am taking them one at a time.

The subcommittee on public lands has to do with the national parks and that part of the forests which comes under the direction of the Interior Department.

Then there is a subcommittee on Indians, and one on territories and insular affairs.

Those are the five subcommittees the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has had for years, ever since I have been in the Senate—at least 9 years—and they were created immediately after the Reorganization Act was enacted.

Is it not a fact that the money for those committees is appropriated to the Senate as a whole, and then is allocated to the committee, under the Reorganization Act?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. A subcommittee has been created by the chairman of the committee, designated as the oversight committee, which came up for discussion in the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. That subcommittee was created as a result of legislation which required the committee to follow up legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. That subcommittee was created by the chairman without action of the full committee, as I understand.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. The creation of that subcommittee was recently under discussion by the committee, and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana, assured us there would be no further creation of subcommittees under that kind of procedure.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Wyoming discussed the matter with me, and I explained to him that I established that subcommittee at the time because it appeared to me proper for me to do so. I had the authority. However, at his request, I have taken the position that hereafter no special subcommittee will be established except by consent of the full committee.

Mr. WATKINS. And the committee itself took that action by formal motion. Did it not?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Assurance has been given that the oversight subcommittee, when it finishes the current investigation of the Al Sarena matter, will end its existence. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is the understanding.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted that matter clear for the Record.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I have the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am asking the Senator if he will yield for a moment, because I wish to add to what he has just said.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I talked to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] before he was unfortunately required to return to his home. This was last Saturday. He told me at that time that I was authorized to say he would support the resolution as it came from the Committee on Rules and Administration, but that it was with the understanding that only the whole committee in the future would operate on any of the so-called oversight investigative business if it should come up. So there was a complete understanding on all sides. I know that is the point of view of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is my point of view. It is the chairman's point of view. It is the point of view of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. It is the point of view of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. It is the point of view of the committee. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] agreed to that.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I had not intended to take any extended part in this discussion, but I have been on the committee since I came to the Senate 9 years ago. The committee seemed to be able to manage pretty well with the funds allocated to it by the Reorganization Act, under the chairmanship of the former Senator from Nebraska, the late Hugh Butler, and under the chairmanship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr.

O'MAHONEY]. I do not know if any extra money was allotted to the committee at that time or not, but I know that the committee did not have a large staff. As I recall, the staff was increased last year to 29. That seemed to me to be entirely unnecessary, but I did not care to disagree with the chairman and others who felt they had to have a staff of that size in order to proceed with the work. I personally could not see the necessity of having more staff members than were employed under the chairmanship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the former Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Butler. I do not think the committee was inefficient at that time. I think it looked into every matter it had the duty to look into.

I recall that the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels did make an investigation in the 80th Congress. I was a member of the subcommittee of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. I know extensive hearings were held, and that the opinions of experts were gathered together and included in volumes. It has been done once since that time. Perhaps it ought to be done again. But when it comes to this point, it seems to me we are going too far. We have more than doubled the staff membership. Now another request is made. I have felt that increases were unnecessary, though I have been willing to extend confidence to those requesting them up to this point, but now it seems to me there ought to be some place where we should stop.

I say the additional amount asked for certainly is not justified. I think the committee did a good job under the two chairmanships prior to the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Montana. When the proposal came before the committee, I did not see why we should have extra employees. I voted against the budget of the committee.

I realize the committee has a lot of work to do. Previously I was on the Indian Subcommittee, which held hearings for about 60 days. The committee had a good staff at that time. It employed extra reporters to report the proceedings, but the committee still got along with the amount allocated to it under the Reorganization Act.

I do not think that any investigations have been held which were more extensive than the Indian investigation held during the 83d Congress. The same is true with respect to irrigation, reclamation, and other fields.

Sometime, somewhere we will have to stop our expansion, unless we want to say that every time 10,000 or 3,000 employees are added to the rolls of the Interior Department, we will have to have so many more staff members on the Hill to watch the Department. I do not believe that is the policy. We have a vast organization looking after the interior affairs of the country, in all these various fields.

That is why I opposed, in the committee, the proposed increase; and that is why I feel that I should vote against it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California. [Putting the question.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand that the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. MONRONEY. I see.

Do I correctly understand that those opposing the amendment should vote "no"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. On this question a division has been ordered.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on page 2, I offer an amendment to change "February" to "March", and to change "\$177,000" to "\$162,250."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out "February" and to insert "March."

On the same page, in line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$177,000" and insert "\$162,250."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 183), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) minerals, materials, and fuels;
- (2) irrigation, reclamation, and power development;
- (3) public lands;
- (4) Indians;
- (5) Territories and insular affairs;
- (6) national parks; and
- (7) resource management and development.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$162,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### INVESTIGATION OF ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a cloud has arisen over the Congress of the United States. That cloud consists of suspicion that undue pressure was applied to Members of Congress in connection with the recent natural gas bill, and in connection with other legislation, too. There have been innuendos and allegations that the Case incident was not an isolated one. There have been suggestions that the pressure applied was on a very large scale and took many forms—not just the crude form of alleged campaign contributions.

It has been suggested that large-scale, wholesale pressure attempting to influence the course of that proposed legislation was not confined to the weeks immediately preceding the consideration of that particular bill in the Senate, and that it has been going on for a long time.

Mr. President, the result of all this has been to place the Congress of the United States under a cloud. For the sake of the dignity and integrity of the Congress, there is no alternative, in my mind, to a thorough investigation of the entire situation, going back as far as may be desirable, and going as deep as may be justified.

Nothing should be done which could be called a whitewash. There should be no delay or impediment in the path of this investigation.

The standing subcommittee which seems to me to have unquestioned jurisdiction in this area is the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, now headed by the distinguished, able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I can think of no more dangerous or unfortunate thing than to raise in the minds of the people of this country any implication that we are trying to hobble this investigation or that we are trying to smother or impede it in any way.

If the newspaper reports are accurate, the minority leader of the Senate—and I have for him the highest regard—suggested over the weekend that another special committee, a bipartisan committee, be set up to make this investigation. I hope and trust that the minority leader will not press his proposal. As he well knows, the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee is bipartisan.

It has on it two Democrats and a Republican. The parent committee, the Rules Committee, is also bipartisan. It has on it 7 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

But, Mr. President, this is not a partisan matter at all. This question has nothing to do with Democrats or Republicans. No finger of suspicion has been pointed at any one particular Senator, or any one particular party. Both parties are involved in this situation. The Congress of the United States is involved. It seems to me that a regular standing committee of the Senate, within whose jurisdiction this problem falls, should conduct the investigation.

Is there any one among us who questions the integrity, the qualifications, and the sense of fairness of the junior Senator from Tennessee, one of the most distinguished and courageous Members of this body, with experience in both Houses of the Congress? Of course not.

Is it not a fact that of the 3 members of that subcommittee as presently constituted 2 of them voted for the natural-gas bill, and only 1, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] voted against the natural gas bill?

Yet I am willing, and I think the people of the country are willing, to leave this investigation up to that subcommittee, and to any other committee which has jurisdiction, under the rules of the Senate, in this matter.

If there is any other subcommittee or committee which clearly has jurisdiction, let that committee or subcommittee go into this subject, too. That is a question to be resolved under the Rules of the Senate.

But to create a new, special committee would raise doubts and questions in the minds of the people. It would not allay any suspicions. It would not remove the cloud that now hangs over the Congress of the United States.

The suggestion made by the distinguished and able minority leader that the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee should not conduct this investigation because that would interfere with its job of supervising the elections of 1956, is far from convincing to me. I think the minority leader, on reflection, may wish to withdraw that argument. This investigation is an essential part of the policing of the elections of 1956.

This investigation, in my opinion, is the work of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee. I hope this work will be done, as it should be done, in a fair, thorough, and proper way.

I hope nothing we do will lend color to any impression that anyone is trying to cover up anything.

I hope that nothing is done to set aside the investigation already launched by the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator GORE. I will oppose, with all my strength, anything which is undertaken in this direction unless it can be clearly shown that it is for the purpose of facilitating the investigation and expanding it, and pressing it onward. And not for any other purpose.

#### ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the con-



sideration of Calendar No. 1400, Senate Resolution 175.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 175) authorizing additional expenditures by the Select Committee on Small Business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, last year the funds authorized were \$50,000, of which the funds spent were \$28,593. I understood from the colloquy we had last week, in which this subject was discussed, that this amount was only for a 6-month period, so those figures would need some adjustment in the minds of Members of the Senate. Inasmuch as the funds spent were \$28,593 for a 6-month period, I wonder if the distinguished and able chairman of the committee would be able to agree on a figure of \$90,000, instead of \$100,000. Then there would be the normal deduction of one-twelfth of the \$90,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished minority leader that he is correct in the statement that the appropriation was on a 6-months' basis. However, in order that the record may be clear, the staff had to be organized after that. As a matter of fact, our first staff member was not employed until the early part of August. Some of the employees had perhaps less than 3 months' work. Therefore the figure given for last year does not correctly reflect the work of the committee.

Before I answer the Senator's question, let me say that the Small Business Committee does not manufacture work. The work we do comes to us from Senators. We are never able clearly to anticipate just how big the workload is to be. I will say to the distinguished Senator from California that I have checked most carefully the proposed budget for this year, and have gone over it with the staff director. We have agreed that we can tighten up the budget. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the suggestion of \$90,000 on a 12-month basis, with the usual amendment of eleven-twelfths of that amount for the remainder of the year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$82,500"; and on page 1, line 4, to strike out "February" and insert "March."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with our colloquy; the sum of

\$82,500 represents eleven-twelfths of the \$90,000 on an annual basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think my good friend from California is very liberal in suggesting that this committee receive \$90,000 on an annual basis. I served as a member of this committee when it was first organized. The purpose of it was to try to assist small business. We had a great deal of work to do. At the beginning we had a very small staff, but like all other committees, it has grown, and it has become top-heavy.

The committee is now in the same category as a standing committee, so far as operating funds are concerned. It obtains the same amount of money as a standing committee obtains. In other words in addition to the \$90,000 which is now being asked of the Senate, this committee obtains approximately \$111,400 with which to employ 4 professional workers and 6 clerical employees. Bear in mind, too, that this committee does not consider pending legislation. It is a committee created solely to look into the problems of so-called small business.

The committee started its work by looking into the problems of companies which employed from 5 to 10 employees. The scope of the committee's jurisdiction has grown now to the point where a small business is any business which has a hundred-and-some-odd employees, and its work has increased correspondingly. That is the same situation with many committees today. Of course the Small Business Committee has turned out a great deal of work. I recall that when I was a member, special studies were made, and the printing presses were kept busy turning out special reports that were prepared, not by the committee, but by so-called experts employed by the committee. What became of those reports, I do not know, nor do I know of any good purpose they served.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this committee has no legislative business to perform. It receives the same amount of money for employing a regular staff as a standing committee gets, \$111,400.

If the pending resolution is adopted it will mean that the committee will have available to spend this year a little more than \$200,000, plus \$5,000 for hearings. I believe that is entirely too much money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 175), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of \$82,500 for the purpose of discharging obligations incurred by it from March 1, 1956, through January 31, 1957, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress. Such sum shall be in addition to any other moneys

available to the committee for such purpose, and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

#### STUDY OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION MATTERS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1403, Senate Resolution 172.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 172) to make a study of immigration and naturalization matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this subcommittee is one of the hardest working subcommittees in the Senate. It has a caseload of private immigration bills which is constantly increasing. In the first session of this Congress approximately 2,000 bills of that character were introduced in the Senate. The committee must make an investigation of each case. In addition, there are 6,269 cases of immigrants who are entitled to an adjustment of status. Furthermore, the President of the United States has requested that the basic immigration law be rewritten. The subcommittee will have to hold hearings on that subject.

The \$102,000 requested is \$9,272 less than the amount asked for last year. It is a reduction of \$9,272. Last year there was an appropriation of \$102,000 for 11 months. This year the same amount of money is requested for 12 months. The matter has been very carefully studied. I believe it is imperative that the resolution in the sum of \$102,000 be approved.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is this the subcommittee which considers all the private bills dealing with immigration which are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition to that, the Senator said that the subcommittee will have to hold hearings on another subject. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. The President has made recommendations to rewrite the entire immigration structure of the country. The subcommittee will have to handle that subject. In addition to that, there were 6,269 immigrants who are entitled to an adjustment of their status. A study will have to be made of that subject and a report made. The subcommittee has a staff composed of eight persons.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what kind of investigations are made with respect to each individual case?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is necessary to go into each case to determine whether a

man is entitled to an adjustment of his status.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who does the investigative work? Is it not done by the Justice Department?

Mr. EASTLAND. The committee does a great deal of that work.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means the attorneys who are employed by the subcommittee; is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not by the Senators themselves.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course not.

Mr. ELLENDER. In fact, it is not correct to say that all the work that is done with reference to these immigration cases is done by the attorneys?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; that is not correct. I would not say that. I am privileged to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, and I believe it is one of the hardest working committees in the Senate. Last year the facts show that 43.6 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced in the Senate were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Sixty-two and one half percent of all House bills and resolutions which reached the Senate were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. What percentage of those bills and resolutions were passed?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator say as many as 50 percent?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know what the figure is.

I have a statement on that point. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. KILGORE] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the workload of the committee during the first session of the present Congress.

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

#### SUMMARY OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE WORKLOAD DURING THE 1ST SESSION, 84TH CONGRESS

The workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, summarized as of the end of the session, August 2, 1955, comprised: 43.6 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 62.5 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; 48.3 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of origin.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing committee of the Senate, it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 1,305 written reports filed on legislation in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has filed 708, which represents 54.2 percent.

The total of reports filed with the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 627 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation, 682 cases involving adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act, and 419 cases involving adjustment of status under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended. Each case is equivalent to a bill.

As of August 2, 1955, the Judiciary Committee had received 1,340 Senate bills and resolutions and 634 House bills and resolu-

tions, making a total of 1,974 bills and resolutions.

As of August 2, 1955, the committee had disposed of 603 Senate bills and resolutions and 377 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 980 bills and resolutions, which includes 5 bills from which the committee was discharged.

Of the bills thus disposed of 64 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 130 were private relief bills, 784 were private immigration bills, 2 were general claims bills.

Committee approval was granted to 379 Senate bills and resolutions and 344 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 723 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

It will be noted that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but 15 of the 723 bills and resolutions approved.

Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably 51 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 71 were private relief bills, 600 were private immigration bills, and 1 was a general claim bill.

Bills postponed indefinitely by the committee included 224 Senate bills and resolutions, 33 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 257 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably 13 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 59 were private relief bills, and 184 were private immigration bills, 1 was a general claim bill.

Measures pending before the committee as of August 2, 1955, included 737 Senate bills and resolutions and 257 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 994 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of these bills 214 are general bills other than immigration and claims, 289 are private relief bills, 449 are private immigration bills, 24 are general claims bills, and 18 are general immigration bills.

It will be noted the committee has disposed of 377 House bills and resolutions out of 634 such measures referred to it, leaving 257 House bills and resolutions pending as of August 2, 1955.

This means the committee took action on 59.4 percent of all House measures received.

In comparison, out of 1,340 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 603, leaving 737 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that although the committee had to start from scratch by requesting departmental reports in most such cases, action was taken on 45 percent of all Senate measures received.

Suspensions of deportation by the Attorney General, adjustments of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, and under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, under authority delegated by the Congress, are reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the 84th Congress, there were pending in the committee 537 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 993 additional cases submitted since the beginning of the Congress, making a total of 1,530 cases, of which 613 were approved, 5 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, and 9 cases were not approved, leaving 903 cases in process as of August 2, 1955.

At the beginning of the 84th Congress, there were pending 1,018 cases of adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, to which were added 287 additional cases submitted during the 1st session, making a total of 1,305 cases, of which 611 were approved, and 9 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, and 62 were not approved, leaving 623 cases in process on August 2, 1955.

At the beginning of the 84th Congress, there were pending 41 cases of adjustment of status under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, to which were added

3,393 additional cases submitted during the 1st session, making a total of 3,434 cases, of which 409 were approved, and 7 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, 3 were not approved, and 8 were held for further information, leaving 3,007 cases in process as of August 2, 1955.

During the 1st session, 84th Congress, the committee received 54 executive nominations, of which 1 was Associate Justice of the United States, 31 were Federal judges, 8 were United States attorneys, 10 were United States marshals, 1 was a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and 3 were members of the Parole Board.

As of August 2, 1955, nominations pending totaled 14.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am privileged to serve also on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is chairman. That committee is doing very outstanding and conscientious work. However, I will say that the subcommittee to which I have referred handles much more work than the whole Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means more detailed work, of course.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but it is work that must be done.

Mr. JENNER. It must be done under the law.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly; under the law. The subcommittee is taking a reduction of \$9,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to insert the word "prior" between the word "the" and the word "consent."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer the following amendments:

On page 1, line 10, strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March"; and on page 2, line 12, strike out "\$102,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$93,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 172), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable



services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$93,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950 AND OTHER LAWS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1404, Senate Resolution 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 174) to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and other laws for the protection of the internal security of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the resolution requests funds for the internal security subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. It requests \$285,000, which is a reduction of \$7,000 from the amount the subcommittee received last year. This is a very hard-working subcommittee. It handles bills of a legislative nature and conducts investigations. I do not believe there can be any doubt that the subcommittee is entitled to this amount of money.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I beg to differ with my good friend from Mississippi. The amount appropriated last year for the subcommittee, according to the figures before me—and I have the original resolution—was \$260,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, but the Senator is mistaken, because \$30,000 or \$35,000 had been appropriated previous to that, and there was an unexpended balance carried over from the year before.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is not included in the resolution.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was money that was unexpended at the end of 1955. Both resolutions totaled \$292,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution does not so state.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have taken a \$7,000 cut.

There is something else, Mr. President, to which I should refer. Last year the leadership on both sides of the aisle wanted a code of conduct governing investigations, which cost the committee \$18,000 or \$19,000.

Previously, some of the employees of the Internal Security Subcommittee were doing internal security work for another subcommittee, and they were transferred to this committee. I do not think, in fairness to the investigation of the Communist conspiracy, this amount should be reduced.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the same number of employees as were employed last year be on the payroll this year?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have no plans in that regard. If it is necessary to carry on the work, they will be. I cannot predict how many employees we shall have. If I remember correctly, we do not have as many employees at this time as we had last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the budget calls for 25 employees.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. A year ago there were 30 employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the number be about the same as it was last year?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think it will be, but I am not going to be held down one way or the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The amendment was, on page 2, line 13, to insert between the word "the" and the word "consent", the word "prior."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 9, to strike the word "February" and insert "March"; and on line 19, to strike out "\$285,000" and insert "\$261,250."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike the word "February" and insert "March," and on line 19, to strike out "\$285,000" and insert "\$261,250."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent is there cooperation between the Senator's committee and the committee on the House side? Is there any duplication?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; there is no duplication.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator's committee coordinate its work with the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continu-

ing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$261,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### RELEASE OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON REAL PROPERTY HERETOFORE GRANTED TO THE CITY OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1508, House bill 2430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2430) to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed, upon payment by the city of Charleston, S. C., of \$500,000", and insert "the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized, in exchange for a minimum 470-foot extension at the north end of the existing 1,000-foot reinforced concrete wharf of the Charleston Transportation Depot, and the installation on the extension of rail trackage with necessary adjustments to connect with the rail trackage of the existing wharf, to be constructed by the said city of Charleston, S. C., or its lessee, the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Secretary of the Army,"; after line 21, to strike out "Beginning at a point in the west harbor line of the Cooper River (which point is south 41 degrees 31 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 13.2 feet from the southernmost corner of the concrete dock, formerly the dock of

the Charleston Quartermaster Intermediate Depot; and which point is the terminal point of the 14th call in the deed dated February 24, 1950, from the City Council of Charleston to West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.; thence north 48 degrees 28 minutes 30 seconds west for a distance of 2,999.27 feet, along the property line between tract 12 and tract 2, part 1, to a point (which is distant 11.42 feet north 68 degrees 33 minutes east from an iron pipe); thence north 69 degrees 00 minutes east a distance of 104.71 feet, more or less, to a point common to this tract 12, tract 13 (leased to South Carolina State Ports Authority by West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. by indenture dated February 4, 1947), and tract 10 (leased by the City Council of Charleston to North Charleston Terminal Co.); thence along the property line separating tracts 12 and 13, north 86 degrees 45 minutes 50 seconds east 15.58 feet, north 88 degrees 32 minutes 20 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 87 degrees 23 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 82 degrees 42 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 76 degrees 46 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 70 degrees 20 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 64 degrees 09 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 56 degrees 48 minutes 30 seconds east 25.0 feet, north 86 degrees 57 minutes 50 seconds east 373.90 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 899.77 feet, south 41 degrees 32 minutes 50 seconds west 25.0 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 1,494.83 feet to a point on the east edge of the concrete dock; thence along the east edge of the concrete dock south 41 degrees 32 minutes 50 seconds west 525.0 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning and is as shown on drawing No. 799-47-1, dated August 1949, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and insert "Beginning at a point in the west harbor line of the Cooper River (which point is south 41 degrees 31 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 13.2 feet from the southernmost corner of the concrete dock, formerly the dock of the Charleston Quartermaster Intermediate Depot, and which point is the terminal point of the 14th call in the deed dated February 24, 1950, from the City Council of Charleston to West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.); thence north 48 degrees 28 minutes 30 seconds west 2,999.27 feet, along lands of the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. to a point which is distant 11.42 feet north 68 degrees 33 minutes east from an iron pipe; thence north 69 degrees 00 minutes east a distance of 104.71 feet to a point common to this tract, lands leased by the city of Charleston to the North Carolina Terminal Co., and lands of the South Carolina State Ports Authority; thence along lands of the South Carolina State Ports Authority north 86 degrees 45 minutes 50 seconds east 15.58 feet, north 88 degrees 32 minutes 20 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 87 degrees 23 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 82 degrees 42 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 76 degrees 46 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 70 degrees 20 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 64 degrees 09 minutes 40 sec-

onds east 50.00 feet, south 30 degrees 44 minutes 40 seconds east 24.55 feet, north 86 degrees 54 minutes 06 seconds east 374.48 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 899.77 feet, south 41 degrees 32 minutes 50 seconds west 25.00 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 1,494.83 feet to a point on the eastern edge of the concrete dock; thence along the eastern edge of the concrete dock south 41 degrees 31 minutes 30 seconds west approximately 483.0 feet to the point of beginning and containing 30.75 acres, more or less."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I should like to announce that at the policy meeting today it was determined that the farm bill would be considered immediately after the completion of the Senate's action upon the money resolutions now pending on the calendar.

In addition, the policy committee cleared for consideration after completion of the farm bill Calendar No. 364, Senate Joint Resolution 31, a proposed constitutional amendment relating to the election of President and Vice President.

Also, Calendar No. 1287, Senate bill 898, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the Senate will meet and transact business on the 22d of February?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that if we start consideration of the farm bill tomorrow the debate will continue uninterruptedly until we complete it?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct, unless something of an emergency nature should interrupt it.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my belief that if we can start the debate on the bill tomorrow afternoon and continue it without other matters intervening we should be able to complete the farm bill about Friday.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will say to my friend from Louisiana that I am very hopeful that kind of a schedule can be met, but I invite his attention to the fact that there are a number of resolutions yet to be acted upon, and I think they may consume a good deal of the time tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has any effort been made before the policy committee to have the Senate sit on Saturday so that we may complete action on the farm bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would say to my friend from Louisiana that it is the judgment of the acting majority leader that there will be no session on Saturday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whether we complete action on the farm bill or not?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

#### STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1406, Senate Resolution 165.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 165) to make a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is not the intention of the leadership to have the Senate act now on the resolution which has just been made the unfinished business, but rather to take it up immediately after the morning hour tomorrow.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 20, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 926) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20, 1956:

##### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Edward Thomas Williams, O12818, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Stevens Lawton, O14924, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).



Maj. Gen. Haydon Lemaire Boatner, O15641, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arnlestead Davis Mead, O15767, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. George Henry Decker, O15950, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Gordon Byrom Rogers, O15620, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Bateman Peploe, O16246, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hobart Hewett, O12328, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bernard Linn Robinson, O12652, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

#### To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Aubrey Strode Newman, O16099, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Franklin Bird, O16179, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

#### To be major generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Patrick Cooney, O17338, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

#### To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Stuart Gross Smith, O16369, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Elbert DeCoursey, O17813, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

#### To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Brig. Gen. Arthur Letcher Irons, O16526, Army of the United States (colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

#### To be major generals

Brig. Gen. David Henry Tulley, O16075, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Lewis Sherrill Griffing, O16413, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Harold McDaniel, O16497, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alfred Benjamin Denniston, O17315, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Lewis Bell, Jr., O17549, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Elial Bush, O17634, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., O17730, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Francis Regis Seitz, O17734, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

#### To be brigadier generals

Col. George Robinson Mather, O18696, United States Army.

Col. William Jonas Ely, O18974, United States Army.

Col. Frederick William Gibb, O19222, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Creator and benefactor, inspire us during this Brotherhood Week with a clear vision of the high and helpful things that we are privileged to do together for the welfare of all mankind.

Grant that, as brothers of the Son of Man, our minds and hearts may be impervious to those attitudes and feelings of prejudice and pride, of dislike and indifference, which we know are so alien and contrary to His spirit.

We pray that, as we engage in the great enterprise of building the temple of world peace, we may seek to do Thy will and help us to hasten that glorious day of prediction when men shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and nations shall learn war no more.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 16, 1956, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 8787. An act to provide for a prorated stationery allowance in the case of a Member of the House of Representatives elected for a portion of a term;

H. R. 8796. An act to increase the amount of telephone and telegraph service furnished to Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; and

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint committee to arrange for

the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States, January 20, 1957.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3053. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such Commission shall continue in existence until the construction of such auditorium shall have been completed; and

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary copies of certain hearings and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

#### AMENDING NATURAL GAS ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 342)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., February 17, 1956.

The honorable the SPEAKER,

House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office on February 17, 1956, and said to contain a veto message from the President on H. R. 6645, an act to amend the Natural Gas Act as amended.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

#### To the House of Representatives:

I am unable to approve H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. This I regret because I am in accord with its basic objectives.

Since the passage of this bill, a body of evidence has accumulated indicating that private persons, apparently representing only a very small segment of a great and vital industry, have been seeking to further their own interests by highly questionable activities. These include efforts that I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes.

Legally constituted agencies of Government are now engaged in investigating this situation. These investigations cannot be concluded before the expiration of the 10-day period within which the President must act upon the legislation under the Constitution.

I believe I would not be discharging my own duty were I to approve this legislation before the activities in question have been fully investigated by the Congress and the Department of Justice. To do so under such conditions could