

would be dissipated into thin air by evaporation during storage. The bill before this Congress seeks to authorize a substantial portion of the overall project. Authorization of additional phases would be sought later.

In all, 58 million acre-feet of water would not flow down the Colorado River from the upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado to the lower basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California.

Yet so vital is this water in the lower basin that even today arid Arizona and California are before the United States Supreme Court litigating their rights to it.

California agrees that the upper basin is entitled to use some of that 58 million acre-feet, but contends that most of it must be left flowing down to the lower basin under provisions of a solemn contract entered into by these seven States in 1922 known as the Colorado River compact.

California's basic position is that she conforms to the compact and must insist that the States of the upper basin and the Federal Government do likewise in the planning and administration of the storage project. California thus is fighting only to preserve rights to water she already has and not for any new and additional water rights.

Relying on these existing rights, California carefully invested between one-half and three-quarter billion dollars of local money, not Federal money, for water projects calculated to make maximum use of her share of the Colorado River. Thereby, southern California was transformed from a semidesert into an oasis constituting one of the Nation's key economic and agricultural regions, supporting millions who migrated to her borders from less hospitable climates.

As southern California continues to grow, her need for water becomes greater, not less. Should the bleak day ever come when her Colorado River water supply is cut off, on that day the jobs of the millions she supports will vanish and the value of everything they own that cannot be transported to another

part of the country will be lost completely and forever.

That is why Californians in Congress are fighting so hard to prevent spending billions from the United States Treasury to build the upper Colorado project in such a manner as merely to transport the oasis of southern California to Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. In the process, financial ruin would be imposed on almost 6 million southern Californians. These States can plan their projects without this disastrous result and California demands that they do so.

The reason they have failed so far to do it is clear. To find a common ground for agreement amongst themselves, each of the upper basin States had to accept every project, good, bad, or indifferent, any of the others asked for. They ended up with a monstrosity that did not fit the interpretations and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Rather than recede, they adopted a technique of twisting, straining, and distorting the compact in an attempt to stretch it over the monstrosity.

The reason they have adopted this technique is not so clear. To understand it requires some knowledge of the Colorado River compact and the situation that produced it.

Early in this century southern California already had begun its miraculous expansion in population, agriculture, and industry. A water shortage was faced, and Los Angeles began reaching up into the Owens Valley for water to be transported through an aqueduct over 100 miles long. Even then, men of vision foresaw water needs beyond those satiable from the Owens Valley and began talk of more ambitious plans—plans which one day would result in such great works as Hoover Dam, Davis and Parker Dams, the All-American Canal, and the Metropolitan Water District's vast Colorado River aqueduct with its extensions reaching even as far as San Diego.

Meanwhile the upper-basin States were experiencing little growth or progress. A Supreme Court decision had laid down a rule of law respecting use of river

waters which said that whoever first begins using them obtains a right to continued use that cannot be taken away by someone who later wants to use the same water. The upper States foresaw burgeoning southern California acquiring first rights to almost all the river's water before they were able to appropriate uses themselves.

In this circumstance, according to the language of Delph Carpenter, Colorado's negotiator of the compact:

The upper States had but one alternative, that of using every means to retard development in the lower States until the uses within the upper States have reached their maximum.

And that exactly is what they did. The Boulder Canyon Project Act authorizing Hoover Dam was stalled in Congress for almost 10 years by the obstructive tactics of upper-basin Senators and Congressmen. It was passed only after tribute had been extracted from California and the lower basin in the following manner:

First, imposing the Colorado River compact, which removed at least 7½ million acre-feet of water from appropriation by them; and

Second, requiring the California Legislature to pass a law further limiting the amount of water to which the State could acquire first rights.

The net effect was to place on California a limit of slightly less than 5½ million acre-feet of water per year that she could use. Thus limited, the State had to jettison many desirable projects. Nevertheless, California went to work and tailored her developments on the river strictly to the limitations and to the intent and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Even with only a portion of the great dreamed-of projects built, no place in time or history has experienced developments of water resources comparable in scope and magnificence to those of southern California.

It is the water rights which underlie those developments that Californians seek to protect when they oppose the upper Colorado River storage project and charge that it tramples these rights.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1956

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

Lord God Almighty, who amidst the shifting sands of time standest sure and whose throne is forever steadfast, though often obscured by earthborn clouds, from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God. O Thou Light that followest all our way, we would yield to Thee the flickering torch of our doubts, our fears, our willfulness, and our moral failure. At this high altar in the temple of public service, maintain in us, we beseech Thee, fidelity to our possible best, knowing that of those to whom much has been given much will be required. Lift us to greatness to match these days. In Thy provi-

dence may this dear land of liberty, with all its privilege and power, be the quarry whence shall be fashioned the white stones of a new order whose alabaster cities shall gleam undimmed by human want and woe. We ask it in the 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 Monday, February 20, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2286) to amend the

Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of certain personnel of the Department of Defense, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 2108. An act to repeal certain laws relating to professional examinations for

promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 2111. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to cause to be published official registers for their respective services;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5862. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation;

H. R. 6643. An act to amend the reclamation laws to provide that excess lands acquired by foreclosure or inheritance may receive water temporarily for 5 years;

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; and

H. R. 8710. An act to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 6643. An act to amend the reclamation laws to provide that excess lands acquired by foreclosure or inheritance may receive water temporarily for 5 years; and

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2108. An act to repeal certain laws relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 2111. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to cause to be published official registers for their respective services; and

H. R. 8710. An act to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5862. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Security of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

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:

AMENDMENT OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY THE COAST GUARD IN EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts executed or negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, by the Coast Guard, for the period July 1, 1955, through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF AUDIT OF SONS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR

A letter from the commander in chief, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Ridgewood, N. J., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of audit of that organization, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRAINING OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AT PUBLIC OR PRIVATE FACILITIES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, within recent days the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of both the House and the Senate have held hearings on the subject of transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I have received many petitions relating to this subject, signed by literally thousands of people in my State.

A few days ago I received a petition from one of the outstanding citizens of Birmingham, Mrs. J. E. Dillard, with a relatively short list of signers, but including some of the most outstanding citizens of the Birmingham area.

I ask unanimous consent that the petition and list of names be printed in the RECORD.

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

PETITION

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies

the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increase the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Mrs. J. E. Dillard, L. Frazer Banks, R. H. Hurlbert, Mrs. L. M. Gunter, C. V. Swindle, Dorothy Phillips, Mrs. E. L. McRee, Mrs. H. W. Wilkins, Mrs. H. G. Jahnsey, Mrs. J. D. Williams, Mrs. W. K. Wilson, Mrs. Nancy M. Stover, Mrs. Wm. C. Brannan, Mrs. J. L. Guyton, Mrs. Walter J. Bryant, Mrs. J. B. Sansing, Mrs. W. H. Sharp, Edgar Keenon, Mrs. T. P. Chapple, Mrs. J. H. Tribble, Mrs. Fred O. Key, Mrs. Hayden McCain, Mrs. J. M. Breckenridge, Mrs. Robert D. Elby, Mrs. John B. Vaughn, Jr., Mrs. Anita P. Murphy, Cynthia Rice, Jane M. Palmer, Mrs. John Blakely, May Grace Douglas, Estele Whorton, Katie C. Williams, Lucille Rucker, Mrs. J. A. Tower, Birmingham.

RESOLUTIONS OF TRUCK-TRAILER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the Truck-Trailer Manufacturers' Association at Edgewater Park, Miss., favoring the construction of an atom-powered trallership and the enactment of legislation to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

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

RESOLUTION III, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 8289

Whereas a bill, H. R. 8289, calling for the Federal Government to construct an atom-powered trallership, as requested by the President of the United States in his annual state of the Union message, has been introduced in the Congress by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, State of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas the mission of this trallership would be to cruise the ports of the world and demonstrate to peoples in foreign countries the peacetime applications of atomic energy being developed in the United States; and

Whereas this exhibition ship would be constructed as a trallership, with exhibits housed in truck trailers that could be ramped ashore or aboard at any port, regardless of port facilities; and

Whereas the membership of the Truck-Trailer Manufacturers' Association views this proposal as a powerful, positive force for maintaining world peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Truck-Trailer Manufacturers' Association, assembled this 25th day of 1956 in Edgewater Park, Miss., for their 15th annual convention, do hereby respectfully urge Members of Congress to lend their support to H. R. 8289.

RESOLUTION IV, IN SUPPORT OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Whereas the Hoover Commission has made a diligent study of economy in the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission's 18 specific reports contain 314 recommendations that can be put into effect in part through administrative and in part through congressional action; and

Whereas the functioning of our Government will be strengthened by the adoption of these recommendations; and

Whereas the moneys saved through the economies recommended by the Hoover Commission can be used either to reduce the national debt, provide the basis for a downward adjustment of taxes, or for needed improvements such as highways, schools, and other desirable public works: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the wish of the Truck-Trailer Manufacturers' Association, assembled at Edgewater Park, Miss., this 25th day of January 1956, that various recommendations of the Hoover Commission be adopted by either administrative action, when possible, and by congressional action, when required.

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL— RESOLUTION OF ALASKA BOARD OF HEALTH

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Alaska Board of Health, Juneau, Alaska, favoring the enactment of the so-called Alaska mental health bill.

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

RESOLUTION BY ALASKA BOARD OF HEALTH RE H. R. 6376 (ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL)

Whereas the Alaska Board of Health is deeply and vitally concerned with the health problems of the Territory; and

Whereas the Federal Government, under the organic act of the Territory, is responsible for the care and treatment of the mentally ill in Alaska; and

Whereas the commitment and hospitalization procedures now in use are dangerously antiquated; and

Whereas the Alaska Department of Health, the Alaska Legislature, and the peoples of the Territory have demonstrated their desire for corrective legislation from Congress; and

Whereas there is now a bill before Congress, H. R. 6376, providing for the establishment of modern legal commitment and hospitalization procedures; administration of the act, and gradual assumption of financial responsibility for the mental health program, by the Territorial government; and provision for the construction and equipping of hospital and related facilities; and

Whereas this bill will authorize Alaska to administer her own mental health programs: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Alaska Board of Health urges that this legislation, so badly needed, be passed and approved without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of health directs the commissioner of health to forward copies of this resolution to the Department of Justice, Department of the Interior, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Governor of Alaska, Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, Bureau of the Budget, and each Senator and Representative of the 84th Congress concerned.

Adopted at Juneau, Alaska, board of health meeting, October 12, 1955.

ASA MARTIN, M. D.,

Chairman, Member, Third Division.

A. B. PHILLIPS,

Member First Division.

BYRON A. GILLAM,

Member, Fourth Division.

A. J. SCHABLE, M. D.,

Member-at-Large.

RESOLUTIONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DENTAL SOCIETY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I present, and ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the New Hampshire Dental Society, relating to appropriations for the National Institute of Dental Research.

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

RESOLUTIONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DENTAL SOCIETY

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the amount of money allotted for dental research has in the past been inadequate; and

Whereas the funds recommended for the next year by the Bureau of the Budget for the National Institute of Dental Research is less than 2½ percent of the money recommended for general health research; and

Whereas the incidence of dental disease is almost universal: Be it

Resolved, That the amount of Federal funds allotted to dental research be increased to an amount in keeping with its importance.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the present quarters for the Dental Research Institute is greatly overcrowded; and

Whereas the Congress authorized the construction of a Dental Research Building 8 years ago; and

Whereas funds for such a building have not been appropriated: Be it

Resolved, That sufficient funds be appropriated for the construction of a National Institute of Dental Research Building.

Dr. FLOYD E. WILLIAMS,

Secretary.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY PRO- GRAM—RESOLUTIONS FROM MIN- NESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 31, 1956, I placed in the RECORD a list of county officials in all parts of Minnesota who had sent me resolutions regarding the urgent need for a comprehensive, large-scale, and long-term highway program. I wish to add to this list five additional resolutions I have received endorsing Federal-aid highway legislation during this session of Congress.

Three of these resolutions, from the Moorhead Chamber of Commerce, and the Koochiching and Cottonwood County Boards of Commissioners, specifically endorse the Gore bill, S. 1048, or the Fallon bill, S. 8836.

Two other resolutions, from Lac qui Parle County Board and Mower County Board, do not specifically support any bill, but do urge an expanded highway construction program on National, State, and local levels. A similar resolution has been received from the Owatonna, Minn., Central Labor Union, and the Village Council of Rothsay, Minn.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON HONEY— EXCERPTS FROM RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, four excerpts from resolutions passed by the American Beekeeping Federation, Inc., of Cannon Falls, Minn., endorsing legislation necessary to maintain price supports on honey at their present level.

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

10

Be it resolved, That the American Beekeeping Federation in convention assembled this 26th day of January 1956, recognizing the great need for research in the marketing of honey, petition the proper United States Department of Agriculture officials regarding the establishment of a research program on honey marketing and refer this matter to the council for their approval and support.

11

Whereas since the parity price of honey has gradually decreased during the past few years, the members of the American Beekeeping Federation in order to maintain the same monetary level of the price support received for honey, do hereby instruct their officers to petition the proper officials of the United States Department of Agriculture to support honey at the rate of 80 percent of parity.

12

Since the marketing pattern of west coast and intermountain honey has changed during the past few years, thus making the price differential between eastern and western honey in the United States Department of Agriculture support price program unnecessary: Be it

Resolved, That the American Beekeeping Federation in convention assembled this 26th day of January 1956, go on record as favoring the discontinuance of this price differential and furthermore, that the officers of this organization be instructed to petition the proper United States Department of Agriculture authorities concerning the removal of this differential.

14

Whereas the export-subsidy program for honey has been of inestimable value in the removal of surplus honey in the past: Be it

Resolved, That the officers of this organization be instructed to petition the proper United States Department of Agriculture officials for the reinstatement of this program, when and if a surplus of honey is apparent and further that the program contain restrictions providing for restrictions to prevent speculation.

FOREST HYDROLOGIC LABORA- TORY, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League, giving their support for the establishment in Minnesota of a Forest Hydrologic Laboratory.

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

RESOLUTION PASSED OCTOBER 14, 1955, AT THE ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION OF THE MINNESOTA DIVISION OF THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FOREST HYDROLOGIC LABORATORY

Whereas the importance of scientific knowledge is fundamental to the proper and wise use of the forest and water resources of Minnesota; and

Whereas research to determine the relation of forest cover to the availability, quality, and quantity of water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural use is lacking and can be obtained only by initiating a broad and comprehensive research program; and

Whereas Minnesota is the headquarters of a nationally and regionally recognized research organization, the Lake States Forest Experiment Station: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Izaak Walton League of America, the Minnesota Division, endorses the need for the establishment of a Forest Hydrologic Laboratory in Minnesota; and that the League take the initiative in urging Federal and State financial support for such a laboratory to be established in Minnesota by the Lake States Forest Experiment Station.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT RELATING TO RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record*, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Agra Lite Cooperative of Benson, Minn., expressing their opposition to the enactment by the Congress of any legislation that would carry out, in whole or in part, any of the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission Report, as it pertains to the Rural Electrification Act.

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

Whereas the Hoover Commission Report, as it pertains to REA, advocates drastic changes in the existing law which governs the relationship between the United States Government and borrowers that qualify to borrow money from the Government as provided in the Rural Electrification Act; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of this board of directors, representing nearly 4,000 farmer members, that the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission Report for changes in the Rural Electrification Act are inimical to the future welfare of the rural-electrification program and will, if adopted, create a financial burden upon borrowers which would result in their eventual financial failure; and

Whereas rural electric cooperatives and other qualified borrowers, will long need the security afforded by their present ability to borrow money on a long term basis at a relatively low rate of interest in order to carry out the obligation placed on them by Congress to adequately supply electric power to rural residents: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of Agra Lite Cooperative hereby express their complete opposition to the enactment of any legislation by the Congress that would carry out, in whole or in part, any of the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission Report as it pertains to the Rural Electrification Act; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, and that they be requested to firmly oppose any legislation that may be introduced which shall be designed to revise the Rural Electrification Act in any way as recommended in the Hoover Commission Report.

EXTENSION OF SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record*, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the board of managers of the Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.,

endorsing the school milk program, and recommending the extension of the program through June 30, 1958.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE MINNESOTA CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, INC., AT THEIR MEETING JANUARY 23, 24, 1956

Resolved, That the Congress make immediately available sufficient additional funds to insure full reimbursement for the entire fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to all schools participating in the widely accepted special school milk program; further

Resolved, That Congress extend the life of the special school milk program through June 30, 1958, increasing the present yearly appropriation from 50 to 75 million dollars; further

Resolved, That the proposed \$83 million appropriation for the national school lunch program is woefully inadequate in the light of increased participation: on prevailing food and labor costs and recommend an increase to \$130 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

EXPANDED FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—STATEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record*, and appropriately referred, a statement issued by the Minnesota Department of Highways on the importance to Minnesota of an expanded Federal aid highway program.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

STATEMENT RE IMPORTANCE OF EXPANDED FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM TO MINNESOTA

Every State highway department, and specifically the State highway department and the county and municipal road and street authorities of Minnesota, are vitally concerned with the enactment at this session of Congress of an expanded Federal highway financing program comparable in magnitude to that proposed in either the Gore bill or the Fallon bill which failed in the closing hours of the last session of Congress.

Public support for a program of this kind is evidenced by the fact that more than one-half of the county boards of commissioners in the State have already adopted supporting resolutions, as individual boards, and the State Convention of the Minnesota Association of County Commissioners, held in Minneapolis on January 27 and 28, unanimously adopted a resolution demanding early action on this issue.

Doubtless, as Minnesota's Representatives in Congress, you are already aware of the close link that exists between the adoption of the proposed Federal highway program and the State constitutional amendment which will be submitted to popular vote in November.

At the outset, I might point out that long-range planning for the kind of highways our people and our industries simply have to have in the very near future calls for a commitment by Congress, not only to an expanded annual authorization for highway construction, but for a commitment to provide such highway construction funds over a longer continuing period than the customary 2 or 3 years for which Federal aid highway authorizations have been made in the past. These long-range commitments are essential not only to justify the necessary plant expansion, or production expansion, of the producers of such critical materials as steel and cement,

but also in order to make it possible for the States to proceed with the procurement of right-of-way and the preparation of plans which will be vitally necessary for the carrying out of such a long-range program.

Recently when the State highway department, for the first time in its history, was able to announce, project by project, a tentative but relatively firm program by which it hopes to put \$37 million worth of trunk highway construction under contract within the next 6 months, the announcement rated headlines in every daily newspaper in the State. Scores of weekly papers also gave it prominent display. Our people are rapidly awakening to the fact that congressional enactment of such an expanded highway-improvement program as has been proposed will step up their achievements, State and local, by approximately an equivalent amount every year.

In other words, I believe that our farm, industrial and civic groups are rapidly being alerted to the fact that they have within their grasp, provided they get the uniform bipartisan support of their congressmen, a highway program which for once in a lifetime can be in step with our mounting traffic requirements. These requirements apply to the marketing of virtually every product of our farms or our factories. They apply to the distribution of practically everything we make, or sell, or consume. And they apply with equal force to the safety and convenience of every man or woman who drives a motor vehicle, or owns a motor vehicle, or sends his children to school on a school bus.

The several plans for financing the highway program that have been advanced by the American Association of State Highway Officials, the American Road Builders Association, the Associated General Contractors of America, the National Highway Users, and lastly, but among the most important because it reflects the willingness of the average motorist to pay his share of the expense, the American Automobile Association—all of them prove that the expanded highway program can be financed, and willingly will be financed, by the people who want the roads and who will save more by having good highways to travel on than they are now paying in the cost of inadequate highways.

It is the earnest belief of the staff of the Minnesota State Highway Department, and the openly expressed belief of our county highway engineers and county commissioners, that if the additional sums that have been proposed for highway construction at State, municipal and county levels are authorized by the present Congress, and the Federal Government is committed to a long-range program of commensurate magnitude, there will be little if any question as to the adoption of our State Constitutional Amendment No. 2 at the fall election. There would be little likelihood of any successful organized opposition to this State constitutional amendment because the adequacy of funds to finance the necessary improvements on main arterials and State trunk routes, rural and urban, would appear to be assured over a continuing period of years.

The proposed amendment No. 2 to our State constitution would, as you doubtless know, allot some \$7 million more of road user funds annually to the improvement of county highways and also would provide upward of \$7 million a year to meet the road and street needs of cities of over 5,000 population. Both the counties and cities are in urgent need of additional funds, and I believe that if the way were cleared, by such Federal legislation as has been proposed, for the adoption of the State Constitutional Amendment No. 2, we would end once and for all the unhealthy conflict that has been going on for the past decade between urban and rural groups over various proposals for redistribution of road user funds.

I am sure that I speak for the people and the industries of our State, and for the best

interest of its future economy, when I urge your support for the expanded Federal aid highway program that is now taking shape in Washington.

NIAGARA PORT AUTHORITY— RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn., endorsing immediate passage of the Lehman-Davidson bills authorizing United States development of the Niagara by the Power Authority of the State of New York.

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

RESOLUTION OF RURAL COOPERATIVE POWER ASSOCIATION, ELK RIVER, MINN.

Whereas we believe in the immediate development of the United States share of Niagara power by the Power Authority of New York at the lowest possible cost, in accordance with the treaties between the United States and Canada concerning the waters of the Niagara River; and

Whereas we believe all power developed by said power authority should be disposed of in strict compliance with the existing preference laws relative to sale of power to rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and other nonprofit distributors of electricity within economic transmission distances: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we favor immediate passage of the Lehman-Davidson bills authorizing United States development of the Niagara by the Power Authority of the State of New York, and an immediate and public announcement of the Niagara-St. Lawrence power marketing plan by the power authority; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators and Congressmen from the State of Minnesota encouraging their support in the passage of the Lehman-Davidson bills or similar legislation to accomplish the foregoing.

J. MAURITZ NELSON, *Secretary*.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Douglas Maxwell Moffat, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Australia.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McNAMARA, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 3246. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BENDER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. IVES, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S. 3247. A bill to simplify, broaden, and consolidate the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to making loans to farmers and stockmen in cases of disaster and severe production losses, and to broaden his authority with respect to loans made under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3248. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3249. A bill to facilitate the payment of any lump-sum payment payable under the Railroad Retirement Act on account of the death of Henry James; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

S. 3250. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to make the applicability of State water laws to applicants for a license under that act independent of any reservation or classification of lands of the United States, to revoke the Federal Power Commission's license for the Pelton project No. 2030, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3251. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Georges Zacharias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. IVES, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 3252. A bill to provide a 5-year program of Federal construction grants for the purpose of assisting medical and dental schools to expand and improve their research and teaching facilities, and of assisting other public and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical or dental research to expand and improve their research facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3253. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Tominaga Beckmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. Res. 216. Resolution providing for the revision and printing of a compilation of Federal laws relating to regulation of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BUTLER, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. Res. 217. Resolution to investigate problems relating to the preservation of life from the effects of nuclear explosions; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. GEORGE):

S. Res. 218. Resolution amending Senate Resolution 205, agreed to February 7, 1956, relative to attempts to influence the vote of Senator CASE, of South Dakota, on the then pending gas bill; considered and agreed to.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, which appears under a separate heading.)

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

S. Res. 219. Resolution to investigate campaign expenditures, lobbying, and certain other activities affecting the Senate or any Member thereof; ordered to lie over under the rule.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING FOR NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which has as its objective the prompt carrying out of the declared intention of the Congress to construct among the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda a building to house the National Institute of Dental Research. While I believe this legislation is quite important to the American people and to the dental profession in our country, it is nonetheless very simple and uncomplicated in its contents. It would simply increase the existing authorization for such construction from \$2 million to \$5 million.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare unanimously recommended and the Congress in passing the National Dental Research Act of 1948 approved and authorized the construction of a building to house the activities of the National Institute of Dental Research. In that legislation we authorized an appropriation of not to exceed \$2 million for the construction of that building. Subsequently the Congress appropriated \$100,000 which was used to develop building plans and specifications for the dental institute. The Korean war intervened, however, and, of necessity, the construction work had to be postponed. Subsequently, and despite the fact that plans for the building have been drawn at great cost, there has been no appropriation to begin its construction. The explanation is very simple. It lies in the fact that building costs have advanced considerably since 1948, and while the sum of \$2 million was undoubtedly sufficient at that time, to construct the Dental Institute Building in accordance with the already approved plans would, it is estimated, cost more than double the

amount originally estimated. Failure to initiate the construction of the Dental Institute Building at the time the Congress authorized the project has proved a most costly postponement. If this construction should be further postponed, it will be still more wasteful. More important than the monetary aspects of this situation, however, is the fact that lack of proper facilities for the Dental Institute's program poses a serious threat to this Nation's progress toward the effective control and prevention of dental disease. I would remind the Members of Congress, Mr. President, that dental disease afflicts more than 98 percent of our population in the course of their lifetimes.

I am happy to announce that Senators ALLOTT, BENDER, DOUGLAS, HILL, IVES, KENNEDY, LEHMAN, McNAMARA, and NEELY have joined me in cosponsoring this worthy measure. We are in complete agreement that the amount authorized for the National Institute of Dental Research Building should be increased to \$5 million. It is my conviction that the increased authorization should and will be promptly approved on a bipartisan basis and that the Congress will restate its conviction that the construction of the Institute Building be postponed no longer.

Members of the Congress will find that their State, county, and district dental societies, as well as the American Dental Association, are wholeheartedly supporting the passage of this bill. In so doing America's dentists are once again proving that they are indeed members of a great profession, that now as always in the past they regard the interests and the well-being of the American people as more important than their own immediate self-interests. This is the distinguishing mark of a true profession. For this the American people are once again indebted to America's dentists, and because of this I want to express my thanks to the members of the dental profession and to assure them that I shall do all that lies in my power to see to it that this legislation becomes law and that the National Institute of Dental Research becomes a physical reality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, which is very brief, 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 will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3246) to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the National Dental Research Act, approved June 24, 1948 (Public Law 755, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out "\$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000."

PROPOSED FARMERS AND STOCKMEN'S EMERGENCY LOAN ACT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKAL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to simplify, broaden, and consolidate the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to making loans to farmers and stockmen in cases of disaster and severe production losses, and to broaden his authority with respect to loans made under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, explaining its purposes, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3247) to simplify, broaden, and consolidate the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to making loans to farmers and stockmen in cases of disaster and severe production losses, and to broaden his authority with respect to loans made under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Farmers and Stockmen Emergency Loan Act." As used in this act, "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized, in any area designated as an emergency area pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to make loans to bona fide farmers and stockmen for any agricultural purposes, including but not limited to, the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

(b) The Secretary may designate any area as an emergency area if he finds—

(1) that there exists in such area a general need for agricultural credit which cannot be met for temporary periods of time by private, cooperative, or other responsible sources (including loans the Secretary is authorized to make or insure under any other act of Congress) at reasonable rates, and on terms and conditions which farmers and stockmen could be expected to meet under the circumstances; and

(2) that the need for such credit in such area is the result of natural disaster or severe production losses.

SEC. 3. (a) Loans made or insured by the Secretary under the provisions of this act shall—

(1) be made to farmers and stockmen (A) who have a reasonable prospect for successful operation with the assistance of such loan, and (B) who cannot secure the credit they need from other sources on reasonable terms and conditions;

(2) be made at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent per annum; and

(3) be secured (A) in the case of any individual farmer or stockman, by the personal obligation and available security of the farmer or stockman, and (B) in the case of corporations or other business organizations, by the personal obligation and available security of each person holding as much as 10 percent of the stock or other interest in the corporation or organization.

(b) Such loans shall be subject to an agreement that if at any time it shall appear to the Secretary that the borrower may be able to obtain a loan from a production credit association, a Federal land bank, or other responsible cooperative or private source, at reasonable rates and terms for loans for similar purposes and periods of time prevailing in the area, the borrower will, upon request by the Secretary, apply for and accept such loan in sufficient amount to repay the Secretary or the insured lender, or both, and to pay for any stock necessary to be purchased in the cooperative lending agency in connection with such loan.

(c) Such loans shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary is authorized, in any area designated by him pursuant to subsection (b) of section 2 of this act as an emergency area, to furnish bona fide farmers and stockmen with feed for livestock or seeds for planting.

(b) The Secretary shall furnish such feed and seeds for such period or periods of time and under such terms and conditions as he may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the emergency in any such designated area.

(c) The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for carrying out the purposes of this section and shall reimburse such Corporation for the value of any commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or stockmen, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in performing such functions.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. sec. 1148a), (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") for carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) All sums received by the Secretary from the liquidation of loans made under the provisions of this act and the act of April 6, 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 43), and the act entitled "An act to provide emergency credit," approved August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 999), and from the liquidation of any other assets acquired with money from the fund shall be added to and become a part of the fund.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the fund such additional sums as the Congress shall from time to time determine to be necessary.

SEC. 7. The act of April 6, 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 43), and the act entitled "An act to provide emergency credit," approved August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 999), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. The repeal of any provision of law made by section 7 of this act shall not—

(1) invalidate any action taken, or affect the validity of any obligation incurred, under any such provision; or

(2) prejudice the application of any farmer or stockman, with respect to receiving assistance under the foregoing provisions of this act, solely because any such farmer or stockman is obligated for assistance received under any such repealed provision.

SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of the foregoing provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. Title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C., sec. 1007-1009), is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—REFINANCING AND GENERAL FARM LOANS

"Sec. 21. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make and insure loans to farmers and stockmen who are citizens of the United States for any agricultural purposes, except as provided in subsection (a) (4) of section 44 of this act, including but not limited to, the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the cost of reorganizing the farming enterprise or changing farming practice to accomplish more diversified or more profitable farming operations, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

"(b) (1) No additional loan shall be made or insured under the provisions of this title to a borrower for an amount in excess of \$21,000.

"(2) No additional loan shall be made or insured under the provisions of this title to a borrower if the total amount of such borrower's indebtedness (including accrued interest, taxes, and other obligations properly chargeable to the account of the borrower), for loans made under the provisions of this title, is in excess of \$30,000.

"(c) The term of any loan made or insured under the provisions of this title, including any renewal or extension thereof, shall not exceed 15 years from the date the original loan was made.

"(d) Any borrower (1) who has failed for a period of 15 consecutive years to liquidate indebtedness incurred by him under the provisions of this title, or (2) who has failed for a period of 15 consecutive years to liquidate indebtedness incurred by him for any other production-type loan which is being serviced and collected by the Farmers Home Administration, shall be ineligible for loans hereunder until he has paid such indebtedness in full.

"SEC. 22. The Secretary may assist in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors and may cooperate with State, Territorial, and local agencies, and committees engaged in such debt adjustment. Services furnished by the Secretary under the provisions of this section may be without charge to the debtor or creditor.

"SEC. 23. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this title."

The statement presented by Mr. ALLOTT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

There has been in this Congress, and deservedly so, a great amount of attention given to the Nation's farmers. The President's farm message was an excellent one. The administration has been working diligently on the problem. The Committee on Agriculture has literally been working night and day on the farm problem and I feel certain that there is much in the legislation proposed, upon which we can all agree. Suffice it to say that this 2d session of the 84th Congress will work for the long-range im-

provement of the farmers' position in the Nation's expanding economic picture and face the issue squarely.

One great problem of the farmer, however, receives no attention in the omnibus farm bill (S. 3138) to provide an improved farm program, as presented. That is the problem, faced by many farmers today, of obtaining suitable and adequate financing at the time it is needed. That is the problem dealt with by the bill which I now introduce.

The general problem of farm credit is one which, in the past, has received the diligent attention of the Congress. In fact, it has received such extensive attention, particularly in the areas of emergency loans and production and subsistence loans, that a patchwork of laws has developed which, too often, tends to defeat the purpose for which the various laws were provided. There exists special provisions for fur raisers, farmers, stockmen, etc., under different sets of rules depending upon whether the President declares a disaster, or the Secretary finds that there is a need for emergency credit * * * etc. The matter has become so complicated that the farmer and stockman do not know what is available, and those charged with the administration of credit often cannot honestly answer them.

I have had many conversations with, and letters from, farmers and stockmen and their organizations. During the past few months, the subject of farm credit has been discussed with hundreds of farmers personally. On December 16, 1956, the Secretary of Agriculture called a meeting at Denver which was attended by Mr. K. L. Scott and Robert McLeish and at which 200 persons were present to discuss this problem.

The entire farm-credit picture is unnecessarily complicated. It now requires altogether too much time to determine whether an applicant is qualified for one of the various farm loans. I have been advised of emergency-loan applications left pending for as long as 6 months. If there is a need for an emergency loan, and that need has been recognized by a substantial amount of legislation, then there is a need for processing these loans with reasonable speed. The same thinking applies for general farm-operation loans. The present emergency situation in farm credit cannot be attributed to either party but is due to the unprecedented demand and the archaic patchwork under which the local administrators must operate.

These, then, are the problems to which this bill is addressed:

1. Consolidation of existing farm-loan provisions.
2. Simplification of existing farm-loan provisions.
3. Broadening the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make farm loans.
4. Easing current restrictions on duration and amount of farm loans.

Farm credit needs desperately to be made less complicated and the fears of farmers in a financial crisis must be allayed. This legislation would go far toward doing just that. The only changes in the existing laws on the subject are those necessary to accomplish those purposes.

Under some circumstances the Secretary of Agriculture is now empowered to make emergency-type loans to some agricultural people, but under other circumstances action by the President is first necessary. By the provisions of this bill the Secretary would need only to determine (1) that there is a need for credit not being met by other credit sources, and (2) that this need is the result of natural disaster or severe production losses in order to proceed.

Presently, the Secretary may furnish seed and livestock feed only after Presidential declaration of a disaster. Under this bill he would be able to do so under the same cir-

cumstances as those in which he is authorized to make emergency loans.

The provisions concerning (1) rate of interest, (2) security, (3) termination of the loan when emergency no longer exists, and (4) persons to whom such loans may be made are substantially the same as the current provisions for disaster loans.

The Secretary of Agriculture currently has restricted authority to refinance existing indebtedness in a disaster situation. Specific authority to do so would be granted him under this bill. This bill would not affect existing law established for the purpose of assisting farmers and stockmen to acquire land under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or the provisions for the acquisition and maintenance of water under the Water Facilities Act. All other current emergency-loan provisions for farmers are repealed by the act. Of course, loans previously made under any provision repealed by this bill would not be affected by this bill. It is my sincere belief that by virtue of the consolidation and simplification provided in this bill, the Department of Agriculture will be able to provide credit to farmers quickly under a reasonably simple program where an emergency is found to exist.

The second part of this bill is a broadening of the old title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which authorizes loans for farmers and stockmen for production and subsistence. This authority currently is restricted to a maximum of \$7,000 for an original loan and \$10,000 total indebtedness and a maximum length of 7 years. This bill would authorize loans up to \$21,000 and a total indebtedness of loans under this title up to \$30,000. The Secretary would also be able to insure loans and is still specifically authorized to refinance existing indebtedness. The length of loans under this title, as well as the time in which a loan must be paid off to qualify for any further loans, would, by this bill, be extended from 7 to 15 years. As under the old title II, these loans would be available only to family-type farms.

There can be no question that there is a need for a liberalization of the restrictions on these general farm loans.

In Colorado alone there are about 200 families who are adversely affected by the present limitations. Many have had 5 successive years of drought, and they could not be expected to pay their obligations within the additional 2 years. These are substantial families. The ones the law was designed to protect. They have everything they own tied up in their land, improvements, and equipment. They have the ability to repay and the will to do so with the help of normal rainfall. However, these people will soon reach the end of the road under the present Farmers' Home Administration law if these limitations are not changed. These provisions benefit only the family-type farmer. He is the person I am anxious to save.

The purposes for which these general farm loans could be made would be broadened to include, but not be restricted to: The purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the cost of reorganizing the farming enterprise, or changing farming practice to accomplish more diversified or more profitable farming operations, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

There is no doubt that the need exists for a less complicated system for extending emergency credit to the farmers and stockmen. The consolidation and simplification provided for in this bill will be of inestimable value to those of our agricultural people who have good workable units but who are temporarily in need of assistance.

These problems of emergency farm credit and general farm loans should, I believe, receive the immediate attention of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP TO COMMEMORATE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DISCOVERY OF COMSTOCK LODGE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev.

There is no more colorful page of American history than that surrounding the discovery of what was probably the country's greatest boom mining camp in the shadows of the Sierra Nevada Range of mountains in western Nevada. The people of my State are planning a statewide celebration commemorating Nevada's silver centenary and the 100th anniversary of the discovery of precious metal at Virginia City.

Without the contribution of Virginia City, American history would be much less colorful. Its fabulous veins of gold and silver are responsible for some of the great achievements of the most famous families of America.

For example, Clarence McKay built the Postal Telegraph System out of silver from the Comstock Lode. The Sharon, Newlands, O'Brien, and Stewart fortunes made in Nevada helped develop the cities of San Francisco and Washington, D. C.

The Comstock Lode at Virginia City is not of historical importance regionally, but nationally. It was the wealth taken from the earth beneath Virginia City that played a role second to none in saving the Union in the calamitous War Between the States.

To dip back into history, it might be said that Nevada's birthright was Virginia City's gold and silver.

President Abraham Lincoln not only wanted another State in the 1860's to pass the 13th amendment, but he wanted this gold and silver to help the Union's great cause.

While miners dug gold and silver on the Comstock Lode in the 1860's, Nevada's Constitutional Convention passed an enabling act permitting Nevada to become a State. The constitution previously proposed had failed because a heavy tax had been imposed on the territory's mines. After this was changed, speedy passage followed and Nevada's constitution was telegraphed to President Lincoln at a cost of \$3,416.77. President Lincoln immediately proclaimed Nevada the 36th State of the Union and it still bears proudly the name of "The Battle Born State" for its great role in preserving the Union.

My bill will permit this country—North, South, East, and West—to commemorate in a proper manner this 100th anniversary of the opening page in a great chapter of American history.

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

The bill (S. 3248) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at

Virginia City, Nev., introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. NEUBERGER. 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 Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, our Nation is presently entering a cycle of its greatest population growth—a trend which foreshadows unprecedented pressures on our storehouse of natural resources. Perhaps no more delicate task confronts us than the problem of putting these resources to their best use to meet the demands of the present generation without forever impairing their availability to those who will follow us.

This conflict has been brought dramatically into focus in my home State of Oregon where a power company has received a Federal Power Commission license for a hydroelectric project, despite efforts of the Oregon State government to prevent it. The State of Oregon contends that the power company's high dam will destroy the runs of anadromous fish which spawn in the Deschutes River, a stream held in high esteem by anglers for the number, size, and quality of its fish.

On March 16, the Portland General Electric Co. will open bids for the dam which will forever form a barrier across this source of enjoyment for sportsmen and source of a livelihood for scores of commercial fishermen. When the concrete is poured for the dam's foundation and powerhouse, and unless Congress acts, a final and unhappy chapter will be written to what has become known as the Pelton Dam case. The steel and concrete of the dam will bring to an end the inspiring fish runs which, since some time in the misty past, have coursed each year up the Deschutes River to spawn. If this depredation is permitted to occur, we will again have turned our backs on the obligation to preserve and protect natural resources for the benefit of future generations. It will also stand as a symbol of private power company arrogance and disregard of State law for management of its resources.

STATE OF OREGON SOUGHT TO PRESERVE FISH RUNS

The battle to preserve the fisheries resource of the Deschutes has been long and involved. In 1949, the Northwest Power Supply Co., of Portland, Oreg., predecessor company of Portland Central Electric, applied for a Federal Power Commission license to construct, operate, and maintain a hydro-electric plant designated as Pelton Project No. 2030. The State of Oregon, the Fish Commission of Oregon, the Oregon State Game Commission, and the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League, intervened be-

fore the Commission. They objected to the Commission's authority to grant a license opposed by the State government and to the suitability of the fish-passing facilities.

In 1953, seeking to eliminate the legal objections of the State, the power company attempted to have the Oregon Legislature enact a measure which would have nullified State laws on water rights and usages. The attempt failed, and after the Federal Power Commission license was granted, an appeal was taken by the State of Oregon to a Federal court. Last June, the United States Supreme Court held that the FPC was within its authority in granting the license.

Taking refuge behind the Supreme Court decision, the power company has moved to start construction of the project. Despite the fact that the license stipulated the company work out plans for passing fish over the structure with State and Federal fisheries agencies, this has not been done. The authority of the State has been disregarded.

Because of this situation, I am introducing a bill today to revoke the license of the Portland General Electric Co. for the Pelton Dam project. But it is also necessary to correct the deficiency in water law which made the Pelton decision possible. In explaining the effect of this section of the bill, I would like to outline the background which makes its enactment necessary.

RIVER FLOWS WHOLLY WITHIN STATE OF OREGON

Mr. President, the entire length of the Deschutes River lies in the State of Oregon. It is a wholly intrastate stream. The Federal Power Commission made no finding of navigability on the Deschutes—in granting the license it proceeded on the assumption either that it is nonnavigable, or at least that it made no difference whether or not the Deschutes is navigable. The Pelton Dam license, then, represents a case of a project licensed to be built on lands of the Federal Government across a wholly intrastate stream, assumed to be non-navigable.

The State of Oregon, having objected to this project, took its case from the Federal Power Commission to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in San Francisco. That court set aside the Commission's order, on the ground that the public lands legislation of the Congress had long ago made the use of nonnavigable waters on Federal lands subject to State control, and that licensees would have to receive their water rights under the water law of the State concerned.

The Federal Power Commission took the case to the Supreme Court of the United States. Several other Western States, which, like Oregon, find a large proportion of the land—and, even more important, the water—within their borders owned by the Federal Government, joined Oregon in the litigation by submitting briefs amici curiae.

SUPREME COURT'S HOLDING JEOPARDIZES ALL WESTERN STATES

The Supreme Court reversed the court of appeals. It held, in brief, that

whatever might have been true on public lands of the United States under the Desert Land Act, those rules were made inapplicable by the fact that the proposed project would be built on Federal lands which have been reserved for power purposes—that is to say, on “reservation” rather than “public lands.” Both terms are used in the Federal Power Act, under which the license is granted.

Mr. President, the apparent implication of this decision is that—whatever may be the water rights of a State and its citizens under other Federal public land laws—these State water laws may be superseded by a simple decision by the Federal Government to create a “reservation” for some purpose. Already, I understand, Federal military reservations all over the West are relying on the Supreme Court’s decision as proof that they are beyond any requirement of compliance with State water law.

Mr. President, the decision in Federal Power Commission against Oregon—the Pelton Dam case—is thus of incalculable significance for all western States, including Oregon, in which water is more precious than gold, and in which the Federal Government holds much of the land. The people in these States believe that the implications of this holding go far beyond any reasonable requirement of Federal control over water on its own land. I think the Senate will agree this is a reasonable belief. To negate these implications, and to reverse the decision which gave rise to them, I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to make the applicability of State water laws to applicants for a license under that Act independent of any reservation or classification of lands of the United States, to revoke the Federal Power Commission’s license for the Pelton Project No. 2030, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3250) to amend the Federal Power Act to make the applicability of State water laws to applicants for a license under that Act independent of any reservation or classification of lands of the United States, to revoke the Federal Power Commission’s license for the Pelton project No. 2030, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Federal Power Act is amended by inserting “(a)” after “Sec. 27” and by inserting at the end of the section the following new subsection:

“(b) In any case where a license is required under the provisions of this act because the project, or a part thereof, for which

such license is required is to be constructed upon lands of the United States, any reservation or classification of such lands shall not affect the applicability or nonapplicability of the laws of any State, relating to the control, appropriation, use, diversion, or distribution of water to the applicant seeking the license.”

SEC. 2. Pending any future proceedings in accordance with law as amended by section 1 of this act, the license granted by the Federal Power Commission to Portland General Electric Co. to construct, operate, and maintain a hydroelectric plant, known as Pelton Project No. 2030, in and along the Deschutes River in Oregon, is revoked.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, section 1 of this bill simply provides that the creation of reservations on Federal lands shall not affect the rules governing State water laws and their application to Federal lands under existing public-lands legislation. In other words, it reverses the Pelton Dam decision and returns the law exactly to the point where it was prior to that decision.

Section 2 of the bill revokes the license granted to the Portland General Electric Co. to proceed in disregard of the objections of the State of Oregon, so that if there is ever any future consideration of projects on the Deschutes River, it will proceed in accordance with the law as amended by my bill, and as it was before the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the license on the ground that the project was located on a reservation rather than on the public lands of the United States.

Other bills have been introduced, Mr. President, which seek to institute a tremendous reconsideration and redefinition of all water laws and water rights as between the States and the National Government in our Federal system. Such a redefinition might take years to work out and to enact, and in the meantime the Deschutes would be blockaded for all time.

My bill has no such extreme ambition. It is a simple bill, and it does a simple job. It returns the law to the point where it was, or where all parties thought it was, before the recent decision that has given rise to the presently brewing crisis in western land and water law. Whatever may be later done with other bills, this bill can be studied and acted on very rapidly. I hope that we may be able to complete this action during the present session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, an editorial and an article from the Oregonian, dated February 17, 1956, and a resolution from the Estacada Rod and Gun Club, dated November 17, 1955.

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

OREGON BE DAMNED

Portland General Electric Co.’s refusal to respect the laws of the State of Oregon in the Pelton Dam matter can scarcely be termed less than arrogant. It is, in addition, contrary to the previously expressed policy of the company.

In 1953, PGE tried to pressure through the Oregon Legislature a fantastic bill which would have nullified the long-standing State statutes governing water rights and

usages. The legislature killed the bill in the house, despite a power lobby of formidable intensity.

In 1955, the legislature adopted a State water code and authorized the governor to appoint a water resources board to rule on the use of State waters. PGE had complained that the State fish commission had veto power over its proposed dam on the Deschutes River. The new water law removes this veto power—if it could be said to have existed. PGE now has the right to appeal the State hydroelectric commission’s denial of a license for Pelton Dam—based on harm to the fishery—to the State water board. The latter would be the final authority, and it would be expected to base its ruling on the greater public interest.

But PGE has made no move to proceed under the new State law. It chooses to rely entirely on a license granted by the Federal Power Commission and upheld by the United States Supreme Court. This Court ruling, which nullifies the long-established legal rights of Western States to control much of their non-navigable waters, has resulted in legislation in Congress to restore State authority. But hearings have not yet been held on the several bills directed to this end.

Blessed with a certificate of defense necessity permitting tax amortization in 5 years instead of the life of the project—a hang-over from the Korean war which amounts to a Federal subsidy—and a Federal license which nullifies State authority, PGE has called for bids for the main structures of the project. This raises another interesting point.

The utility will open bids March 16 on the main dam and powerhouse and spillway structures, the reregulating dam 2½ miles downstream, and a single fish ladder on the east bank of the river from below the regulating dam to above the main dam.

The FPC license requires that PGE work out with the State fish and game commissions and the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service plans to pass migrating fish. But if the fishery agencies will not agree, the FPC would act as arbiter. Since the FPC’s interest is power, it is obvious that there is no assurance, under the Federal license, of even moderate consideration of the great recreational and food-fish values of the Deschutes River.

But PGE has not even waited to see if agreement can be reached with the fishery agencies. It intends to build the dam first and leave the fish departments to make the best of it. It appears that PGE has not even met the minimum terms of the FPC license in the matter of fish conservation, in that it has no proper plans for downstream passage of young salmon and steelhead spawned in the gravel beds of the Deschutes, Squaw Creek and Metolius Rivers over a dam behind which the water will fluctuate drastically each day because of a peaking operation.

These are some of the reasons why we say that Portland General Electric Co. is proceeding in an arrogant manner against the public interest of the people of Oregon.

GAME MEN HIT AGAIN AT PELTON—TWO SEND VIEWS TO COMMITTEE, OPPOSING PROJECT

Oregon’s State Game Commission Thursday took vigorous issue with Portland General Electric Co.’s proposed construction of Pelton Dam on the Deschutes River.

In letters to the Save the Deschutes Committee, which is organizing State-wide opposition to PGE’s proposed dam, Don M. Mitchell, chairman of the game commission, and P. W. Schneider, director, set forth the opposition of the agency.

“It is a matter of public record that the game commission has opposed the Pelton project because this body is responsible to

the people of the State for the preservation of natural and wildlife resources," Mitchell's letter declared.

MOST SPORTSMEN OPPOSED

Sportsmen's groups generally have opposed construction of high dams on the Deschutes on grounds they would destroy one of the State's most important fish streams.

PGE has called for construction bids on Pelton Dam under a Federal license which was granted after Oregon authorities refused the company a license.

Said Mitchell: "The position of the commission remains unchanged even though a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court ruled that a Federal Power Commission permit is valid right to construct the dam.

"It must be conceded by all," his letter said, "that the high dam in the Deschutes River certainly would destroy the enormous runs of anadromous salmonoids which are now indigenous to this stream. * * * Engineers and fisheries biologists have not yet devised a way for the safe passage of adult fish over high dams and the transmission of downstream migrants safely past spillways and diversions. * * * The Pelton issue is one involving the choice of but one result: Power or fisheries resource. Not both."

MAIN OBJECTIVES LISTED

Schneider said the Commission's main objections to Pelton Dam were:

1. It would obstruct runs of migratory steelhead trout and Chinook salmon.
2. Runs could not be maintained by artificial propagation because of difficulties of handling steelhead and spring Chinook.
3. A substantial area of "excellent and productive" fishing water would be replaced by a deep, narrow reservoir with low productive potential, which also would provide an environment for trash fish.
4. It violates the spirit and concept of the lower Columbia River fishery development program and other accepted plans for basin development.

RESOLUTION OF THE ESTACADA, OREG., ROD AND GUN CLUB

Whereas the legislative history of the Federal Power Act clearly indicates that it was never the intention of the Congress to invest the Federal Power Commission with the authority, either expressed or implied, to usurp or encroach on the sovereign powers of the States to regulate the use of the waters of their nonnavigable streams; it being expressly provided in section 9 (b) (16) U. S. C. A. 802b) of said Federal Power Act that said Federal Power Commission shall, before issuing a license, require proof of the applicant that he has complied with the State laws with respect to the use of the water and the bed and banks of streams; and

Whereas the actions of the Federal Power Commission and the courts in this respect have and will continue to jeopardize and to curtail the States in their development of stream utilization and is likely to cause irreparable damage to the water, wildlife, fishery resources, agriculture, and industry and to create havoc in the administration of the water laws in the States, all in contravention of long established public policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners on this 13th day of September 1955, hereby does urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Federal Power Act so as to compel the Federal Power Commission to require proof that applicants for a license have obtained prior approval of the several States in respect to the use of the waters and the beds and banks of streams, notwithstanding the fact that the project sought to be li-

censed is to be located on public lands or reservations of the United States which have been withdrawn for power purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That such legislation shall impose on the Federal Power Commission the duty to require such proof, as above mentioned, whether or not the project shall have an adverse effect on the navigable flow or the navigable capacity of any navigable stream.

FRANK MARSHALL,

President.

ALICE E. CARTER,

Secretary.

FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM OF FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS

Mr. PURTELL. 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 Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an administration bill to carry out the President's recommendation that Congress enact legislation authorizing a 5-year program of grants to assist in the construction of medical and dental research and teaching facilities. The physical facilities for research and teaching in the health field are most inadequate. We cannot continue to make progress in strengthening the Nation's health until these necessary facilities are improved.

As President Eisenhower noted in his health message:

Physical facilities of medical research and teaching institutions are inadequate to meet the human needs of the Nation. As we strive to achieve better health for the people, we must help to provide the needed laboratories and teaching facilities.

The bill I am introducing today would authorize Federal construction grants of \$250 million to be spent during a 5-year period to assist accredited schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health in expanding and improving their research and teaching facilities. It would also help other private and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical or dental research to expand or improve their research facilities. Federal grants made under this program would have to be matched at least equally by the institution being aided.

One of the most important features of this proposal is its primary focus on the intimate interrelationship of the research and teaching functions in our great centers of medical learning. It is the only proposal of its type—to the best of my knowledge—which clearly reflects the ever-increasing interdependency of the research and teaching functions in the health sciences.

This bill, in brief, will combine the best features of the various research construction and medical school aid bills which previously have been introduced.

Mr. President, there is ample evidence that the medical and dental schools of the country are in serious need of improved facilities. Evidence previously presented to the Senate Committee on

Labor and Public Welfare has borne out the need for prompt action to strengthen medical education and research by providing Federal assistance in the construction and renovation of research and teaching facilities. The Association of American Medical Colleges for several years has been pointing out the serious financial problems faced by the medical schools. They have made it abundantly clear that Federal financial assistance is needed if the physical plant of the schools is to be made adequate to the demands of modern medical research and education. The American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Public Health Association, and other equally well-informed organizations favor Federal action of the type proposed in this bill.

The bill as drafted provides ample safeguards against Federal domination of medical and related education. It provides for a 16-man National Advisory Council, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise and assist the Surgeon General in important policy matters arising in administration of the program.

It provides, also, for close coordination of the health and the education aspects of the program. Furthermore, it specifically prohibits any Federal official from exercising any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curricula, methods of instruction, research, or administration of any institution involved in the program.

Mr. President, we in the Senate have been studying ways and means of improving the public health, and we have taken many steps to strengthen health services throughout the Nation. The proposal I am introducing today clearly takes its place among the most important and well-conceived health measures with which we have dealt. As I have said, this bill is unique, in that it combines and strengthens the best features of various earlier proposals to improve medical and dental research and teaching—without Federal domination.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate act promptly and favorably on this bill to provide Federal matching grants for the construction and improvement of private and other nonprofit medical and dental research and teaching facilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD and that it be held at the desk until the end of the week, to enable any other Senators who may wish to do so, to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 3252) to provide a 5-year program of Federal construction grants for the purpose of assisting medical and dental schools to expand and improve their research and teaching facilities, and of assisting other public and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical or dental research to expand and improve their research facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PURTELL (for

himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Medical and Dental Research and Teaching Construction Act of 1956."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(a) Improved health is essential to individual well-being and to the Nation's economic growth.

(b) Full exploitation of new developments and promising avenues of investigation in medicine, dentistry, and related scientific fields, and adequate numbers of physicians, dentists and professional public health personnel, are essential for the improvement of health services and for more effective prevention and disease-control measures.

(c) Research institutions and medical and dental schools have serious unmet needs for additional and improved space for research and for teaching.

(d) Despite increasing support for medical and dental research and teaching institutions, from individuals, private funds and foundations, the professions, industry, and State and local governments, the cost of providing adequate facilities is so high and capital funds for physical plant are so limited that these institutions need additional assistance to finance essential improvements or additions to existing facilities and needed new facilities.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 3. The Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. ch. 6A) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VII—ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL RESEARCH AND TEACHING FACILITIES

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 701. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, such sums as the Congress may determine for grants, as provided in this title, to assist in the construction of new or improved facilities for medical or dental research or teaching, except that the aggregate appropriations during such period for grants for medical research and teaching facilities may not exceed \$210 million and the aggregate appropriations during such period for grants for dental research and teaching facilities may not exceed \$40 million.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

"ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible to apply for a grant to assist in the construction of any facility under this title, the applicant must be a public or nonprofit school or other institution, must be accredited or approved as provided in subsection (b), and, in the case of a teaching facility or a facility for both teaching and research, must be a medical or dental school.

"(b) To be accredited or approved for purposes of this title—

"(1) Medical schools, dental schools, universities, and other educational institutions must be accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, except that a new school or other academic institution, which (by reason of, or an insufficient period of operation) is not, at the time of application for a grant to construct a facility under this title, eligible for accreditation by such a recognized body or bodies, shall be deemed accredited for purposes of this title if the Commissioner of Education finds, after consultation with the appropriate accredita-

tion body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the school or other institution will, upon completion of such facility, meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies.

"(2) Other institutions must be determined by the Surgeon General, in accordance with standards established by regulation, to be competent to engage in the type of research for which the facility is to be constructed.

"(c) No institution shall be eligible for a grant under this title to assist in the construction of a hospital or other facility for which Federal grants may be made under title VI unless the Surgeon General determines that such facility is specially designed for and will be principally used for medical or dental research or teaching and does not constitute a project or part of a project with respect to which a Federal grant has been approved under title VI.

"APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 703. (a) No grant may be made under this title with respect to any facility except upon an application therefor filed in accordance with regulations (but not later than June 30, 1961) and approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that:

"(1) The applicant meets the eligibility conditions set forth in section 702.

"(2) The application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than 10 years after completion of construction, the facility will be used for the research purposes for which it is to be constructed or, in the case of a medical or dental school, the facility will be used for medical or dental research or teaching, and (B) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility and, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the research or teaching for which it is being constructed.

"(3) Construction of the facility will expand the applicant's capacity for medical or dental research or teaching or is necessary to improve or maintain the quality of the applicant's medical or dental research or teaching.

"(b) In determining the order in which applications shall be approved, the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding medical or dental research or teaching capacity, in improving the quality of such research or teaching, or in promoting a more effective geographical distribution of such research or teaching, and other factors relevant to the purposes of this title, as may be prescribed by regulation.

"AMOUNT OF GRANT; PAYMENTS

"SEC. 704. The Surgeon General, in approving an application with respect to any facility, shall determine the amount of the grant to be made with respect to such facility; except that, in no event may such amount exceed 50 per centum of the necessary cost of construction of such facility, as determined by him. Upon such approval, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount so determined, and shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. Such payments shall be made through the disbursement facilities of the Department of the Treasury. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon his approval of an amendment of the application or upon his revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"RECAPTURE OF PAYMENTS

"SEC. 705. If, within 10 years after completion of any facility for which funds have been paid under this title,

"(a) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

"(b) unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so, the facility shall cease to be used for the research purposes for which it was constructed, or, in the case of a medical or dental school facility, for medical or dental research or teaching, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States District Court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON MEDICAL RESEARCH AND TEACHING FACILITIES

"SEC. 706. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Council on Medical Research and Teaching Facilities consisting of the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education, both of whom shall be ex officio members, and 16 members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil-service laws. The 16 appointed members shall be leaders in any of the fields of the fundamental sciences, medical sciences, education, or public affairs and not less than 8 shall be selected from among leaders in the fields of medical, osteopathic, dental, or public health research or education. The Secretary shall designate one of the members as chairman of the Council.

"(b) The Council shall advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of regulations pertaining to the establishment of criteria for determining the eligibility of institutions, for allocating available funds among various types of applicants, and for approving applications (including criteria for determining the relative priority among applicants), and in the review of applications, and shall advise and assist him in other important policy matters arising in the administration of this title.

"(c) Appointed members of the Council, while attending conferences or meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding \$50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 735-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"CONSULTATION ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS

"SEC. 707. The Secretary, pursuant to the authority vested in him by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 (67 Stat. 631), and by section 201 of this act, shall make appropriate provision for consultation between the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education on educational matters arising in the administration of this title.

"NONINTERFERENCE WITH ADMINISTRATION OF INSTITUTIONS

"SEC. 708. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, nothing contained in this title shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirement or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, research, or administration of any institution.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 709. For the purposes of this title—
"(a) The term 'medical school' means a school which provides training leading to a

degree of doctor of medicine or osteopathy, or a graduate degree in public health;

"(b) The term 'dental school' means a school which provides training leading to a degree of doctor of dental surgery, or an equivalent degree;

"(c) The terms 'construction' and 'costs of construction' include construction of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, initial equipment and architects' fees, but do not include the cost of acquisition of land and off-site improvements.

"(d) The term 'nonprofit institution' means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

SEC. 4. Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read:

"SECTION 1. Titles I to VII, inclusive, of this act may be cited as the 'Public Health Service Act'."

SEC. 5. The act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, is further amended by changing the number of title VII to title VIII and by changing the numbers of sections 701 to 714, inclusive, and references thereto, to sections 801 to 814, respectively.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF LAWS RELATING TO CARRIERS SUBJECT TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 216), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is requested (1) to prepare such material as it may deem necessary in order to bring as closely to date as possible the set of volumes entitled "Compilation of Federal Laws Relating to the Regulation of Carriers Subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, with Digests of Pertinent Decisions of the Federal Courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Text of or References to General Rules and Regulations," and (2) to transmit such material to the Secretary of the Senate in manuscript form suitable for printing.

SEC. 2. Such material when received by the Secretary of the Senate shall be printed as a Senate document.

IMPROVED FARM PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. BARKLEY) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 28, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Justin C. Morgan, of New York, to be United States district judge, western district of New York, Vice John Knight, deceased; and

Richard H. Levet, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern

district of New York, vice John C. Knox, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROSS RIZLEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 24, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, vice Edgar S. Vaught, retiring. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and myself as chairman.

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. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address delivered by him before Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at Washington, D. C., on February 16, 1956.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him on the World Health Organization, and excerpts from an article on the subject of nursing, published in the WHO newsletter.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement for the information of the Senate.

I invite the attention of the distinguished minority leader to the fact that the treaty designated Executive Q, of the 83d Congress, 1st session, relating to an international convention to facilitate the importation of commercial samples and advertising material, will be taken up on Wednesday immediately following the reading of the Washington Farewell Address by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. On the treaty there will be the customary yea and nay vote. I should like to have all Senators on notice that that is the plan of the leadership.

In addition, as previously announced, as soon as the Senate completes action on the resolution which is the unfinished business, it is planned to proceed with the farm bill.

The Senate will be in session tomorrow and will be in session every day

through Friday. I do not contemplate that there will be a Saturday session, or that there will be any late evening votes. I hope the Senate may complete action on the farm bill by the weekend, but, if it does not, the bill will go over until the early part of next week.

Mr. President, I had expected that there would be a call of the Executive Calendar today, but I am informed that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is out of town, and he has asked that the nominations to the United States Tariff Commission not be considered this week. Those nominations have been on the Executive Calendar since the middle of January, and I have been pressed on occasions by the minority leader for an executive session to deal with them.

I hope the minority leader will be as patient with me as he usually is in his understanding of what is proposed. There is nothing that makes a Senator more patient than to be majority leader himself, as the Senator from California was. I shall attempt to have the Senator from Illinois be prepared to permit a discussion of the nominations with his consent; otherwise the Senate will proceed to consider them in the early part of next week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader, because, as he has pointed out, we have had considerable discussion with him and, in his absence, with the acting majority leader. We feel that, in view of the fact that the nominations were reported on January 12, and we are now in the latter part of February, it is not unreasonable to have the nominations considered and acted upon. In conformity with the distinguished Senator's statement, I hope that early next week there will be consideration of the executive calendar, and, if there is to be any debate on the Tariff Commission nominations it can take place at that time.

STEPS LEADING TO CONSIDERATION OF THE NATURAL GAS BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while we are on that subject, if the Senator from California will permit me, I should like to express my very deep appreciation to the very able minority leader for his remarks on the occasion of the statement by my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], with reference to bringing a certain piece of proposed legislation to the floor.

I think the RECORD should show that at the last session for more than 5 weeks after the natural gas bill was ordered reported, the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California did not ask that a report be filed or the bill be considered. We felt we should not ask the Senate to consider controversial proposed legislation at that time, unless the House was going to act on it. Our Policy Committee was unanimous, not on the merits of the bill, but on the principle that a bill reported by a standing committee by at least a majority vote had merit and should be debated. But, at the insistence of the Senator from Texas, the gas bill was not scheduled for 5 long weeks.

In the interim the Senator from Texas was stricken, and the bill was brought up in the House. Then a request was made by proponents of the bill, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and others, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill. The then acting majority leader, after consulting with the Policy Committee, recognized the fact that there were opponents of the bill who desired to be heard, and felt they had to talk about it for at least 2 weeks. And it was desired not to delay the adjournment of the Senate. So it was then unanimously agreed, when the Senator from Texas was in the hospital and had no direct communication concerning what had taken place, that the bill would be carried over with the understanding that it would be taken up at this session.

I should like to add that at this session I took up every other bill on the calendar which was ready and which the sponsors thought should be considered. When we got to the gas bill I asked what was the pleasure of the policy committee. The minutes of the meetings of that committee, although they are not usually public property, in this instance, I think, should be made public because of gross misrepresentation in the press, and perhaps by some of our own colleagues.

The minutes of the meeting when the gas bill was discussed show that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], as acting majority leader, said it had been agreed that the proposed legislation would be considered early in this session. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said that was his understanding. Neither of those Senators favored the bill.

After a discussion the senior Senator from Texas said, "Is there objection to scheduling the bill for consideration?"

The Senator from Missouri stated, "I will not object, but I want to say it will be very unfortunate in my State."

There was no objection raised.

So, Mr. President, I stated at a press conference immediately thereafter that the bill was reported for discussion and for vote, just as in the case of the proposal to report on yesterday the electoral college bill and the truck trip-leasing bill—both of which I may vote against or vote for—in order that the Senate itself may not have proposed legislation bottled up.

The Senator from Texas is not apologizing or defending any action he has taken. He is explaining to people who want to know the truth what the truth is. He is happy he lives in an environment and associates with company and is helped in his work by persons such as the minority leader, who, in the absence of the Senator from Texas, had the courage to rise and say, "I take my full share of responsibility," because there has never been a bill brought before the Senate, since Senator Taft and I were leaders, and since the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and I were leaders, without the consent of both policy committees. If I am incorrect, I should like to have the Senator from California correct me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the Senator from Texas is not incorrect.

Let me say that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that has been the policy which has been followed when either of the two parties was in the majority, and when the late Senator Taft, as well as I, myself, served in the capacity of majority leader, and for as long as the distinguished Senator from Texas has served as majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hold in my hand the calendar. To the first bill on the calendar, objection has been raised. On the second one, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] desires to have notice. To the third one, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has a substitute. On the fourth one, a request has been made for more time for the minority to consider it—and so forth and so on. These notations are in the handwriting of the minority leader; and that has been true in the case of every measure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish the Senator from Texas to understand that I do not regard as culpable the act of bringing from the policy committee a bill with which every member of the committee does not agree, because I, myself, frequently vote to report bills to which I make the reservation that I shall oppose them on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall not attribute such a motive to my friend, the Senator from Vermont. But the press has referred to such instances—stating, in one instance at least, that five members were against the bill, and that in another instance, at least, the Senator from Texas had an implied protest about it.

I want the record to be straight. I want the country to know that it is very pleasing to me to be associated in the leadership of this body with a man whose character and courage are such that, when the bombs are bursting, he will stand up and defend his colleague and will tell the truth.

Mr. AIKEN. Also, Mr. President, let me say that in the opinion of the Senator from Vermont, it was not entirely the opponents of the measure across the aisle who induced the veto of the bill by the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me also add—and I think this should be stated in the RECORD—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me to interrupt him at this point—

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not intend to discuss the veto; but inasmuch as the press has discussed it, I should like to say this about the veto: The President has exercised his constitutional authority. I did not agree with the President's judgment—as, obviously, he did not agree with the judgment I had. However, so far as I am aware, that will

have no effect whatsoever on our relations. No statement of mine ever indicated it, and there is no justification for any such assumption.

Mr. WILEY. That is wonderful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not pass on proposed legislation on the basis of personalities or on the basis of parties. I try to put my country first, and act accordingly. Sometimes my judgments may be bad, but my intent is nevertheless good.

Mr. AIKEN. That statement and that position are in full keeping with the character of the Senator from Texas.

I think perhaps it should also be a matter of record that the natural-gas bill was not—to the best of my recollection—ever officially acted upon by the Republican policy committee. I assume that the minority leader was acting in his own individual capacity in agreeing with the Senator from Texas; and he had every right to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think it is the custom for the minority policy committee—at least, that was true when we were in the minority—not to schedule the proposed legislation to be considered. The majority leader does that; and the majority leader looks to his policy committee for the schedule. But the majority leader never schedules any measure for consideration without informing the minority—at least, that has been true up to now, although tomorrow morning he may oppose a motion to proceed to consider some measure or may refuse to join in giving unanimous consent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for whatever time may be necessary in order to set the record straight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is important for the people of the country and the press of the country to understand the mechanics of Senate procedure. It is the majority policy committee which has the responsibility of scheduling proposed legislation. Normally in the procedures, the majority leader is guided by the majority policy committee in deciding what legislative proposals shall be scheduled.

The Senator from Texas is correct, and has been correct, in saying that no legislative proposal is taken up without advance consultation and advance notice to the minority leader. There may be scheduled many times—the last bill was not one of them—proposed legislation to which the minority leader himself is quite opposed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And frequently there is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And that situation might be reversed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And frequently that is the case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But when I receive notice, I inform—and did in this case—the minority policy committee as to the scheduling of the proposed legis-

lation; and the records of the minority policy committee will so indicate—just as I shall report today on the scheduling of the measures the majority is proposing for Senate consideration as soon as the farm bill is disposed of.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out that it is highly probable that some of our friends across the aisle, who are on the opposite side of the question from the Senator from Texas, although they may have been elated over the veto, were in no sense responsible for it. That was my purpose in rising to speak, the other day; but I was very sorry to read in the press, the next day, that I had been needling the Senator from Texas, because that was the farthest thing from my mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the privilege of the Senator from Vermont; and I did not interpret his remarks as constituting needling at all.

Mr. President, I exercised no influence on the Members on this side or on the President in connection with that proposed legislation. I realized that my State had a vital interest in it, and I think most Senators felt that their States had an interest in it.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Once the natural-gas bill was scheduled, I asked my colleague [Mr. DANIEL] at the end of a 1½-hour speech, to yield to me. He yielded to me for about 10 minutes and at that time I made some observations. I left, that afternoon, and went to Florida, in accordance with the instructions of my physicians. I remained there for 11 days. I did not return during the remainder of the debate, until the acting majority leader called me and told me that the opponents were ready to vote—that they had debated the bill for about 3 weeks, and that they would like to have me return, and would like to have a unanimous-consent agreement entered, and were ready to vote on Monday.

So we let them select the day and the hour and the conditions. Although the Senator from California felt that we had wasted some time, and should vote earlier, nevertheless we were so considerate of the opponents that we let them select the time for the vote.

While I was in Florida, I kept reading newspaper articles and magazine stories saying that the Senator from Texas was wielding an unusual influence and was determined to ram the bill down the Senate's throat. Mr. President, I am not a child; I have been in these situations before. My daddy used to tell me, "Don't get on the firing line unless you expect to get shot at."

So I expect a certain amount of punishment to go with the leadership; but I do not expect people to be unfair and unjust, although frequently the uninformed are.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is a common practice that when one State finds itself in the possession of a valuable natural resource, it tries to get as much as possible from that resource. The other day, I stated on the floor of the Senate that if I were from one of the gas-producing

States, undoubtedly I would be in favor of the natural-gas bill. However, being on the other end of the transaction, it seemed to me that, even though the gas-producing States had tried to get everything possible to be obtained for their resource, we had an equally great obligation to undertake to protect the people in our consuming States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas left no doubt about his deep convictions in this matter.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On the other hand, the Senator from Texas attempted to be as discreet as he could and should be in the position he occupied. If the Senator from Vermont or any other Senator was overlobbied, it was not done by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Texas is quite correct. I do not think he ever asked me to vote for the bill, although I think he expressed disappointment when he learned that I was going to vote against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sure that I ever knew how the Senator intended to vote.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. This is the loveliest "wake" I have ever attended in the Senate. I assure the Senator from Texas that in my humble opinion the ideas which he has expressed are the finest expressions I have heard in the Senate.

We learn in life that one's perspective is largely governed by what we may call his background. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has just reminded us of the fact that geography has played a part. One's background educationally, racially, religiously, and economically—and I think, above everything else, geographically—determines one's perspective with respect to legislative measures. But there is something else that determines perspective, something that is more important than all the things I have mentioned. I refer to an understanding mind. The Senator from Texas has demonstrated that quality here today. I think he has taught us all a lesson.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate for consuming so much time. I had merely intended to express to the Senator from California [Mr. KNCWLAND] the appreciation of a grateful heart.

GOVERNMENT STORAGE OPERATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 23 there appeared on pages 1020 and 1021 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] under the caption "Need for Facts Regarding Surplus Versus Inventory for Nation's Needs."

In connection with this statement there also appears in the RECORD a letter from the Senator from Minnesota to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Committee on Agricul-

ture and Forestry of the Senate, dated January 21, 1956. That letter in its entirety reads as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1956.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture
and Forestry, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALLEN: In view of the issue raised before our committee Friday about the extent to which one of our Minnesota grain cooperatives was benefiting from Government storage operations, I believe it only fair to ask that the record be completed by requesting the Department of Agriculture to provide full information on storage payments to all warehousemen in Minnesota, private as well as cooperative.

For that purpose, I urge you to have the committee staff obtain from the Department of Agriculture a complete listing which shows:

1. All the storage facilities in Minnesota approved by the Department for storage of CCC-owned commodities;
2. The total amount of storage utilized in each during the calendar year 1955;
3. The total payment to each for storage purposes during the same period;
4. Designation of which facilities have been given guaranteed occupancy contracts for such storage and which have not;
5. The amount of payment to each holder of such guaranteed occupancy contract covering space unused for storage purposes;
6. The extent to which each approved storage facility has been granted tax amortization benefits of accelerated depreciation.

Only in this way do I believe proper comparisons can be made to judge whether there is any validity to charges entered in our record pertaining to the storage benefits accruing to the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, one of our great Midwest cooperatives.

Furthermore, I believe the hearing transcript will show requests were made for further information about the total extent of the grain operations of this cooperative. Because it is a major competitor in the grain trade with other private firms, I do not believe it fair or just to ask the GTA to make any report of its operations not similarly requested of all its major competitors in the grain business.

To the extent that the same information is asked from any other grain handlers or dealers, I am sure officers of the GTA will be happy to provide detailed data on any of its operations to our committee.

As long as this subject of grain storage has been raised, I believe the committee should go further, looking carefully into what policies the Department of Agriculture has been following.

During the previous administration, a vigorous crackdown was made on grain handlers defrauding farmers and the Government through theft of grain. You, as chairman of our committee, were largely instrumental for exposing these thefts, and full cooperation of the Department of Agriculture was given in bringing charges against these crooked dealers. If I recall rightly, charges were filed against more than 300 grain handlers, involving some \$7 million. More than 50 convictions were obtained, many others subsequently settled out of court, and some charges are still unresolved.

It is my understanding today that practically all of these same warehousemen have once again been approved by the Department for handling of Government-owned grain. The Department of Agriculture is again doing business with them. Of course, some of them went through mock reorganizations or name changes, but basically the same people are involved.

In my opinion, this situation calls for a full-scale investigation as soon as the farm

bill is out of the way, either by our committee or, if you deem advisable, by the Senate's Permanent Investigating Committee.

If the information I have received is correct, it seems deplorable to me that men who defrauded the Government are now rewarded with new contracts at nearly double the previous storage fees.

It is more than deplorable when, in the face of such a situation, spokesmen for this administration have the effrontery to publicly criticize a farmer-owned cooperative on the ground that its primary interest is making money through grain storage.

Testimony of Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the GTA, flatly called such charges a lie. From my own knowledge of the situation in Minnesota, I support him most vigorously. The GTA's primary interest at all times has been the highest possible returns for its farmer members, and its dealings with the Government have at all times been as clean as a whistle.

If such charges are to be bandied about, however, it would be constructive to get the facts on the table for all to see.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Several paragraphs in this letter are certainly of more than ordinary interest; and I invite particular attention to the paragraphs beginning midway in the letter, which read as follows:

As long as this subject of grain storage has been raised, I believe the committee should go further, looking carefully into what policies the Department of Agriculture has been following.

During the previous administration, a vigorous crackdown was made on grain handlers defrauding farmers and the Government through theft of grain. You, as chairman of our committee, were largely instrumental for exposing these thefts, and full cooperation of the Department of Agriculture was given in bringing charges against these crooked dealers. If I recall rightly, charges were filed against more than 300 grain handlers, involving some \$7 million. More than 50 convictions were obtained, many others subsequently settled out of court, and some charges are still unresolved. . . .

In my opinion, this situation calls for a full-scale investigation as soon as the farm bill is out of the way, either by our committee or, if you deem advisable, by the Senate Permanent Investigating Committee.

If the information I have received is correct, it seems deplorable to me that men who defrauded the Government are now rewarded with new contracts at nearly double the previous storage fees.

I could not imagine that these observations would stand without some response from the Department of Agriculture; and accordingly I made inquiry as to the answer the Department might have made.

I learned that on February 10 the Secretary did make a reply; and at my request a copy of his letter has been supplied to me. It reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

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

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: My attention has been directed to your accusation that the Department of Agriculture is doing business with warehousemen who have been convicted of thefts of Government-owned grain. This matter has been examined by this Department and we have found that the facts do not support this charge.

When I assumed office I found in effect a set of regulations concerning the investiga-

tion and approval of warehousemen who desired to store Government-owned commodities. Unfortunately, the regulations were not issued by my predecessor until the Government had already lost millions of dollars as a result of thefts of Commodity Credit Corporation grain by warehousemen. Their issuance, therefore, to an extent represented "locking the barn after the horse had been stolen."

We are doing business with some 14 country warehousemen in Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota who sold flaxseed owned by CCC for seed and later replaced it with other flaxseed shipped in from Texas. These operators settled their civil claims with CCC by accounting for their gross profits in the transactions, and although two were indicted no convictions were ever obtained. The decision to resume doing business with these warehousemen was made during the last administration and the matter has never been subsequently reopened. There are also a very few cases where we are doing business with organizations which were short and the shortage was the result of the default of an official or employee who was subsequently replaced and we have assurance that the management of the organization is now on a sound basis.

If you have knowledge of any case where a convicted thief has been able to conceal from us and from State warehousing authorities his past record and as a result has been able to reenter the grain warehousing business I hope that in the interest of good administration you will inform me promptly in order that I may take corrective action at once. Please understand that I have no objection to an investigation of this matter, but I see no reason for delay if you have any information which you are willing to supply.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

This letter speaks for itself. In my judgment it is a complete refutation of the allegations which were made to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RUSSIA'S REQUEST FOR A FRIENDSHIP PACT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD one paragraph of a letter from Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, dated February 4. Dr. Morgan is a former president of Antioch College and a former head of the TVA. He has a long list of public services to his credit. The excerpt from the letter reads as follows:

My other conviction relates to our day-to-day policy. Take the case of Russia's recent request for a friendship pact. Why can we not say in specific terms how actions speak louder than words? Wars are built in the minds of peoples. So long as Russia indoctrinates her people with the ideas that American labor is oppressed and coerced, that lynchings are usual, and that America is a servile country dominated by plutocracy, what is the use to talk about friendship. Why not begin by asking her to cooperate in honest effort to establish or to publicly repudiate certain propaganda charges, and offer to do the same with reference to our charges, as about slave camps. A constant reiteration of our desire for honest friendship, with constant repetition of our willingness to make honest examination of charges on either side, and this is in spirit of restraint rather than of name calling, would, I believe, make a deep impression. Insofar as such a program should be carried out it would tend to remove suspicion and hatred

that are based on false propaganda. Russia has left herself wide open to such proposals, and would have difficulty in rejecting them without loss of prestige. But we would have to do the job honestly, and not just as clever moves for prestige purposes.

CARGO PREFERENCE AS APPLIED TO SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to keep the record straight.

With all the furor about the cargo preference bill and the allegation that our merchant marine does not need to have the 50-50 principle applied to the surplus agricultural commodities, it might be well to bear in mind the following discouraging facts concerning our merchant fleet which have just come to my attention.

According to a report issued on February 13 by the American Merchant Marine Institute, as of September 1955, only 21.8 percent of United States oceanborne foreign trade is being carried aboard American flag vessels, exclusive of trade with Canada and trade in military controlled vessels.

What alarms me is not the fact that even with our cargo preference law we are still not carrying the substantial portion of our foreign commerce envisioned by those who wrote the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; but rather the fact that in September 1954, our ships were carrying 27.2 percent of such cargoes.

Thus, it is clear that our vessels, even with cargo preference assistance, have suffered almost a 20 percent decline—think of that, almost a 20 percent decline, from 27.2 percent to 21.8 percent—in cargo carriage within 1 year.

How anyone recognizing the importance to our economy and national defense of our merchant marine could recommend the weakening, let alone the repeal of our cargo preference law, is beyond me. It would make a great deal more sense to me, and I am sure to many other Senators, if we were to change the 50-50 principle so as to require that 100 percent of such government-financed cargoes as those covered by Public Law 480 were carried entirely aboard American flag ships.

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER ON THE NIAGARA RIVER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there is a piece of proposed legislation in which the people of my State are vitally interested, which I have been urging and advocating in the Senate since 1950. It is legislation which is urgently and vitally needed to prevent an extravagant and unjustifiable waste which has been going on for many years. I am referring to the legislation providing for the public development of hydroelectric power on the Niagara River.

Mr. President, at long last this legislation was acted upon by the Public Works Committee of the Senate. That action was taken on January 16, more than a month ago. I understand that a report was prepared by the majority of the committee and made ready for

filing some weeks ago. That report is being held up, because the minority of the committee, which does not favor the bill which was reported by the majority, has not completed its work on the minority views.

I understand that minority views have been written but the Senators favoring them have not gotten around to approving them or filing them.

This is very unfair to the people of my State. It is unfair, in my judgment, to the Senate.

The majority leader of the Senate has included the Niagara power development bill on his list of "must" legislation. It is "must" legislation for New York State and for the people of the northeastern section of the United States. It is my fervent hope that this proposed legislation can be called up shortly for debate, consideration, and a vote. Before that can happen, however, the report must be made public. It must be made available to the other Members of the Senate so that they may study it and give it consideration. It must be made available to the general public so that they may consider it and indicate their interest in this legislation to the Members of the Senate.

I, therefore, urge upon those members of the Senate Public Works Committee who are in opposition to the bill introduced by me in association with 16 other Members of the Senate—Senate bill 1823—to complete their work upon the minority views and to file them so that there may be no undue delay in bringing this measure before the Senate for debate and vote.

I hope and trust that this is not an indication of a desire to postpone action—to delay and put it off—until the last possible moment. Consideration should be given to this bill at the earliest possible time. It has been waiting a long time for consideration.

The people of New York State are entitled to have this vital project considered by the Senate and by the House.

Every day hundreds of thousands of potential kilowatt-hours of power are going to waste, so far as the United States is concerned. Canada is picking up a great part of the water which is rightfully ours, and it is entitled to do this, under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Canada, until we get ready to use this water.

I hope that the advocates of private development in this area are not going to play the part of dog in the manger. I hope they are not going to try to delay action on this proposed legislation merely because they cannot get their own proposal for a private development enacted. I want them and the general public to know that we are alerted and we shall continue to insist on consideration being given to this proposed legislation at the earliest possible date.

INTEGRATION OF NEW ORLEANS ROMAN CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an encouraging development in the bigotry we recently have been following in some sections of the Nation is the magnificent

letter by Archbishop Joseph Francis Rummel that he intends to integrate the New Orleans Roman Catholic parochial schools. All honor to Archbishop Rummel for recognizing courageously that all children, regardless of the color of their skins, are children of the same God. This is a most heartening episode amidst the intolerance we have witnessed elsewhere concerning different races in school systems. Archbishop Rummel deserves great credit, and I ask that a story from the New York Times of February 20, 1956, headlined "Prelate To Press Integration Plan," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

PRELATE TO PRESS INTEGRATION PLAN—ARCHBISHOP OF NEW ORLEANS DENOUNCES SEGREGATION IN A STRONG PASTORAL LETTER

NEW ORLEANS, February 19.—Archbishop Joseph Francis Rummel in a strongly worded pastoral letter denounced racial segregation today as "morally wrong and sinful." He gave clear indication he intended to integrate New Orleans Roman Catholic parochial schools.

His letter was read at all masses in all churches throughout the archdiocese. It is the largest in the Deep South and has a Catholic population of 524,157. About 25 percent are Negroes.

It was the first time New Orleans Catholics had heard integration plans discussed in a public letter from the archbishop. The reading at most churches commanded rapt attention.

Church spokesmen previously had announced that plans were under way to integrate the Catholic schools sometime after 1956, but this was the archbishop's first public denunciation of segregation as a sin.

LARGEST SCHOOL UNIT

The New Orleans parochial school system is the State's largest single school unit. New Orleans is one of the few cities in the country where more children attend parochial than public schools.

Archbishop Rummel did not say when integration would come, but pleaded "that the decision when made will be accepted in the spirit of Christian charity and justice. . . ."

"This is a problem which should be worked out not in an atmosphere of wrangling or contention or discord or hatred but in a spirit of conciliation and with a desire to achieve peace through justice and charity."

He said the plans still were under study. The New Orleans public school system already is under Federal district court order to begin carrying out the Supreme Court decision of 1954 ending public school segregation.

The court order came Wednesday after a special 3-man Federal court had declared all Louisiana school segregation laws unconstitutional.

SEGREGATION MORALLY WRONG

Earlier this week three Catholic State legislators announced they would ask the May legislature to include Catholic schools in these State segregation laws. Catholic schools were deleted from the original bills in 1954 at the urging of Archbishop Rummel.

More than 50 percent of the South's Catholics live in Louisiana, but the archbishop's letter had no effect on Louisiana's two other dioceses, Lafayette and Alexandria.

In his letter the German-born archbishop said racial segregation "is morally wrong and sinful because it is a denial of the unity and solidarity of the human race as conceived by God in the creation of man in Adam and Eve."

He added that "difficult indeed is the approach to a propitious solution according to the Christian principles of justice and charity of the problem of racial integration in our schools, especially in the Deep South where for more than a century and a half segregation has been accepted without serious question and challenge."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STUDY OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 165) to make a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior", and in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$115,000" and insert "\$100,000", so as to make the resolution read:

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 constitutional rights.

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 \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 165 is sponsored by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if he wishes to speak on the resolution at this time.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who is the acting majority leader of the Senate. I shall undertake, briefly as I can, to cover such ground as may be pertinent

to the question of the appropriation sought in the resolution.

Senate Resolution 165, submitted by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], to provide an appropriation of \$100,000 to cover the staff salaries and other expenses of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, was first reported by the unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in turn was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration with one dissenting vote.

It might not be inappropriate at this time to make a brief statement, first, of the work done by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights since last May, and second, of the work proposed to be done by the subcommittee during the current year. I might say, too, that the reason for my being the chairman of the subcommittee is that I was assigned to that responsibility; I did not apply for it.

In addition to being the chairman of this subcommittee, I am also the chairman of another subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, namely, the subcommittee on improvements in the judicial machinery; I am a member of 3 subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, and a member of 3 special subcommittees of the standing committee, making a total of 9—6 standing subcommittees and 3 special subcommittees. I mention this only as an indication of the work load of the Committee on the Judiciary, which, in addition to the work of its subcommittees, handles all private immigration and claims bills, of which there are many hundreds. Furthermore, the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, by specially appointed subcommittees, undertake to pass upon the qualifications of nominees to the Federal judiciary, including United States district attorneys, United States marshals, and other officers of the judicial or quasi-judicial agencies.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights began its work last May and had \$50,000 as its appropriation beginning at that time. The subcommittee has turned back, as unallocated funds, about 10 percent of its appropriation, or \$4,785.44.

I may say, parenthetically, that the subcommittee has been able to function with a relatively small staff, due largely to the fact that I have had to press some of my own staff into service during the period of the recess of the Senate, when, commencing on Constitution Day, September 15, 1955, and ending about December 1, 1955, the subcommittee held rather extensive hearings, covering a considerable number of days and in excess of 100 hours of the hearing of witnesses.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is not a select committee of temporary duration, but is a standing subcommittee of the Senate, charged with the responsibility for continuous observation of the execution of laws dealing with civil liberties and constitutional rights.

The task of this subcommittee was defined by Chief Justice Earl Warren in his celebrated address on February 19,

1955, when he recalled that "the men of our First Congress knew, as we may be in danger of forgetting, that each element of the Bill of Rights was a painfully won acquisition. They knew that Government must be neither too strong nor too weak; that whatever form it may assume, Government is potentially as dangerous a thing as it is a necessary one. They knew that power must be lodged somewhere to prevent anarchy within and conquest without, but that this power could be abused to the detriment of their liberties."

The abuses arise not out of the laws themselves, but out of their administration by men, and the Chief Justice appreciated the temptation to abuse which springs from the tensions of our troubled times when he said:

Periods of domestic dissension and of foreign war are especially liable to produce tendencies to disregard established rights in the name of national safety. . . . In our time, we have seen the greatest of wars give way to a decade of chronic tension and crisis, in which it is to be expected that new encroachments upon traditional liberties may have to be countered. I have suggested that if there has been damage done to our traditional rights, it has been accomplished by a process of erosion.

The Chief Justice very clearly saw the necessity of a continuing struggle against this subtle wearing away of our constitutional rights, saying:

The fact remains, however, we do have a battle today to keep our freedoms from eroding just as Americans in every past age were obliged to struggle for theirs. Many thoughtful people are of the opinion that the danger of erosion is greater than that of direct attack.

At the end of May, following the voting of the appropriation, the subcommittee hired a small staff to make preliminary studies as to what topics and fields especially required subcommittee investigation. In July the subcommittee obtained the services of a distinguished lawyer from Missouri, Mr. Lon Hocker, who is a strong Republican by political faith, and a former president of the St. Louis Bar Association.

He came to Washington at a personal sacrifice to his own private practice, and stayed for about 6 months, helping to conduct and prepare for the hearings. It was not because Mr. Hocker hailed from Missouri, or because he was a Republican, that I invited him to come, but because, after canvassing the field, he seemed to be a man who had long been imbued with a desire to maintain the principles involved, and because he had an interest in the preservation of individual liberty. We were certainly sorry he came was that he would stay for 6 months. He fulfilled that commitment in spite of great personal sacrifice. I wanted to pay tribute to Mr. Hocker today for the work he did for the subcommittee during those 6 months.

The inquiries of the subcommittee began with an examination of the rights guaranteed by the first amendment. From the very first approach to the problem it became apparent that the greatest danger of erosion of the first amendment was in the operations of our

various loyalty-security programs. The majority of the cases studied by the committee involved instances in which American citizens were being dismissed from Government employment, dishonorably discharged from the Armed Forces, or deprived of their right to travel—not because they were Communists, but because of allegations that either they or their relatives had at some time held opinions which are offensive to most of us, or belonged to organizations now discredited.

On the basis of these complaints, the committee held a series of public hearings beginning on November 14, 1955, and ending on November 29, 1955.

The principal accomplishment of the recent hearings by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has been to reveal the snowballing nature of the Government's loyalty-security programs, and their extension to areas having no genuine relation to the Nation's security.

We know that when the Nation is imperiled, the interest of our national security must override individual rights, but our hearings have revealed that too often the rights of citizens have been sacrificed needlessly and recklessly without regard to the national security. One instance of such reckless sacrifice is involved in the treatment of American soldiers caught in the complexities of the Army security program.

In many instances, boys are called into the Army and then given menial duties until they are discharged under conditions less than honorable because of something they did or said or something their parents or relatives did or said prior to the soldiers' Army service. It is important to remember that under present law, no Communist—indeed, no man about whom there is "credible derogatory information of Communist membership"—can be inducted into the Army, so that every case involves not a Communist, but an American soldier. Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson has justified this phase of the Army program not in the name of security, but of discipline. It is so obvious that the Army has no power to discipline a man for anything done before he enters the service that the Defense Department announced a change in policy designed to minimize the practice of giving less than honorable discharges for preinduction conduct even before our committee held its hearings.

A few weeks ago, the subcommittee received a letter from the Defense Department's General Counsel, Mansfield D. Sprague, making certain clarifications of the new policy announced November 16, 1955.

I want to make it very clear that this policy was announced after the subject matter of the hearings had been determined and the hearings were underway.

The testimony before the Subcommittee on the State Department Passport Policy tended to establish that the right to travel was being taken away from American citizens even where no question of national security existed. We learned from the testimony of Scott McLeod, head of the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs,

that while the Department's regulations do provide a hearing for a Communist who is denied a passport, they do not provide a hearing for the citizen who is not a Communist and who is denied the right to travel.

This is a very singular and strange anomaly, indeed. Under the regulations, Communists have a right to a hearing, but a citizen who is not a Communist does not have that right.

Inasmuch as it is the Communists who threaten the national security, I do not see how we make ourselves safer by giving more rights to Communists than we do to other citizens.

While I do not want to burden the Senate with voluminous case notes, I believe that the Linus Pauling case illustrates how seriously damaging to individual rights the passport program can be, and how far it has strayed from the requirements of national security. In our hearing we found that this world-famous scientist applied for a passport in 1952, without success, until strong protests from eminent scientists resulted in the issuance of a limited passport to Mr. Pauling. On 3 occasions the limited passport was thereafter renewed, and then on 3 later occasions refused. In 1954, Mr. Pauling's application for a passport was finally and definitely rejected on the grounds that the State Department had secret information that Mr. Pauling was a concealed Communist. Despite all the evidence that Mr. Pauling was not a Communist, concealed or otherwise, the State Department persisted in its refusal to issue his passport until Mr. Pauling was honored with a Nobel prize. Immediately following this distinguished award, Mr. Pauling was given, not a restricted passport, as in days past, but a full and unrestricted permit to travel. Mr. McLeod explained the sharp reversal of the State Department by saying, and I quote his testimony in the hearing:

We in the State Department do not operate in a complete ivory tower down there. And when the announcement of the Nobel prize was made, I think that the question of his passport was then considered at a high level.

We of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Mr. President, feel that our Constitution requires that every American citizen, no matter how humble, must receive consideration at the same high level that seems now to be reserved, as in this case, exclusively for Nobel prize-winners.

Only the most compelling national security considerations, Mr. President, can justify any abridgment of the individual rights afforded to all of us by our Constitution. The possibilities of injustices within the national security program were exposed in frightening detail in the case of Clifford J. Hynning, who was disgraced last year when he was dismissed by the Treasury Department as a security risk, after 15 years of Government service. Under Secretary of the Treasury H. Chapman Rose testified before our committee that the charges against Mr. Hynning were not based on the specific paragraphs—the so-called security-risk criteria—of the President's security order, and admitted that at his

hearing Mr. Hynning had successfully rebutted any inference of sympathetic association with communism. Nevertheless, Mr. Hynning was condemned as a security risk, and on the basis of an accusation made for the first time at the very close of his hearing. The offense charged against Mr. Hynning was that he was not candid when he said that he failed to recollect a 10-minute interview with an FBI agent which had taken place 12 years before, and in regard to another man. This accusation, if it can be termed such, was not developed into a specific charge, and the accused was not given adequate opportunity to defend himself, although these basic protections form the concept of due process of law under our system of jurisprudence. I am happy to tell you, Mr. President, that following our hearings, Mr. Hynning was restored to duty in the Treasury Department. Remembering his long ordeal, it came as no surprise that having vindicated himself, Mr. Hynning then resigned from the Government service.

Mr. President, I believe that it would be unfair if I left you with the impression that those charged with administration of our security programs habitually refuse to admit error. As a matter of fact, Frank Campbell Waldrop, consultant to the Secretary of State on security matters, and a distinguished journalist and former editor of the Washington Times Herald, told our committee that he thought the Hynning case "was a terrible thing to happen in the Government of the United States, and other cases like it were terrible things."

Other alarming testimony as to the far-reaching impact of the security program was provided by Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. His testimony developed two highly significant facts. The first is that the Commission maintains some two million dossiers or files of derogatory information, in addition to an index file of some 5 million names. The derogatory information, which is completely unevaluated is assembled by clipping newspapers and getting names from petitions and mailing lists of various organizations. Later, this unevaluated information may be considered as evidence of disloyalty in security-board proceedings conducted without the safeguards of due process. Moreover, numerous classes of persons, such as applicants for Government employment and probationary employees, are not even entitled to hearings. In their cases they may find themselves condemned as a result of the mere fact of permitting their names to get into the newspapers.

Mr. Young's testimony also disclosed the novel interpretation put upon President Eisenhower's security order. Mr. Young testified that in compiling the figures on security-risk terminations, the Commission adds to the number of those dismissed under the Presidential security order the far greater number of those who were dismissed under regular civil-service procedures without having been charged with being security risks.

Now I should like to outline briefly the present plans of the subcommittee for the coming year.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains evidence of the growing concern of Members of Congress over the practice of the Foreign Claims Commission in depriving American soldiers of the money which Congress has, by law, declared they should have in token payment for their long, agonizing days of imprisonment in Communist prison camps. We have in the files of our committee indignant letters from Members of Congress, from veterans' groups, from lawyers, and from former prisoners of war, relating to American soldiers who have been deprived of the money that Congress has, by law, declared that they should have as only a small payment for their days of imprisonment in Communist camps. We have been urgently requested, and are being so requested to hold open hearings to determine just what the practice of the Claims Commission is; and we are now engaged in the necessary preparations for these hearings.

Last year, Chief Justice Warren posed the question:

Have there not been enough invasions of the freedom of the press to justify a concern about the inviolability of that great right?

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, in addition to its other tasks in the coming year, will seek an answer to the question asked by the Chief Justice. Our investigations and studies in this field will have particular reference to the constitutional aspects of the problems created by the growing tendency of the executive branch—any executive branch, under any administration—to withhold from the public information which needs not be suppressed because of national security or because of the safety of our country. The maintenance of the people's right to freedom of information certainly transcends any partisan considerations. I believe that all of us agree about that.

Ever since World War II, we have witnessed an increasing secrecy cloaking the operations of the Federal Government. This secrecy within the executive branch has been quite properly the subject of criticism by newspaper editors and other thoughtful men and women throughout the country. We plan a thorough study of this problem, insofar as it touches the basic constitutional right of freedom of the press, which, certainly, by implication, includes as a part and parcel of it the right of the American public to be informed.

The subcommittee is also charged with the responsibility of making recommendations concerning all bills and resolutions referred to it on the general subject of civil rights. That, of course, pertains among other things, to the question of racial minorities. Many such measures are before us. They require very careful study and consideration. As the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will bear witness, we met only last week to consider a number of such measures affecting civil rights.

There are a number of such measures on the agenda. Some of them will require public hearings. They will require

that witnesses be brought from some distance, perhaps, for the enlightenment and information of the committee.

The subcommittee has already requested the opinion of the Attorney General and of various other executive agencies with respect to these measures.

It is always important that specific injustices be remedied. We may easily fall into a routine way of doing things, because we are so busy and so concerned with many problems affecting not only our own country, but the rest of the world. It is easy to lose sight of the fact that the most important thing in this country is the individual man and woman, and the protection of their God-given constitutional rights and privileges. A government should ever be solicitous to safeguard and protect their rights.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I ask my distinguished colleague whether or not it is true that we have received hundreds of complaints from individuals who have been deprived of their rights by police officers or the courts, and whether or not we have investigated such cases to the best of our ability, so as to indicate examples which should be followed all over the country.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from North Dakota is correct. He is a very hard working and invaluable member of the subcommittee.

As indicative of the workload, during the past 6 months public hearings have been held to the extent of more than 100 hours, beginning September 15 and running until the first of December. Telephone inquiries average approximately 500 each week. With respect to the correspondence load, the average number of letters each week is 200. This workload is handled by a staff of 6 professional and 3 clerical members.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that complaints have come from every State in the Union, as well as from Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and even from soldiers stationed in various parts of the world?

Mr. HENNINGS. Even from soldiers stationed overseas, both in the Asiatic and European theaters. The Senator is entirely correct. I think the prisoner-of-war problem is one which this committee certainly should take up as one of the first orders of business. There are some 250 former prisoners of war who, for grounds which seem less than substantial, have been given honorable discharges in some cases, but no payment for their term of service spent in Communist prison camps.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that this is the one committee to which any citizen, regardless of race, color, or creed, no matter how humble he may be, no matter how rich he may be, can come

to see that his constitutional rights are preserved under the Bill of Rights?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator well knows that he is entirely correct. As I recall, in one instance he himself made a trip to a Federal penitentiary in my own State, and thereafter conducted hearings in California, relating to two ex-service men who had found themselves in great difficulty because of what may have been excessive zeal on the part of certain prosecuting officers.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. I was interested in the exchange with regard to what may be done by this committee in connection with certain prisoners of war who have appeared before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in order to justify their rights, which may be threatened. The question involved is whether they are to be sustained and permitted to collect the benefits to which they would be entitled in the normal process, or whether they are to lose such rights. Am I correct in understanding that the committee is acting under the law which Congress enacted some time ago, and which, by its very wording, makes it essential that every one of such cases come before that Commission before any decision may be reached?

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to the Senator, as I have already indicated, that as a result of the hearings the Department of Defense changed its policy with respect to giving some men less than honorable discharges, in cases in which they had properly completed their term of service and performed the duties assigned to them.

Our interest is not to supersede any other Government agency, or to encroach upon the legal functions of any other Government agency or board, quasi-judicial or otherwise. However, we are very much interested in cases which seem to indicate that the administration has been faulty, that the spirit of the law has not been complied with, and that injustice has been done to any man, regardless of race, creed, or color.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. My reason for asking the question is that recently a young man from my State, who was in the service for a considerable period of time, appealed to me. He was a prisoner of war in Korea. This young man's legs were frozen from his feet to a point above his knees. He was compelled to walk some 300 miles back and forth across the northern part of Korea before he finally landed in a prison camp. He was in the prison camp for a long period of time.

Some time after he was released, he was given an honorable discharge. Prior to that time he was given an advance in rank. At that time he was given disability benefits.

Time went on, and then suddenly, out of the blue, came a charge against this man, because what someone said about his conduct in a prisoner of war camp, which reflected against him to such an

extent that his rights to obtain benefits under the Prisoner of War Act were challenged. It became necessary for that young man to defend his rights. I doubt very much indeed whether he could have done so had he not known me personally and had I not known the young man and his background. After checking with me, he came to Washington, and was accompanied to the hearing before the Commission. I must say that in that instance certainly—I am not qualified to speak about others—he was given most courteous consideration by the Commission. Finally it resulted in the clearing of his name and the removal of any charge that he was disloyal in any way. He had his rights restored.

However, my concern is not now for that young man, because that incident is over. My concern is for young men in similar situations who may not know to whom to appeal in order to have their rights safeguarded and to have their records cleared.

Therefore, if the committee did nothing else other than to assure persons—and I care not whether the number of cases be 1 or 2 or 5 or 10—have a hearing before the Commission, and in that way have their rights safeguarded, and thus make it possible for young men to know that they have somewhere to turn in their attempt to have their rights protected, then I would say that any expense of the committee would be justified in my mind. I hope that the Senator from Missouri will be able to carry out his efforts along that line.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for his statement and his contribution and his evident understanding of the work we are doing.

So far as I know, we have about completed our work on the loyalty security program, because most agencies have revised and changed their programs.

However, I should like to say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Maine, that the case which he has so graphically described and cited is typical of the vast majority of the other cases we have had before us.

Those are the things we are concerned with. We are concerned particularly with men who may not be able to employ counsel, or may not have the means or the opportunity of understanding their rights. Those are the things we propose to set right, bearing in mind that we do not give any aid or comfort to any Communist or subversive, but do seek to protect the rights of loyal American soldiers and sailors. Such effort is worth \$100,000 a year in appropriations, or even \$100 million, if necessary.

That has been the slow and laborious approach which our committee has undertaken. We have endeavored to screen some of the cases. Of course, we get a great many letters from irresponsible people who believe their constitutional rights have been violated. I dare say we have had some letters from Communists and former Communists. However, I want to make this statement very clear for the RECORD, that in no instance has a Communist or a former Communist appeared as a witness during the hear-

ings, so careful and meticulous have been the investigations and screenings preceding the hearings.

Our concern has been with the decent and blameless loyal American whose rights have been subverted and, indeed, whose reputation and, in some instances, his entire career, may have been ruined.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. PAYNE. In the case to which I have referred, I happen to know that the information which was forwarded to the Commission and which resulted in this particular situation, was unsubstantiated by anyone who was willing to show his face and to make the charge publicly. It was purely on the basis of hearsay or idle gossip and rumor. It was thrown out the window after the young man was able to state the facts. I had a chance to review his testimony. Certainly after reading the revelations this young man gave in connection with his having been a prisoner of war, any real American would wonder why this young man ever happened to fall into the situation of having his loyalty to his country challenged by anyone.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maine. I should like to say that the committee is just as much concerned with the humblest of the former soldiers as it is with the highest echelon Government employee whose rights may have been violated.

We get down now to the business of the informer, so-called. Of course, in my experience as a district attorney in a large city, I have used so-called informers in murder cases and bank robberies, and in all manner of criminal prosecutions. But in such cases the testimony is evaluated and corroborated and, what is most important of all, the accused is confronted by his accusers. The accused has the opportunity of cross-examination to determine, upon the anvil of cross-examination, in a tribunal of law, the truth or falsity of the testimony and the credibility of the witness.

Far from trying to impair or impede the loyalty security program, the record is replete with statements from hard-working and conscientious men from the Department of Defense, the Department of the Treasury, the Army, and other such agencies that the committee has helped to clarify their thinking and that they have been grateful for the opportunity to appear before the committee.

Many of them have returned to their offices and made a restudy, as in the Hynning case, to which I have referred, and made a complete reversal and restored a person to full and honorable status. In the Hynning case the situation arose solely because Mr. Hynning said he did not remember having had an interview with an FBI agent 12 years ago about someone else during a field check.

In a few minutes I shall complete my preliminary statement, if the Senate will indulge me.

It is important always that specific injustices be remedied, and the committee is proud of its record in this respect.

But of even greater importance is the function of this committee in preventing abuses of a necessary but dangerous system of security. In his testimony, Mr. Waldrop said in refreshing language:

"As a friend of the system, I think it is very good for the system to get hit over the head a bit and find out what it's like, if I may just advance an opinion. A kick in the pants sobers the head, I think. This is too serious not to be treated with deadly seriousness all the time by everybody involved with it and not played with, I feel."

Mr. Waldrop perhaps says spontaneously what Justice Warren said deliberately when he warned that "the liberties thus written into our Federal law have not gone unassailed in the course of our national history, for men in office are still men. Whether men derive their authority from hereditary right or from popular election, they remain prone to overstep constitutional limitations and invade legal immunities."

Despite Mr. Waldrop's invitation, we have no desire to knock heads or to kick pants, but if through ceaseless study we can continue to inform the people as to the health of the precious liberties given them by the Constitution to the end that they may protect them from abuse, and be protected from it, then, Mr. President, I believe the committee will have served, indeed, the cause of all America.

Mr. President, I should like now to offer for the RECORD a complete statement of expenditures—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he offers his statement?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the distinguished Senator has not forgotten the fact that the committee has taken under its protection the 21,500 inmates of Federal penitentiaries. These men are poor and forlorn, and the committee is interested in seeing to it that if a man in a

penitentiary, no matter how humble or poor he may be, wishes to consult a lawyer, the rules and regulations shall be such that a lawyer can go and see him. The committee is interested in seeing that a man in a penitentiary has an opportunity to appeal to judges or to Senators. It may be that in 99 cases out of 100 the man is guilty and may deserve everything he is getting, but the committee is interested in the one hundredth case, in seeing to it that no innocent man is deprived of his constitutional rights, even though he may be an inmate of a penitentiary. He is still a human being.

Mr. HENNINGS. In reply, I should like to say that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has been notable and outstanding in his own interest in this special phase of the problem. I have had the pleasure and privilege of serving with him on another subcommittee relating to national penitentiaries, which, of course, pertains more to the functioning of the institutions as institutions, and has not this particular field under its jurisdiction.

Mr. President, last year the committee turned back 10 percent of its appropriation. However, it took us from May 11, 1955, until several months thereafter to assemble a staff and to begin working on the subject matter of the first hearing, which was the first amendment to the Constitution. So that in presenting both the expenditures and the projections for the next year, I believe we are abundantly justified in asking for the appropriation which the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously recommends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table of expenditures of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights from May 11, 1955, to and through January 31, 1956.

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

Expenditures—Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights from May 11, 1955, to Jan. 31, 1956

	Payroll	Stationery	Telephone and telegraph	Reporting	Witnesses	Staff travel	Incidental expenses
May.....	\$742.51	\$3.86	\$41.70				\$4.20
June.....	2,628.26	13.01	59.67	\$23.68			18.75
July.....	3,792.34						8.00
August.....	4,400.24		97.59	142.01			26.68
September.....	4,076.03	153.66	138.20	649.96	\$85.05		72.20
October.....	4,300.03	79.89	197.36	1,779.90	123.08	\$746.58	184.16
November.....	4,639.72	13.33	272.67		3,816.01	425.00	61.55
December.....	2,564.40	49.53	170.33				17.67
January 1956.....	5,169.24	608.79				230.82	1,211.70
Total.....	33,312.97	\$22.07	977.52	2,595.55	4,024.14	1,402.40	1,604.91

Total expenditures.....	\$44,839.56
Estimated telephone and incidental expenses to Jan. 31, 1956.....	375.00
Unallocated funds.....	4,785.44
Total.....	50,000.00

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that I do not in any way impugn the motives or the honesty of the able Senator from Missouri. I think his motives are of the best. I think he is completely honest in his investigation, and I should like to commend him at the outset for his statement that he is going to investigate Govern-

ment secrets. I think that is something which needs attention. In the Committee on Government Operations we have been faced with the question of government by secrecy. I think the Senator's committee can do something along that line. It is certainly entitled to some appropriation.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I first wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his suggestion that our motives certainly are not subject to question.

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I also wish to assure the Senator that the first big undertaking, in addition to the investigation of the cases which have been described by the Senator from Maine, will be freedom of the press. That will be the next major project. The important aspect of that right is the free access to information which should not be secret or classified when it has no effect upon the security of the United States.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I should like to say to the Senator that I had prepared a rather extensive speech, but in view of the Senator's statement that he intends to investigate the question of governmental secrecy—keeping secret from the American people information which they should have—and will try to expose the facts and do something about it, and inasmuch as that is going to be one of his major aims, and because of his statement that he has practically finished the investigation of the security program, I shall desist from making the speech I had intended to make. I do think the Senator has done a great deal of damage to the security program, but if that phase of his investigation is ended, if he is going into the other things which he has mentioned, I shall not oppose the appropriation which is requested.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his understanding of this problem and for the statement he has made. I think it is certainly characteristic of a body of men such as we have in the Senate to differ on questions of principle, but I believe that most, if not all of us, are open to reasonable conviction, and I am very glad if the assurances I gave the Senator this morning have set to rest some of the points which I know were disturbing him.

The committee wants to do an honest and thorough job, a job which no other committee has the jurisdiction or the authority or the power to do. The committee is one which is easily misunderstood, perhaps, because it deals somewhat, possibly, with abstractions of law on constitutional questions, but, nonetheless, I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin and I can join in the general proposition that every individual American, if he is loyal and is a decent American, is entitled to the full protection of the Constitution.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Mexico may yield to me, so that I may question the Senator from Missouri about his statement, with the understanding that the Senator from New Mexico will not lose the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Missouri state the progress which

has been made in the study that was started last year, and whether the appropriation he is now seeking will be sufficient to permit his subcommittee to conclude the hearings on the subject which is now being investigated?

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is a standing subcommittee. I believe the Senator was not on the floor when I undertook to state what it has done thus far.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I was here, and I listened to the Senator's statement.

Mr. HENNINGS. The progress which has been made is as I undertook to outline it. Would the Senator be more specific in his question? I am afraid I do not understand the nature of the information the Senator is seeking.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Missouri has stated that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is a standing subcommittee. Does that mean the Senate will have to provide for the subcommittee as much as \$100,000 each year in order to sustain the subcommittee's present staff?

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, I cannot commit future chairmen or future committees. Presumably I shall be a candidate for reelection myself this fall, and I may not be here next year to have anything to do with the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain the Senator from Missouri will be here. I think that is a safe assumption.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator for his expression of confidence and heartening encouragement.

I do not wish to be frivolous in responding to the Senator's questions, but I am trying to understand what the Senator is asking me.

Mr. ELLENDER. I pointed out in the debate last week, and this week, as well, that among many committees of the Senate it is the practice to divide the main committee into subcommittees. This is true of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, in particular, the Committee on the Judiciary, because the Committee on the Judiciary is where the practice of subdividing into many subcommittees really began. As I have pointed out, the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary are now receiving a total of more than \$1,080,000 each year. That sum is in addition to the regular amount paid to each of the standing committees.

In addition to the amount paid to the standing Committee on the Judiciary, and aside from the \$1,080,000 paid to the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on the Judiciary maintains another little group of employees consisting of 2 professional and 3 clerical employees at a cost of \$49,000 a year. So, the Committee on the Judiciary has now obtained for all the operations of that committee in excess of \$1,200,000 a year.

As I understand, the work now being done by the subcommittee which is headed by the Senator from Missouri is the work of one of the standing subcommittees.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I must assume, then, that it is contemplated that subcommittee will continue to receive each year approximately the amount which is now being sought for its operation this year.

Mr. HENNINGS. At the outset last year, in May—the Senator from Louisiana was present at the time, and we had some discussion of the matter—an appropriation of \$50,000 was asked for. At that time I suggested that the subcommittee had determined to study the first 10 amendments to the Constitution in the light of their modern application—in other words, to have a look at the Bill of Rights, to see whether the Bill of Rights was, in fact, not being eroded, or was being eroded, as the Chief Justice of the United States saw fit to express it.

As to future appropriations, I can only say that the subcommittee has this year turned back 10 percent of the amount granted the subcommittee last year; and I used many members of my own office staff during the greater part of the hearings, because we started in the summer to get ready for the hearings, we commenced the hearings on September 15, and continued with them through December. So the membership of the staff fluctuated. There are now 10 members of the staff, including clerical and professional personnel—a chief counsel, a staff director, lawyers, and so on. I do not know whether the Senator from Louisiana was on the floor and heard me read the data with reference to the workload.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is outlined in the report.

Mr. HENNINGS. The subcommittee has received 500 telephone calls a week; the correspondence load has averaged 200 letters a week; and the subcommittee has been holding public hearings.

I appreciate the fact that it is not pleasant for the Senator from Louisiana to do what he has undertaken to do every year for some years past, namely, to discuss the appropriations. I know he is doing it as a matter of duty or of deep conviction; otherwise he would not continue to make his inquiries. But I am certain the Senator will agree with me when I say it is very difficult to tell exactly what another fellow needs in doing his job.

The Committee on the Judiciary, for example, handles 43.6 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced. It handles 62.5 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented to the Senate.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to get away from the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. Before the passage of the Reorganization Act, I happened to be the chairman of the committee which handled all claims against the Government.

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish the Senate now had another committee to handle them. The Committee on the Judiciary is swamped with such bills all the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. At that time, the small committee of which I was the chairman handled 52 percent of all the bills passed by the Senate. The Sena-

tors did the work themselves, with the assistance of two clerks.

Mr. HENNINGS. Sometimes in the Committee on the Judiciary, when we should be considering legislative proposals of the greatest importance to the country, bills involving constitutional questions and all manner of other subjects within our very particular compass, we sit as though we were holding a justice of the peace court, passing on claims and immigration cases. Often we sit day and night on some of these matters, to the neglect, in my judgment, of very important questions, some of which are required to abide the next session of Congress, simply because the committee has not the time to consider them.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my understanding that the way in which these immigration and claims cases are being handled before the Senator's committee is that the work is done by lawyers hired by the committee; the Senators do not go into the details.

Mr. HENNINGS. I beg to differ with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. None of the Senators takes the claims and studies them, as was done in the former Committee on Claims, which was in operation prior to 1946.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is entirely conceivable that some of us are not so diligent or studious as is my friend, the Senator from Louisiana. I know he is a scholar, and I know he is diligent; but I do not know, either quantitatively or qualitatively, the nature of the work he may have done in studying claims.

Some Senators got their backs up in the committee 2 years ago and said they were not going to sit there and pass upon claims about which they did not know anything. So bills relating to immigration and claims against the Government are now parceled out among the Senators.

In my own case, I serve not only as a member of the full committee, but also on nine subcommittees, and, in addition on special subcommittees whose work relates to the confirmation of nominations for Chief Justice of the United States and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. The last nomination to the Supreme Court on which we held a hearing was that of Associate Justice Harlan. We consider also the nominations of district judges and United States attorneys.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why are all bills reported to the Senate in the name of the chairman?

Mr. HENNINGS. I assume that has been the custom, and always will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was not the case in the old Claims Committee. Each Senator who considered a particular claim made the report and was ready to answer any questions asked about the claim. But I assume the custom has changed.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will come to my office, I will show him my stack of claims and immigration bills, and I should be glad to have him spend a few hours on them with me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think I have been patient; I know the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from

Louisiana are not going to agree, so I wish the Chair would recognize me and let me proceed for a few minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall conclude my questioning in a few minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, personally, I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri for the fact that he still talks of civil rights. So long as we have men in the Senate who are willing to consider civil rights of the humble and the rich alike, the country is in pretty good shape. I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO PRESERVATION OF LIFE FROM EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read and referred to the appropriate committee. I desire to have a few minutes in order that I may discuss the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 217), as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee composed of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full, complete, and continuing study and investigation of all problems relating to the preservation of life from the effects of nuclear explosions. The committee shall from time to time report to the Senate the results of its study and investigations together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the 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 such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, 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 committee, which shall not exceed \$50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senate for a few minutes during times when the headlines of our Nation's press, radio newscasts, and television news broadcasts are filled to the brim with questions such as the health of our President, his exploits as a hunter, and the \$64 question, "Will he run?" I hesitate at the moment to discuss the equally momentous question as to the result of the expose by our beloved colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in regard to the Natural Gas bill and certain influences which, apparently, were used in behalf of that measure. However, the Senator from New Mexico does have a tremendous responsibility in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, the defense budget for this year is \$35 billion, \$5 billion more than the cost of all the other branches of the Government, so it is quite a responsibility. The horrible and devastating weapons with which we are arming our services for destruction of any enemy are, naturally, of very grave concern; but it seems to me it is of equal concern that the civilian population of the United States, which, since the Civil War, has not undergone the destruction and terror of war such as was known by the civilian population of Japan, Germany, England, and Russia, be informed of the danger, and that study be given by the Congress toward devising ways and means of protecting the civilian population.

I do not wish to intrude on the jurisdictional responsibilities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the field of military or industrial uses of the atom, but I have submitted a resolution which concerns itself with the destructive effects of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons on American civilians. This matter has been discussed with such eminent scientists as Dr. Edward Teller of the University of California, the inventor of the hydrogen bomb, and Dr. L. R. Hafstad, director of research of General Motors. Without presuming to speak for them, I feel confident that they represent the views of most American scientists. They created these weapons. They performed their tasks and developed the weapons in the same patriotic fashion in which Stephen Decatur fought for our country in the first years of the Republic.

These outstanding Americans are interested in the peaceful and industrial developments of atomic energy, but at the moment, knowing the capabilities and the horrible and apocalyptic effects of the weapon which they have helped create, they would like to lend their scientific knowledge toward the task of protecting our civilian population, and softening, if possible, the blows of the bomb. They are concerned with the civilian population of our country, and it is for this purpose, Mr. President, that I am submitting the resolution. In the light of the weekend announcement by the Soviet Marshal and Minister of Defense, Georgi K. Zhukov, that the Soviet Union is prepared to wage atomic warfare against the mainland of the United States and that they have developed an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching our bases abroad and our shores, the resolution is most timely.

I am not an alarmist, but, on the contrary, I do not believe that the American public should be treated as children and that the facts of life should be withheld from them. The difference of opinion between the Department of Defense and the ex-Secretary of the Air Force, Trevor Gardner, is of no concern to me other than to ponder the question, "What if Mr. Gardner is right?" After all, the man who controlled the German Reich, Hitler and his gang of paranoid desperadoes, used every weapon they could lay their hands on. The Japanese did not wait for a Declaration of War to destroy the main part of our fleet at Pearl Harbor, and I doubt very much if

the men in the Kremlin, if they considered themselves prepared and capable of winning, would hesitate for one minute to use the horrifying weapons they claim to be producing.

I believe that the Congress must interest itself in this matter, and that the time to act is now and not after H-bombs have knocked out our major cities.

Mr. President, I had prepared by Dr. Teller and Dr. Hafstad, both of whom are scientists, a documentation and statement as to what the horrible H-bomb would do to the American people, especially the civilian population. In order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the statement prepared for me by Dr. Teller and Dr. Hafstad.

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

Within the last 60 days the Soviet Union has detonated a multimegaton H-bomb.¹ This has been fully confirmed by Western scientists. In fact the fallout from this bomb still continues.² Last fall the Geneva Conference³ failed and while I, like everyone else, earnestly hope that peace will prevail, nevertheless I think it is but common prudence that while we have the opportunity we provide for the safety of the lives of our citizens.

The element of surprise in warfare has always been a tremendous advantage to an unprincipled aggressor. We have only to think back to December 7, 1941, for confirmation. However, heretofore while such surprise could strike at best a crippling blow, it is a hard fact that with nuclear weapons, such a surprise attack could actually win a war. In short, the advantages of a sneak attack have been increased a thousandfold.⁴

In these remarks, I wish to emphasize that this is under no circumstances a criticism of the preparedness steps taken by our military services. In fact aside from the extent to which these services run parallel to what I am discussing, I am not here concerned with either our defensive, or retaliatory steps taken after a sneak attack. What I am concerned with is the horrible effect of such an H-bomb attack upon our civilian population. The old concept of far-reaching frontlines of defense, of land, sea, and air, behind which the country itself lies relatively secure, literally no longer exists. In modern warfare our vast centers of population and our entire industrial might are the striking points and will be under attack simultaneously with the firing of our first defensive shot. Much has been done to provide us with some warning time. The radar warning networks of Canada and Alaska, the civil defense ground observer corps (air watchers), the "Texas towers" off the east coast, our radar-equipped station ships and planes are all for this purpose. But it is now as imperative to provide "defense in depth" for the civilian population as it is for the military. At present we are so vulnerable that the time granted can save little human life.

With piloted conventional bombers most military authorities agree that despite our interceptor squadrons, Nike installations, and

other defense measures, a well-planned, well-coordinated air attack cannot be stopped once it gets underway. Enough of the enemy bombers would get through to make the attack disastrously effective.⁵ It should be needless for me to add that there are other methods of attack open to the enemy now or will be in the future where the element of surprise will be greater. In any event, the enemy force that would reach their destination is sufficient to wreak untold havoc and disaster upon our civilian population.

In my opinion the average citizen regards the so-called H-bomb as a sort of super A-bomb. I say so-called advisedly. Actually the H-bomb, as first publicly discussed, has been superseded by a new and far more terrible weapon, the thermonuclear (fission-fusion-fission) bomb which uses elements of both the original A- and H-bomb wrapped finally in natural uranium (U-238) to create the most ghastly weapon of destruction ever conceived by the mind of man. The fact that natural uranium, not the tremendously expensive isotopes uranium 235 and plutonium 239 is used for this bomb makes it far cheaper to make and easier to produce. This is an implication of ominous significance. The A-bomb is measured in thousands of tons of TNT, the new bomb in millions. One such bomb falling on a city would create a fireball over 3 miles in diameter in which all things animate or inanimate would be vaporized. There would be no survivors and no man-structure could resist the heat effect or the blast force.

Within an 8-mile circle, destruction would be nearly total from the shock waves and heat and suction caused by the burst. Within a possibly 50-mile diameter, destruction, fire damage and casualties would be extensive.⁶ This, however, would vary depending on the kind of protective action and nature of the terrain. Besides the foregoing visible effects, far more diabolical are those of fallout. They may be an even greater hazard as fall-out deadliness can vary according to the composition of the bomb, the point of detonation, and prevailing weather conditions. The fall-out effects of an H-bomb by taking advantage of weather conditions can be "tailored" to inflict the greatest damage on densely populated areas or on vast stretches of the Wheat Belt, the cattle country, or our forest lands.⁷ It is possible with the H-bomb, the right burst position and the right wind condition to spread a deadly fall-out downwind over thousands of square miles. This might not only be lethal to all animate unprotected beings but it could poison much vegetation. Besides all of this, it is believed by many scientists that the fall-out where it doesn't kill can have a disastrous mutative effect upon the genes of all animal life and produce monsters and still-born children in succeeding generations.⁸

There is the ravaging force of evil now loose in the world and, alas, in the hands of those we dare not trust.

There has never been a problem which faced our Nation that has not been solved. This is as true today as it has always been. To assume that because the warning time is short, or, even that there will be no warning time, and to claim therefore that there is no defense is not only suicidal apathy, it is mass murder and at total variance with the spirit that makes this country so great.

I believe there is a defense against the H-bomb. Not only is it the immediate and instant flight from the centers of great cities as now officially proposed by our Government, but also and equally important a place to flee to and means of getting there. The prospect of our urban populations fleeing aimlessly without food, shelter, clothing, or medical attention and searching vainly for the members of their families is too horrible to contemplate. There must be points of refuge⁹ where all these necessities can be provided and where great masses of people can be sheltered from deadly radiations and fallout for 4 weeks or longer.¹⁰ If this be true, and it certainly appears so, then I can see no other practical solution. But the exits of our great city are woefully inadequate for such an evacuation.¹¹ It will be necessary to create a system of escape routes for our citizens. Such routes can also be used in times of peace, but obviously there is no use in evacuating if there are no facilities by which it can be done and no provision for caring for our citizens afterwards. I am aware of the effort being made by Federal, State, and local officials to find an answer to this problem. But I am convinced that fallout from these superweapons requires an approach far beyond simply canvassing the Nation to see what facilities are available. I am convinced facilities for the people who evacuate our target cities must be created. These facilities, or evacuation centers, would serve as rallying and supply points, giving our people a definite objective toward which to flee and having the means to transform the refugees back into our greatest asset—and aroused citizenry vowed to stamp from the earth the malignant forces that have attempted to overwhelm them. In modern war, productive effort is a tremendous factor. The great percentage of skilled workers are concentrated in our cities. Their contribution is as necessary to all-out war as is that of the military, and aside from the prime consideration of safeguarding the lives of our people war production will be the difference between victory or defeat.

Warning time at present is estimated to be, under the most favorable conditions, not over 30 minutes to 1 hour.¹² With the development of improved missiles, there is no reason to anticipate that such warning time will ever materially increase. All evacuation to be practical must be based on immediate flight by everyone from where they are at the moment of the alert. In fact it will never be possible for families to attempt to unite before leaving. There is some informed opinion which believes that it would be impossible to evacuate our citizens because of the stampede of panic-stricken mobs blocking every exit. I do not believe this. There have been too many instances in American life of courage and resolution when faced with great danger. Panic stems from fear. Fear, in this case, would come from the incredible horrors of the H-bomb. An uninformed and untrained public would panic precisely as untrained soldiers will flee the battlefield, but it is my conviction that if the average American knows the truth, what he is to do, where he is to go, and means are provided for him to get there, even under an H-bomb attack a minimum of panic will result. However, it is essential that we have prepared places to go and that the citizens themselves are trained in what to do to get

¹ Announced by AEC (December 3, 1955) classified in power of megatons, Life magazine, December 5, 1955, states 10 to 20 megatons.

² Press reports (Washington Evening Star, November 29, 1955).

³ Confirmation of the failure of the Geneva Conference, Dulles' report, November 18, 1955.

⁴ Facts About the H-Bomb, Civilian Defense pamphlet. General LeMay interview, U. S. News & World Report, December 9, 1955.

⁵ General LeMay, U. S. News & World Report, December 9, 1955.

⁶ Life Magazine, April 19, 1954, June 27, 1955, December 5, 1955. Recent pamphlet titled "Facts About the H-Bomb" Civil Defense (cost, 5 cents).

New York Times, June 13, 1955—Civil defense article with geographic map.

⁷ Dr. Ralph E. Lapp—June 1955 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

⁸ AEC releases—February 15, 1955, June 3, 1955, November 3 and 17, 1955.

⁹ Exchange of letters, Dr. Hafstad and Dr. Teller.

¹⁰ Dr. Ralph E. Lapp; Life magazine, June 27, 1955. June 1955 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

¹¹ East River project and other metropolitan studies.

¹² Mr. Willard Bascom, Attack Warning System of Washington, October 1, 1955.

there. This is the essence of the program which appears to me to make common sense.

That the program I have so briefly outlined is not fantastic can be proved by the precautions already taken by other nations. Sweden has its vital industries underground and has hewn berths for some of her navy out of solid rock. Denmark and Norway have taken similar precautions. Bomb-proof shelters underground have already been provided by Canada for its power sources. The astounding thing is that none of these nations is the primary target. The primary target for Red aggression is the United States and we, unlike other countries, have taken no such bold and positive steps to protect our industries or the lives of our citizens.

There is another most sobering thought which I should like to leave with you. In our past wars our tremendous industrial capacity and our vast agricultural resources have been a prize eagerly sought by our enemies. In the present case this is not true. Our probable enemies have more undeveloped land than have we. Should they eliminate our industrial might, all of the world's remaining industrial facilities would fall within their grasp. There is, therefore, no reason for them to spare any phase of our country's life. Logically, if any of their reasons can be considered logical, it would be advisable if possible to erase our country including its citizens, its industry and its agriculture from the face of the earth as we are their sole deterrent to world-wide domination.

We have spent billions upon billions for our own military defense and offense and billions upon billions for the protection and benefit of the distressed peoples of the world.¹³ It is high time that we now look to the protection of our own citizens. If we reduce these expenditures to the simplest terms, we have spent billions in an effort to protect our way of life, and from the military viewpoint to carry the war to an aggressor while defending our own shores. Yet, we are told by our military experts that a determined attack will succeed to some degree. We know that even a handful of H-bombs would create devastation and loss of life beyond measuring. Yet, we have done nothing adequate to preserve the very lives of the people for whom—in the end—all these billions have been spent. What the cost of adequate protection will be I do not know, but I will forestall any arguments on expense by asking how is it possible to evaluate the lives of our citizens in terms of dollars and cents.

Over a considerable period I have devoted much time and thought to the need for a new program that will guarantee the survival of our people. There is, in my opinion, nothing whatever in the present world situation to make me feel that the protection of the lives of our citizens should not be one of the primary concerns of this session of Congress. In fact the peril comes so close to the words of Holy Scripture as to be frightening. Let me quote: "He that is on the housetop, let him not come down to take his coat out of his house. Pray that his flight be not in the winter" and "Woe to them that are with child in those days."¹⁴ These Biblical injunctions to flee could have been written for the very situation which confronts us. Our very survival depends upon immediate action.

Our peril is real. It could happen today, it could happen next month or next year. I pray to God it may never happen, but it is as true now as it was in the days of Washington that in time of peace prepare for war. No prudent man would propose that we embark upon such a national venture as I suggest without first having made a most exhaustive study and investigation of every phase of it.

The program I have discussed today appears to me as most practical in view of the situation confronting us and also appears to have the approval of practically all of our leading experts including the scientists who designed the bomb itself. There may be other solutions. What I wish to emphasize here and now is that a solution must be found and once found must be put into effect without further delay. For the purpose, therefore, of studying the program of evacuation and shelter and all other related programs which appear to have merit, I have submitted a resolution for the establishment of a Senate Committee for the Preservation of Human Life.

EXPLANATION OF FOOTNOTES

Footnote 1: History of Russian development of nuclear weapons is as follows:

September 24, 1949: United States discloses first atomic explosion in Russia.

October 3, 1951: United States announces Russia exploded second atomic bomb.

August 20, 1953: Russia announces explosion of H-bomb August 12.

September 17, 1954: Russia announces new atomic weapon explosions.

October 26, 1954: United States AEC confirms new series Russian nuclear tests.

November 25, 1955: Russians announce explosion of H-bomb at high altitude.

December 3, 1955: United States AEC confirms explosion as multimegaton bomb.

In AEC release of November 23, 1955, Chairman Lewis L. Strauss stated: "This explosion was the largest thus far in the U. S. S. R. and was in the range of megatons." (A megaton represents the explosive equivalent of 1 million tons of TNT.)

Special Washington dispatch of November 26, 1955, published in the New York Times of November 27, 1955, stated under heading "Views of United States Experts" that the "Soviet had tested a hydrogen bomb substantially more powerful than 1 million tons of TNT."

Footnote 2: Special Tokyo dispatch of November 26, 1955, published in the New York Times of November 27, 1955, stated that Kyoto University's earth shock experts "estimated the shock center to have been on Wrangel Island, off the northwestern coast of eastern Siberia. Wrangel Island is only 750 miles from the northwestern tip of Alaska." The dispatch describes highly radioactive rainfall on the northern and western areas of the main Japanese island of Honshu and at Tori Island, southwest of Okinawa. Tori Island is more than 3,600 miles southwest of the estimated point of the H-bomb detonation. The Washington Evening Star of November 29, 1955, published a similar account of fallout observations, including other reports of increased atmospheric radioactivity by scientists in Paris and other European points.

The Soviet announcement of the H-bomb test included the statement that "in the interests of avoiding fallout the explosion was carried out at a great height. At the same time wide research was conducted on questions of the defense of peoples." AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray stated in AEC release of November 17, 1955, that "rainfall speeds its (radioactive strontium as released in a large thermonuclear weapon) descent, but it comes down slowly; only a fraction of it is deposited on the earth during the course of a year. Hence the contamination continues to be deposited on the earth for years after the blast of the weapon has died away."

Footnote 3: Secretary of State Dulles, report to President Eisenhower in the Washington Evening Star of November 18, 1955, gave a detailed account of the failure to reach any agreement with the Soviet Union on German unification, European security, disarmament, and improved East-West relations. The official doctrine of the Communist Party which caused the cold war was confirmed.

Mr. Dulles stated "Our military strength must be based upon the capability of the Soviet bloc."

Footnote 4: Federal Civil Defense Administration pamphlet Facts About the H-Bomb states:

1. Atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs do exist as deliverable weapons of war. The Russians are known beyond any doubt to possess a growing stockpile of such weapons.

2. Even the small atomic weapons now make 1 plane able to deliver as much destruction as could be carried by about 1,000 airplanes using conventional bombs in World War II.¹ No absolute military defense exists today or is likely to exist in the foreseeable future. A determined aggressor could deliver atomic or hydrogen bombs on our cities, should he decide to attack our country.

Footnote 5: United States Newsweek, December 9, 1955.

The editors of U. S. News & World Report interviewed Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief, United States Strategic Air Command, at Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.

A portion of the interview, as subsequently cleared by the appropriate authorities in Washington follows:

"Question. Many people have been wondering whether, if the enemy struck the first blow, we wouldn't be at a disadvantage. Is there any way in which air power can intercept that first blow before it reaches us?"

"Answer. We have our air defense system and certainly it is efficient enough to intercept some enemy attacks. However, I think most authorities agree that you cannot stop a well-planned, well-coordinated air attack once it gets underway. Some of the bombers are going to get through. The percentage of the bombers that are shot down versus the percentage that get through is a flexible figure that depends upon the relative effectiveness of the offense versus the defense at that particular time.

"Question. We used to read that about 1,000 bombers going across to Germany from England to make a raid—could all that be done with, say, 1 bomber today?"

"Answer. One bomber can carry even more destructive force, and if you put 1,000 World War II bombers on one target, yes, you get better results with the latter."

Footnote 6: Life magazine, April 19, 1954, illustrates first release on Eniwetok H-bomb test, describes "fireball of more than 3 miles in diameter, containing expanding gases of 1,000,000° heat, 5 times hotter than sun's center."²

Life magazine, June 27, 1955, article by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, page 48, refers to AEC Commissioner Libby's speech of June 3, 1955, that "Dr. Libby makes clear that this new superbomb is a revolutionary weapon—a breakthrough in explosive art comparable to the development of the original A-bomb." Dr. Lapp states that "the H-bomb can derive most of its power from ordinary uranium, U-238. U-238 costs only \$20 a pound."

Life magazine, December 5, 1955, page 54, article Why the H-Bomb Is Called the 3-F illustrates the composition of the new type H-bombs, states that "United States, Russians appear to use fission-fusion-fission principle." Although this weapon is described in Dr. Lapp's previous Life article in the June 27, 1955, issue as deriving most of its power from ordinary uranium, Life refers to "a new theory which scientific observers have evolved concerning the way the H-bomb works, and a speech by AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, which gave a clue as to the materials used in building them." This clue appears to have been given in AEC Commissioner Willard's speech of June 3, 1955,

¹ Nuclear scientists regard this estimate as being too low.

² Also described in official Government film Operation Ivy.

¹³ Total expenditures abroad, \$51 billion.

¹⁴ Matthew 29: 16-20.

in which he cites a nuclear explosion releasing 10 megatons of fission energy or 1,100 pounds of fission products. In fact, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated at a news conference in Washington, D. C., on February 15, 1955, that the "United States has developed fission bombs many times as powerful as the first atomic weapons, and hydrogen weapons in the ranges of millions of tons (megatons) of TNT equivalent."

Confirmation of the blast force of the new-type H-bombs and the effects inside the fireball are difficult to obtain. The heat effect, given by scientists as several times greater than that of the sun's center, will vaporize all objects within its more than 3-mile-diameter area. The Eniwetok test explosion, at ground level, destroyed the island of Elugelab completely and created a crater roughly 1 mile in diameter, 175 feet deep, through many fathoms of water. The new-type H-bomb may be exploded approximately a mile above ground level to inflict maximum effects of heat, blast, and fallout, the latter effect to result in the poisonous radioactive contamination of many thousand square miles of land.

Footnote 7: Bulletin of atomic scientists article, June 1955, page 207, on radioactive fallout by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, includes reference to pattern bombing, "to maximize the areas subjected to fallout." One bomb might thus effectively pin down and immobilize several target cities—contiguous metropolitan areas might well be blanketed with fallout radioactivity so that escape to "cool" (uncontaminated) areas would be difficult.

Footnote 8: AEC releases on radioactive fallout:

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of AEC, stated at a news conference in Washington, D. C., on February 15, 1955, that "the United States has developed fission bombs many times as powerful as the first weapons, and hydrogen weapons in the range of millions of tons (megatons) of TNT equivalent." On February 16, 1955, this statement was published in the Washington Evening Star, together with a map diagram showing the "H-bomb's deadly swath of contamination," reaching from Washington, D. C., to New York City. Admiral Strauss also stated that "the staff of the AEC was studying the subject of fallout and expressed the hope that information about it would be made public at a later date."

Other releases by AEC on the subject of The Radioactive Fallout have been the published remarks of Commissioner Willard F. Libby, under dates of June 3 and November 3, 1955, and those of Commissioner Thomas E. Murray under date of November 17, 1955. The release of June 3 is in the form of a speech delivered at the Alumni Reunion, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., and constitutes the first realistic public notification on fallout phenomena to be expected from the new-type H-bombs.

Commissioner Libby uses 100,000 square miles as an assumed dissemination area of 1,100 pounds of fission products resulting from a nuclear explosion releasing 10 megatons of fission energy. In same report, under Genetic Considerations of Atomic Weapons Test, Dr. Libby states, "The genetic effects of a generalized nuclear war would be one of the catastrophic consequences of such a disaster."

The release of November 3 is in the form of a speech delivered at the annual meeting of the National Association of State Civil Defense Directors at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C. The persistence of fallout in a contaminated area, length of denial to such areas, and methods of decontamination are described.

The release of November 17 is in the form of a speech delivered at the golden jubilee dinner of Fordham Law School, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City. Commis-

sioner Thomas E. Murray proposed to convene a meeting at the atomic summit—at Eniwetok—of representatives of all the nations of the world to witness a thermonuclear explosion. The following description of the H-bomb exploded by the United States at Eniwetok atoll is given: "Then came the thermonuclear explosion of November 1, 1952. This device taught us not only that we had a new weapon, but that we had a different kind of weapon. We had unleashed a different kind of power."

"The thermonuclear bomb crosses the threshold into a separate category of power by reason of the sheer force and reach of its blast. Its explosion is so tremendous that it must be reckoned as a different kind of explosion. But this is not the more important difference. The thermonuclear bomb not only blasts and burns more acreage, more buildings, more people; it also releases dangerous radioactive fission products into the atmosphere. True the 'A' bomb also releases these fission products, but on a small scale. However, the atmospheric contamination that results from large thermonuclear explosions is serious. In fact, it is so serious that it could be catastrophic. A sufficiently large number of such explosions would render the earth uninhabitable to man. This is a plain fact."

"There is another aspect to the insidious destructiveness of thermonuclear weapons. The radioactive products they release have an effect on human genetics. The sheer fact of this effect is certain. The new power we have in hand can affect the lives of generations still unborn."

Referring to the widespread release by thermonuclear weapons explosions of radiostrontium, Commissioner Murray states that this highly toxic fission product diffuses "throughout the whole envelope of atmosphere that surrounds the earth—that this contamination continues to be deposited on the earth for years after the blast of the explosion has died away."

Footnote 9: Exchange of letters, Dr. L. R. Hafstad and Dr. Edward Teller.

Excerpt from letter, November 18, 1954, to Dr. Edward Teller from Dr. L. R. Hafstad: "Planning for recovery after attack must be firmly geared to the provision of rallying points which give a frightened populace a place to run to."

Excerpts from letter, November 24, 1954, to Dr. L. R. Hafstad from Dr. Edward Teller: "The state of mining makes it possible to construct quite deep underground shelters which can be made self-contained for the requisite period and could provide refuge for upward of 1,000 people."

"Within a small number of years we must be prepared to cope with an attack which may involve countrywide radioactive contamination. . . . Above-ground shelters will be, however, insufficient under these circumstances."

New York Times article, January 8, 1956, Overhead Less Below Ground states that "Industrialists are showing increased interest in building plants underground," and that "many companies are reportedly conducting preliminary studies of underground installations." Data is given on American and European underground projects, indicating that "the renewed activity has been motivated by the economies offered by subterranean plants."

Footnote 10: Life magazine, June 27, 1955, article by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp states that "even after having been evacuated from the blast area of the superbomb, millions of escapees will need shelter for a considerable period. Each major city must be surrounded with a vast cordon of safe shelters to which metropolitan dwellers, 8 million in New York City, can flee on short notice."

"Thus fallout emerges as a triple-threat weapon: A vast area is affected; the lethality persists for days, weeks, and months; and

toxic, if not fatal, effects may endure for years."

Footnote 11: East River project and other metropolitan studies.

Much of the evacuation planning with respect to civil defense done prior to the advent of the H-bomb is regarded today as obsolete. This includes competent studies such as project East River made for the New York City area, and evacuation plans for Milwaukee, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Portland, Oreg., and others. The vital need for the reduction of urban vulnerability was stressed under planning criteria which applied much smaller weapon power yields, and particularly to the greatly minimized hazards of radioactive fallout.

The expansion of existing highway systems, including the provision of additional escape routes by all known methods of rapid transport, including rail, air, and water routes, and possibly underground adjunct routes designed to serve as emergency shelters.

Footnote 12: Mr. Willard Bascom, attack warning system of Washington, October 1, 1955.

No evacuation plan for Washington has ever been completed, although much discussion has taken place, as a result of limited civil-defense budgets. In a report by the National Academy of Sciences' Advisory Committee on Civil Defense of October 1, 1955, prepared by Mr. Willard Bascom and Mr. Kenneth Brickner, an examination was made of the means by which the civil-defense warning alerts are transmitted to the various civil-defense agencies and to the public. This is a thorough, but inconclusive, effort which indicates the warning time may be estimated, the most favorable conditions, not to be over 30 minutes to 1 hour.

Operation Alert, held on June 15, 1955, proved the many inadequacies that would be involved in a mass evacuation of Washington, D. C., including the hazards of removing the President, the Cabinet, the Congress, and high officials, to temporary safe headquarters.

[Excerpts from letter of Dr. L. R. Hafstad, vice president, General Motors Corp., to Dr. Edward Teller, professor of physics, University of California]

NOVEMBER 18, 1954.

DEAR EDWARD: Since our discussions last winter, I have continued to spend my spare time thinking about the problems of civilian defense and the rather obvious inadequacies of our present approaches to this problem. In my own mind it is essential to establish a few basic principles on which there is agreement and then to begin to take steps, however small, to begin to move and to keep moving in the right general direction. Lack of decision, in this regard, can be incredibly expensive. Figures I have been given indicate that United States industry has expanded by 60 percent since the war and almost all of this expansion is in the wrong places, from a civil-defense point of view. If instead, this new construction had been in the right places, we would soon be in a position where our vulnerability was cut in half.

The basic principles, which emerge in my thinking, are the following:

1. It should be recognized as being impossible to get appropriations for civilian defense on a scale which would permit moving industries or populations bodily to dispersed areas.

2. Information on the destructiveness of the new weapons should be made available on an increasing scale, but only in proportion to the consummation of plans to neutralize the dangers, in order to avoid a feeling of hopelessness and panic.

3. Plans for the neutralization of the destructiveness of new weapons should begin with a realistic acceptance of the destruction and demoralization of all of our normal day to day operating agencies in and around any target area.

4. Moneys made available to civilian defense should be used primarily as catalysts to encourage dispersion of industries and population centers.

5. Planning for recovery after attack must be firmly geared to the provision of rallying points, which give a frightened populace a place to run to, after the period of panic in running from has passed.

It seems to me that it is on the last point that our present thinking has been so utterly inadequate. The signs I see on the roads around Washington saying that this road is reserved for civil defense traffic, presumably after a bomb has fallen on Washington, seem to me to be pathetically unrealistic. With a million panic-stricken people running away from point zero, all the traffic policemen in the world couldn't stop them from using any road they chose. It is for this reason that I feel that the concept of strong rallying points, known to the general public and well advertised in advance, would give these people a direction in which to move and, furthermore, if a staff at the rallying points was trained in advance and prepared to accommodate just such a wave of desperate humanity, a beginning might be made to bring order out of chaos.

I have discussed these problems, at some length, with certain selected friends here in Washington. Among many of my engineering friends, I find that the thinking turns more or less automatically to large bomb-proof structures in dispersed locations, all obviously to be financed ultimately by the taxpayer. Personally, I cannot develop much enthusiasm for this approach, for with ingenuity it should be possible to carry most of the cost by private financing. I have, therefore, taken another path in our approach to the problem, based on the following considerations.

Our thinking starts with the concept of a bomb being dropped in the center of the city, disrupting all normal services, including telephones, utilities and transport. We assume a panic-stricken wave of humanity fleeing in all directions away from the center of destruction. Many of the people will be suffering from obvious injuries. Others, apparently uninjured, will have suffered fatal doses of radiation. All will be frightened and, after a few hours, all will be hungry, tired and desperate. The immediate and basic needs will be decontamination from fall-out, medical attention, food, shelter, and sanitation facilities.

Our thinking, therefore, begins with the concept of a hospital facility and a food storage facility in active day to day use, thus insuring a nucleus of experienced personnel, available 24 hours per day, and fresh supplies at all times. Since these facilities are conceived as active working units, they should be privately financed. Against the obvious argument that such a setup is uneconomic, our reply is that it would be a proper function and, in fact, should be specifically the duty of Civilian Defense to provide Government funds, as necessary, to cover the narrow margin between economic and uneconomic operation of such facilities. This, in our opinion, would represent just such a case as was listed above where Government funds would be used as a catalyst.

Once this hurdle is passed, other possible steps fall into place quite naturally. First, the facilities, particularly the hospital facilities, should be provided with water-spray protection against fallout and should be over designed with excess capacity for beds. Removable partitions for individual rooms, for example, with layouts such that in emergency all space could be converted to open wards, with tightly spaced cots, is an obvious design feature. Similarly, stockroom facilities should be greatly over designed with capacity to handle the emergency, rather than the normal day to day work. Plumbing,

electrical, and other services should be similarly over designed so that on short notice many, rather than few, rooms for surgery could be provided. Excess capacity for ambulances and an excess supply of ambulances and perhaps even helicopters should be maintained against the emergency, but again by utilization of the concept of an operating facility during peacetimes, the nucleus of a staff will be available.

Again basic to the entire concept would be the fact that the first able-bodied people to arrive at such a rallying point would be pressed into service, according to plan, as truckdrivers, guards, orderlies, nurses, or whatever else might be necessary. A dogtag or identification card distributed to all individuals in advance, might be helpful in making proper selection.

In an entirely analogous manner, the food storage facility should be over designed to provide both excess food and excess space. As food stocks were utilized, the space would become available, first as hospital space, and later, as living space. To permit this, an over designed water supply and sewage disposal system would be necessary. Again, for peacetime operations, this would be uneconomic, but the margin would represent a very proper expenditure of civil-defense funds. For live storage this center should be both a reception center and a distribution center for food supplies. Department of Agriculture experts could help in the proper planning of such a facility and at very little added expense could arrange for considerable storage for their surplus supplies. Private operators, on the other hand, notably the big chain-store systems, might be persuaded to utilize these facilities, either from patriotic motives, or by sufficient economic concessions. Tax concessions, which might be influential in this regard, while requiring action by Congress, are not at all inconceivable, for it is my impression that Congress is entirely willing to act in the matter of civilian defense, if only a rational overall plan, leading to some concrete results, is proposed.

The fundamental concept in our thinking is, therefore, the provision of a number of such rallying points around each major city. With only a minimum of discretion in choosing, such rallying points might easily be made behind a hill out of the line of sight of the fireball. Ideally, a number of such rallying points would be at the ends of spokes of the wheel radiating from the city, the spokes being either existing improved roads or new-road programs.

In concept this plan would be moving gradually, but surely, toward the "annular city" concept which was discussed seriously in 1945 and 1946, but since has been dropped apparently as impractical. If one or more such rallying points, as I have described, could be started now, it seems to me entirely conceivable that we might start a chain reaction such that the nature of our cities would gradually change. It is conceivable that they would, over the years, be essentially turned inside out, with an airport and parks at the center, a residential area part way out, rallying points still further out, and industry perhaps on the outer fringe. If this should eventually come about, the atom bomb development may come to be looked at in historical perspective as what I refer to as nature's slum-clearance program.

Whether or not the trend goes as far as that, it seems to me that with the resources at the disposal of this Nation, it is sheer stupidity not to use the foresight and relatively small amount of funds necessary to insure that future construction and real-estate developments are in the direction of making us less vulnerable, rather than more vulnerable to the destructive forces of the new weapons.

As I indicated above, I have discussed this plan with a few selected individuals and, so

far, find no basic holes in the arguments. I would greatly appreciate your comments and advice as to whether or not, in your opinion, this is an approach which should be brought to the attention of civil-defense authorities along with the development of adequate political pressures to insure implementation.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE R. HAFSTAD.

[Excerpts from letter of Dr. Edward Teller, professor of physics, University of California to Dr. L. R. Hafstad, vice president General Motors Corp.]

NOVEMBER 24, 1954.

DEAR LARRY: It is very good to hear from you. As you know, I am most interested in the contents of your letter and no matter what else is going on I keep interested in this problem.

Among your points I particularly strongly agree with the suggestion that civilian defense should act as a catalyst, and that the main burden of the work should be shouldered by private enterprise. It is clear that this will be not easy to accomplish, but the whole job never had appeared easy.

I similarly agree with your suggestion that we need places to run to rather than to run from. On this particular point, I had quite a few discussions and I would like to describe some of these to you in the following:

Within a small number of years, we must be prepared to cope with an attack which may involve countrywide radioactive contamination. The most dangerous phase of this contamination will not last longer than a week or two. Aboveground shelters will be, however, insufficient under these circumstances. The state of art of mining makes it possible to construct quite deep underground shelters, which can be made self-contained for the requisite period and could give refuge to upward of 1,000 people. The cost would be not unreasonably high, but would, of course, be quite an important consideration. It would seem to me most important to give thought to the question: how such deep underground locations could be made usable in peacetime so that their construction by private means may be undertaken without delay. Your idea of hospitals or food depots might help, but there is still another point which clearly must be taken into consideration.

An atomic attack will probably wreck the country's economic potential. We must be in a position where we can survive such an attack and where we can recuperate rapidly. We must, therefore, have consumer goods stored for a period like a year, and we must furthermore store facilities like machine tools, machine parts, and powerplants in some form so that at least a reasonable fraction of our economic potential should be rebuilt within a year. This might open up additional uses for the underground installations which in peacetime may be used for some of the vital industries, with some excess space to house people—even though in most crowded conditions—for a short period.

In addition to all this, a different line would have to be explored. It seems to me that in an atomic duel, that side may come out on top which has the best techniques for decontaminating and generally for dealing with the radiation hazards. This seems to me to require both extensive research and some technical preparedness.

You see from all this that my ideas on the subject are by no means fixed and firm. But I agree with you fully that it would be sheer stupidity on our part not to make the necessary funds available which would make national survival a probability. Perhaps the most powerful reason is that if we are sufficiently prepared, the attack will probably never come. It may sound strange, but I really believe that the possibilities of defense by procedures along the lines described in

your letter and in this reply are more hopeful than defense by bringing down the attacking planes. That latter type of defense is too strongly subject to chance and becomes obsolescent quite rapidly.

Please let me know if you think I can be of any real help in the discussions and the plans. I hope you will go ahead with them with full energy.

With best wishes and kind regards,

EDWARD TELLER.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Senator from New Mexico is familiar with the fact that there is a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if it would not be within the province of that committee to make such studies as have been suggested by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So long as the study is made, I care not which committee makes it. There is no pride of authorship involved. The destruction caused by an H-bomb would be catastrophic. We are thinking of sending bombs to Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, but what are we doing to take care of the civilian population? What would we do about the people who would have to evacuate Washington, if that necessity should arise? The consequences of the bomb are horrible to contemplate, and it is only for that reason that I made my statement and had the document prepared by the two scientists.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in full agreement with the objective the Senator from New Mexico is discussing, but instead of setting up an additional committee, it strikes me that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would have jurisdiction over the subject matter now being discussed by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senate decides to refer the resolution to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, well and good; all I want is action. Because certain Senators may be on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does not prevent my being concerned about the welfare of the American people, especially the civilian population.

I do not wish to have any jurisdiction taken from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but certainly Congress should be alerted, and the American people should be informed as to what Congress is doing in order to save their lives.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the senior Senator from New Mexico that I have listened with great interest to his address; and, as always, he illuminates the subject and gives us some basis for thought and action. I also wish to thank him for his very complimentary reference to the chairman of the Civil Rights Subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 217) submitted by Mr. CHAVEZ was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 165) to make a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I were having a discussion.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are several other questions which I should like to ask my friend, the Senator from Missouri, about the resolution. From the investigation made thus far, does the Senator from Missouri believe that legislation may be necessary in order to carry out any of the proposals the committee has been studying?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that we are still on article I of the Bill of Rights. The Senator from Louisiana knows there are many clauses to article I.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Our report is now in preparation, piecemeal. I would say that, of course, it is possible that some legislative proposals may result, in terms of some of the administrative agencies.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as the Senator from Missouri knows at this time, that would not involve any amendment to the Constitution, particularly in respect to the Bill of Rights, would it?

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to my learned friend that I have been charged with being a great reactionary when it comes to making amendments to the Constitution. I believe the Founding Fathers did a good job with the Constitution; and I, for one, am most reluctant to tinker with it. At this time I can foresee no reason for doing so. At this time I have no conviction or predilection in favor of amending the Constitution. When it is suggested that amendments be made to the Constitution, my view is quite to the contrary. As my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee will attest, I am one of those who are in favor of being very slow to amend that basic document.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can my good friend tell me whether, from the studies made, he would suggest the enactment of any legislation of any character?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have not reached that point, let me say to the Senator from Louisiana; I have not arrived at any determination regarding it. It seems to me that the value of the hearings, if they have any value—and many of us entertain a deep conviction that they have—is to let the public know the facts and, indeed, to help some of the governmental agencies. Many of the very fine gentlemen who have very rough jobs in connection with the security-loyalty program, with which we are about completed, have said to us, after the hearings, "You have helped clarify our thinking. Now we see that we should not induct a man into the Armed Forces and give him some restricted or menial duties, and finally give him less than an honorable discharge if his conduct in the Armed Forces has been good."

In that connection let me say that, of course, the law contains a definite prohibition against the induction into the Armed Forces of a Communist. However, in one case the mother of an inductee had belonged to an organization which, I believe, was on the Attorney General's list; in other words, it was one of the guilt-by-kinship cases, of which I know the Senator from Louisiana has heard a great deal. These difficulties and problems and, indeed, these disabilities have made second-class citizens of such young men. They did their duty while in the Armed Forces, but they received discharges less than honorable.

Those were the things we undertook to correct; and the Department of Defense and other departments agreed that we had given them some enlightenment in some of these cases.

Mr. ELLENDER. A continuation of the hearings will not, then, necessarily result in legislative proposals, but, instead, will result in the exposure of how some of these matters were handled administratively; is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; how they were handled administratively. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is entirely possible, is it not, that from the hearings sufficient data will be gathered to give guidance to the administrators of certain laws as to how best to administer them? Is that about the case?

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to my friend that is exactly it, and that has already occurred, to the admitted benefit of several of the governmental departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 1, before the word "consent", it is proposed to insert "prior."

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Goldwater	McNamara
Allott	Gore	Monroney
Barkley	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Payne
Butler	Ives	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kennedy	Schoepfel
Cotton	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Duff	Lehman	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Welker
Ervin	Manfield	Wiley
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Young
Fulbright	McCarthy	
George	McClellan	

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. EYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], 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 by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 1.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. What is the status of the resolution which is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 1, to insert the word "prior" before the word "consent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "\$115,000" and insert "\$100,000."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 2, line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$91,666.67."

The amendment to 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.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kentucky whether the amendment relates to the unanimous-consent agreement that all present committee funds be continued for 1 month, and that the total amount remains the same, excluding the appropriation made for the present month?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct. The net effect of the amendment is that the amount appropriated will be eleven-twelfths of the \$100,000 appropriation.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 1, line 9 of the bill, to strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 165), 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 constitutional rights.

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 \$91,666.67, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1409, Senate Resolution 170.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 170) to make a study of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration.

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor); and

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restriction on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency additional copies of hearings entitled "Stock Market Study";

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on automation and technological change for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; and

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the joint committee print entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability," for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

ILLINOIS FARMERS ARE REALISTIC ABOUT PRESENT FARM PROBLEMS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday, February 20, 10,000 farmers met in Peoria, Ill. Such a meeting could have been explosive, but it was not.

These farmers' restraint and devotion to simple and basic principles embodies a lesson for Congress as it wrestles with farm legislation. From long experience our farmers know things.

They know that the carryover of corn by October of this year will probably be well over a billion bushels. That will be the largest carryover on record. As this pile of corn grows, their acreage allotments must be reduced to the point where their livelihood from farming is, frankly, jeopardized. In fact, the allotment for the coming crop year of 1956 would be 43 million acres. That is 6½ million acres under last year's allotment and 13 million acres less than what was actually planted. That is not merely a drop for our Midwest farmers. It is a real jolt.

I believe our farmers also know that they are losing their feed market under high rigid supports. Two years ago about 75½ million tons of corn were used for feed. Last year this dropped to about 71½ million. The reason is simple. Cheaper feeds moved in. The production of such cheaper feeds, like oats, barley and grain sorghums, increased by 10 million tons. The reason for this increase is also very simple. Acres diverted from wheat and cotton were planted to feed grains. If this continues corn acreage might be further reduced and corn prices will drop further. I think our farmers know that.

I believe our farmers know something else, and that is that as acreage allotments for corn are reduced compliance will drop also. That is not hard to understand. Reducing a farmer's producing plant simply imperils his livelihood, especially when prices are well below parity. Moreover such reductions in acreage allotment are a challenge to every farmer.

Last year 60 percent of the acreage in the commercial corn belt was overplanted. That meant that only 40 percent of the acreage was eligible for price supports. Arithmetic is the greatest of the sciences, so let us apply it. If last year's corn allotment was 50 million acres and only 40 percent was in compliance, that meant that only 20 million

acres had the benefit of price supports. It meant also that more than 30 million acres produced for the market and aggravated the present problem. If acreage allotments for corn are further reduced it is a fair assumption that there will be even less compliance. That is not difficult to understand nor need anyone be blamed. The task before us is to take these human factors into account.

The net of all this is that high rigid supports gradually surrender the Corn Belt farmers' feed market to cheaper grains. That in turn means that acreage allotments will drop further, compliance will drop, prices will drop and the end result will be real disaster.

If then rigid high level supports drive down allotments and invite noncompliance, it can only serve to drive down corn prices, encourage weakness in the livestock market and bring on demoralization. I believe our farmers know this.

They are realistic and realize full well that a workable program must take all this into account and consider the consumer as well, so that all parties in interest will be fairly and equitably treated.

I believe, therefore, that the new program with some modification is the hope of the Corn Belt.

The first thing we must do is to go back to a normal base corn acreage of 56 million or some other reasonable figure and work from there. If the base acreage for corn was set at 56 million, it would be 13 million acres above the 1956 allotment.

Secondly, the corn farmer should be urged to underplant his base acreage. That is another way of saying that he should be urged to come into the acreage reserve program.

Under this program he would receive a certificate which is redeemable in cash or in surplus commodities somewhere equal to what he did not produce. If then the value of the certificate is high enough it will be a real incentive for our corn farmers to come into the program, bring about a reduction in production and move toward the goal which we must achieve.

There should be some type of control, whether direct or indirect, of the diverted acres if the objective of reduced production is to be achieved.

I believe it only fair to compensate the corn farmers one way or another for the feed grains which are produced on the acres which are diverted from cotton and wheat. These cheaper feeds produced on diverted acres in the form of oats, barley, and grain sorghums when measured in terms of corn would amount to 800 million bushels. Equity demands that this be offset. This could be contrived by retaining the acreage allotments on other basic commodities, like cotton and wheat, or by some other type of control. In any event, this is the fair approach and would be the answer to the problems of the corn farmer. It does not lie in rigid high-level supports. These in the long run can only aggravate his problems and do not constitute a durable solution.

I allude to this today, Mr. President, because if we can get 10,000 Corn Belt farmers under 1 roof and have a meet-

ing, where they restrain themselves, where tempers do not get out of hand, and they maintain a wholly constructive and cooperative approach, that would really be a good undertaking in the face of the problem which currently besets the Corn Belt. The farmers do not ask for too much. They ask only for that which is fair. I believe corn is rather in a separate category from the other basic commodities, for the very simple reason that in times past, if the diverted acres from other basic commodities were planted to feed grains, which are cheaper than corn, it simply meant that the corn would be forfeited and surrendered.

I can well understand the interest there has been in rigid, high-level supports, but, in my considered judgment, they will not serve the purpose, and, in due course, as I look down the road, the problem will become more and more aggravated and will finally lead to a demoralized situation in the ten-odd States which are included in the commercial corn area.

I bring the matter up because we stand on the threshold of consideration of the farm bill. I salute the members of the committee for the diligence and devotion with which they have addressed themselves to the bill. I believe that one of the weaknesses of the bill is its provisions with respect to corn. So, Mr. President, I ought to announce at this time that an effort is being made to contrive the necessary amendatory language in order to cure what I esteem to be a weakness in the farm bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Illinois has spoken as he has this afternoon, and I wish to assure him that I, for one, will be very glad to cooperate in seeing to it that the corn grower receive a fair break in connection with the soil-bank proposal. Over the years the corn grower has been very levelheaded. He has not asked for the moon, but has been content to go his way. He has not been insistent that the Government do everything for him. He is now caught, however, by reason of other programs for other commodities. I refer particularly to wheat and cotton as to which the farmers were induced to produce to such an extent that the acreage had to be cut back some 30 million acres, and it was only natural that a great deal of the land taken out of wheat and cotton was planted to other crops which lent themselves to very heavy meat production, and thereby cut the income the farmers of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa would have received from the production of hogs and other meat animals.

So, in view of the fact that the corn grower has, in effect, been willing to stand on his own feet, for the most part, with only a few exceptions, I think he should have a fair break in the soil-bank program which is included in the bill which we shall probably have before us tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the assurance given by the dis-

tinguished Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I am glad he sees the problem in that light. I concur in the observations he has made about the independence of the corn farmer, his desire to cooperate particularly with the present program, and his agreement that here is a weakness which must have a remedy. When all is said and done, we are all moving in the direction of the two principal objectives of the bill, namely, to reduce production so that less comes in the front door than goes out the back door, and to have an expeditious program for the disposal of surpluses which have accumulated up to this time.

Mr. AIKEN. I might point out that the trouble has been in connection with the increased production of feed grains on land which has been taken out of production of wheat and cotton.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It simply means that the corn farmer's normal market has been preempted and he finds himself helpless in the face of that condition.

Mr. AIKEN. That is why it is so important to do something now to prevent conditions from getting worse. We can make them much better this year if we act in time.

I see the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on his feet. I know he has been extremely anxious to have legislation enacted which will help to correct at the earliest possible date some of the unfortunate situations which exist. That is why I hope, with him, that a week from now, perhaps, we can have a farm bill passed by the Senate and on its way to the House and to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I say to my good friend from Illinois that during all our hearings on the farm problem, both in the field and in Washington, there was very little evidence offered, in fact, no special program was offered, pertaining to corn. It was only after the committee got to working on the bill in executive session that the need for special treatment for corn was brought up. I am sure my good friend from Vermont will agree with me that we devoted more discussion and thought in the executive sessions to proposals to assist the corn farmers than we did in reference to other commodities.

On several occasions the committee voted on proposals to fix a more reasonable national allotment of corn acreage. As the Senator knows, the allotted acreage for corn this year is 42 million plus, whereas the historic planting in the commercial corn area is approximately 56 million acres. It strikes me that if we could agree upon a reasonable corn-allotment base of between 49 million and 50 million acres, we may be able to accept such an amendment on the floor and take it to conference. The Senator from Vermont well knows that we took a vote on making 49 million acres the minimum, and as I recall the motion failed to carry by only 1 or 2 votes.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that when we were giving final consideration to the bill, the question of corn came up,

There were 3 or 4 different ideas as to what should be done, but none of them had quite enough votes to support a special provision relating to corn in this bill. Nevertheless, I think there was an agreement in the committee that we should work out something. There was a deadline. It was getting on to midnight then, and we reported the bill on the assumption that some proposal would be made by the time it reached the floor of the Senate.

I think it is only right that some special consideration be given to corn, since corn is in difficulty, not because of any wrongdoing or overplanting on the part of corn growers. Fifty-six million acres of corn have been planted consistently, but the amount has been reduced to 49 million acres, and then to 43 million acres in this year, because of the acres diverted from wheat, and possibly other crops, thus overloading the feed market. That is why the corn-producing section of the country, which has consistently produced 3,100,000,000 bushels a year, has kept itself well within bounds and is now in the role of an innocent bystander, who gets the worst end of it by reason of someone else getting out of bounds.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that if he contemplates offering any amendments to the farm bill pertaining to corn, he should present them as soon as possible, so that the committee can study them beforehand. We would like to be able to submit them to the legal staff, as well as to the Department of Agriculture, in an effort to work out a satisfactory program for corn and have the Senate act upon it before the farm bill comes to a final vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am certainly grateful to the chairman and to the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the cooperative spirit which they have manifested in this matter. I assure them of my own personal desire to go along with the program, insofar as I can. All my proposal is designed to do is to keep corn planting consonant with the farm objectives of the bill.

If the farmer's plantings are reduced to a point where it becomes a challenge to his livelihood to give only 40 percent or 30 percent compliance, we shall be, in effect, defeating, then and there, one of the important, basic purposes of the act itself.

So I express my gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Vermont for their contributions to the discussion and their willingness sympathetically to consider the amendments we have in mind.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I am very much interested in the statement which the Senator from Illinois has made with reference to corn. Corn constitutes one of the most troublesome agriculture problems, as was brought out by the chairman of our committee in our conference sessions, previous to reporting the measure to the Senate.

I was especially interested in the statement made by the Senator from Illinois

to the effect that corn is in a special category or class. I think he means that that is largely because most of the corn is fed on farms.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. The Senator stated that by reason of its competition with other feed grains, he believes sorghum and other feed grains have somewhat contributed to the dilemma in which the corn growers find themselves. I am certain the Senator is aware of the fact that there are certain sections or areas of the country—I refer, of course, to sections of my own State, also—which depend, especially in the upland areas, upon probably the two crops, wheat and sorghum grains. We are now limited to 55 million acres of wheat, it having been cut from 77 million acres to 62 million, and then to 55 million. We are now hearing reports that it will be necessary to cut to a lower acreage figure.

If that situation prevails as to wheat, I doubt seriously whether there will be full compliance on the part of wheat growers in the future, because they will find themselves in the position which the Senator from Illinois says is prevalent and applicable to and is facing the corn-growing States, of which his State is one of the greatest.

Does the Senator from Illinois believe, however, there should be some definite consideration or some determination made by the Secretary of Agriculture as to the relative feed value of, say, corn and certain of the grain sorghums?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the matter were not difficult to accomplish, and if it could be encompassed within legislation, that might be done. I am certain the determination probably could be made by a regulation of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Illinois, because studies show that the feed value of sorghum grains is a very small fraction under the feed value of corn in a great many instances. Especially are we confronted by a very important problem in those areas which generally grow only wheat or grain sorghums, because of the climatic condition in the upland areas in the Midwest, and which pertain to a part of my State, to Colorado, the Dakotas, Oklahoma, and into the Texas area.

I recognize that great surpluses are beginning to build up in sorghum grains. If we could feel that the Department of Agriculture would give some fair consideration to the relative feed value of the sorghum grains, as related to corn, we might be in a position to consider the matter more objectively. I am certain we shall anyway, but it must be considered on a fair basis, because if special concessions are permitted to be given corn, and then the acreages for wheat continue to be reduced, there is only one other crop to plant in certain of the historical sorghum-producing areas, and we shall be confronted in those areas with much pressure for some consideration to be given sorghum grains in the same ratio as we shall probably be asked to give to the corn growers.

I am certain the Senator from Illinois understands that situation, because we

have a very definite problem on our hands in those limited two-crop areas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The comment I would make would be almost in the form of a question addressed to the Senator from Vermont. It occurs to me that, if it is proposed to recite in the law something in the nature of a conversion formula between grain sorghums and corn, we would almost be compelled to do so for wheat which is not of a milling quality, wheat which is known as feed wheat; and we would be compelled to do it for oats and for barley. That might offer some difficulty. That, then, would be a determination which could best be spelled out in the authority granted to the Secretary of Agriculture.

That is a statement which is almost in the form of a question, which I address to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Illinois may recall that in his agriculture message to Congress the President suggested that Congress might want to consider putting corn and all other feed grains on a similar basis. The Department of Agriculture has stated its determination of the feed value of sorghum to be 99.58 percent of the feed value of corn.

The western Kansas farmers who were raising wheat simply went over to raising sorghum, in order to maintain a reasonable income on which to support their families, when the very severe slashes in acreage of wheat were made.

It is hoped that through the soil bank program some of those farmers will be helped to maintain their income over a 1-, 2-, 3-, or 4-year period, until the time comes when they may again be producing a more nearly normal acreage of wheat. Under the soil bank program, they will not have the incentive to grow crops which compete with the corn grown in the corn belt.

I have been very favorably impressed with the idea of putting corn on the same support basis that applies to other feed grains, or of putting them all on a similar level, according to their feed value.

Of course, barley and oats do not have the feed value that sorghum bears in relation to corn. The could not be placed on exactly the same level.

But the best thing to do is to help maintain the income of the farmers in some way, until the principal grain producing area of the country can begin to produce more of the crop which it produces better than it can be produced in any other part of the country.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Vermont intend to propose a support price for oats and barley?

Mr. AIKEN. There is a support price for oats and barley now.

Mr. LANGER. In the new bill?

Mr. AIKEN. It is not mandatory, and it never has been. I believe it is very well supported at 70 percent of parity.

Mr. LANGER. Has not the effect been to use oats and barley for feed, while corn has been under loan?

Mr. AIKEN. I presume so. Oats and barley have a value of, roughly, about 84

percent and 88 percent, respectively of the feed value of corn, whereas sorghum has 99 and a fraction percent of the feed value of corn.

Mr. LANGER. Is not the reason for the huge corn surplus the fact that oats and barley are being used as feed?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. There has been heavy production of oats and barley on lands which were diverted from wheat in the Dakota Territory. That is what North and South Dakota were called—a Territory—when I was 10 years old. In Kansas it was found that sorghum was a better crop to raise on diverted acreage. In every case a crop competitive to corn has been planted for the purpose of maintaining a fairly good level of income. It is what any human being would have done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, the whole problem simply stems from the fact that the normal outlet for corn is feed for livestock. That is the way it goes to market. In a 2-year period 4 million tons of corn for feed have actually been preempted by cheaper feed. The increased production over a 2-year period of cheaper feed was 10 million tons. Obviously, that can become a progressive agricultural movement. That is why I indicated in the statement I made that the ultimate end of that road would be disaster.

Mr. AIKEN. There has been a heavy increase in the use of feed grain this year as compared with last year. That resulted in the production of more milk, hogs, and beef. The hog market has been crowded for that reason. The milk market has not been so much affected as yet, but if we do not make some provision for the acres diverted from wheat and corn, it is possible that millions of acres so diverted will be put to the production of milk and other crops which compete with nonsupported crops, and that will make it difficult for them as well as for the basic crops.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It all adds up to the inescapable and somewhat ghastly fact that, according to the Department of Agriculture, it is estimated that in October 1956, there will be 1,150,000,000 bushels of corn carried over. That is an all-time record, and one need not live in the Corn Belt to evaluate the depressing effect of that kind of carry-over, in the face of other feeds competitive to corn.

Mr. AIKEN. If we can accept a base acreage of 56 million acres of corn, it is anticipated that there will be a reduction of about 5 million acres planted this year. That would be a reduction in the crop of about 250 million bushels.

If wheat acreage can be reduced 12 million acres, there will be a substantial reduction effected in that crop.

If acreages of other crops can be reduced somewhat, for 1, 2, 3, or 4 years, depending on how long it takes to bring production into line with requirements, then, as I have indicated, each part of the country can go back to raising the crop which it produces better and more efficiently than does any other part of the country.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, with respect to the meeting held yesterday by the large group of farmers who are interested in the corn situation, it is most commendable that that type of meeting was held and that such a large number was in attendance. Did that meeting go on record or was the tenor of that meeting to the effect that farmers should be permitted to have 56 or 57 million acres of corn in their overall allotted acreage?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no particular account of what may have happened at the meeting so far as any resolutions are concerned. I understand that resolutions were adopted. Whether the resolutions contain a precise figure for corn acreage, I do not know, but that will be disclosed in good time.

Mr. President, I should like to touch on two other matters before I close these informal remarks. First, I salute the corn farmers who came together in the circumstances, and who are so constructive and so patient with the problem before them. I think that is a great testimony to the American farmer.

Secondly, I would pay testimony to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and also to all the members of the committee. I know they have been beset by at least 100 plans, and perhaps more. I think over a period of time at least 50 plans have come to my desk. Many of them I have submitted to the Department of Agriculture for an evaluation. The committee has been very patient, very kind, and very diligent.

I have just one other statement. As I recall, it was in the latter part of January that I wired every member of the committee from Chicago. I pointed out the fact that corn planting normally begins about the first of April, sometimes later, depending on the weather; but if it was to be expected that the lush and fertile soil of the area known as the Corn Belt was to come into the acreage reserve, it was necessary that as expeditious action as possible should be taken to bring a bill to the Senate.

I salute the chairman for having done so, and I am grateful to every member of the committee for the reply I received. I hope, therefore, that there will be a fair and proper consideration of the bill and that, without undue delay, it can be brought to a vote, with the necessary modifications incorporated in it, so that farmers in more than 800 counties in the commercial Corn Belt can make their plans and regulations may be worked out.

STUDY OF ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 170) to make a study of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, insert "prior."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the amendment which the clerk has just read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 1, line 13, inserting the word "prior."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What calendar number is the Senate considering? Is it Calendar No. 1409?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to make a brief statement before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the amendment. The study of antitrust and monopoly is really one of the most important subjects that can come before the Senate.

I am never at ease talking to empty benches, Mr. President, and I therefore venture to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I have sent for the leaders of the majority and the minority, and therefore I shall not insist upon having a quorum call, because I desire merely to make an explanation of the resolution now before the Senate.

This resolution provides funds for the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Antitrust Laws and Monopoly. I think the words used give a wholly incorrect impression as to what the study is about.

The subcommittee is not working for the punishment of any individual or any group. Instead, it is working for the establishment of a system of law under which a free economy can be maintained. The study was not undertaken by the Committee on the Judiciary because of any desire on its part to have a hearing and to call witnesses before it. The committee undertook to make the study because it was recognized in a wholly nonpartisan way that the time has come in the development of business in interstate and foreign commerce to adjust existing laws to the conditions which now exist.

One of the first acts of the Attorney General of the United States under this administration—Mr. Herbert Brownell—upon assuming office was to appoint a commission of approximately 60 members, including lawyers, professors, and economists, to study antitrust and monopoly conditions in the United States and, particularly, the laws which have been enacted by Congress during the past 60 or 70 years to protect, to stimulate, and to conserve free business. That report took more than a year to prepare. It was submitted to the Senate, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, for its examination and study.

But, Mr. President, that was not all. The Congress of the United States, recognizing the serious character of the problem of adjusting modern government to modern conditions, has four times, I believe, established commis-

sions to study ways and means of bringing about economy in the handling of the Government of the United States; to bring together under one head policies, procedures, and activities which belong under one head; to abolish useless boards and commissions, and altogether to attempt to gear the Government to the modern world in which we live.

Twice, Mr. President, former President Herbert Hoover was made chairman of such a commission. Once, he was appointed by President Truman to head a commission on Government reorganization. On July 10, 1953, the 83d Congress, the first Congress under the Eisenhower administration, passed a law—Public Law 108 of that Congress—to create the Commission on Organization of the executive branch of the Government. On April 11, 1955, almost 2 years after the appointment of the Commission, it submitted its report upon legal services and procedure. According to the reports available to any Senator, that Commission cost the Government of the United States \$2,848,534.

Mr. President, was that money wasted? Who will say it was wasted? The former President of the United States gathered about him some of the most distinguished persons in American business and professional life; and in carrying on his study on legal services and procedure in the Government, he had a task force which was presided over by Mr. James Marsh Douglas, chairman of Washington University, of St. Louis, and formerly chief justice of the Supreme Court of Missouri.

I mention these two studies—one, by the group of 60 experts called together by the Attorney General of the United States of this administration; and the other, by the group called together by former President Hoover, under the authority of a law of Congress, to study the great problem of legal procedure in the modern age. How can anyone say that the Congress of the United States can safely delegate the power to legislate, under the recommendations which are made to us, without ourselves undertaking the studies which must go into the formulation of the proposed legislation? Recommendation No. 50 of the Hoover Commission, as found on page 85 of House Document No. 128, 84th Congress, 1st session, reads as follows:

Congress should look into the feasibility of transferring to the courts certain judicial functions of administrative agencies, such as the imposition of money penalties, the remission or compromise of money penalties, the award of reparations or damages, and the issuance of injunctive orders, wherever it may be done without harm to the regulatory process.

Here is a recommendation by the Hoover Commission that Congress should undertake the particular kind of study which the Judiciary Committee of the Senate has been conducting with the appropriation given to the committee last year.

Recommendation No. 51 of the Hoover Commission reads as follows:

An Administrative Court of the United States should be established with three sections as follows:

(a) A tax section which should have the limited jurisdiction in the field of taxation

now vested in the tax court of the United States;

(b) A trade section which should have the limited jurisdiction in the trade regulation field now vested in the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Reserve Board, the United States Tariff Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture; and

(c) A labor section which should have the jurisdiction now vested in the National Labor Relations Board by the National Labor Relations Act over the adjudication of cases involving unfair labor practices.

It is further recommended that the Congress study and determine whether the Trade Section and the Labor Section of the Administrative Court should have original or appellate jurisdiction.

It is only necessary to read these recommendations to see how important it is that this committee should not be hampered in the work which it has undertaken. I am very happy to say to the Senate, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who unfortunately is detained by illness, that the work of this committee has been carried on with complete cooperation among the members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, and in complete cooperation with the Department of Justice, and with others whom we have called before the committee to testify.

The committee named as its chief counsel Mr. Joseph Burns, of New York City. He was formerly an expert in the Department of Justice. He worked in the Tax Division. He was an assistant United States district attorney in the southern district of New York, and he was successful in handling the cases which were assigned to him in that connection.

Among those who were members of the staff were Dr. Arthur John Keefe, formerly a professor of law at Cornell University, and now a professor of law at the Law School of Catholic University; Mr. Donald McHugh, a practicing lawyer in the District of Columbia, formerly on the staff of the Department of Justice; Mr. Garrett Neville, formerly of the Department of Justice, and now a practicing lawyer in the District of Columbia; Mr. Joseph Seeley, who is on loan to the committee from the Federal Trade Commission, because of his experience and ability; and Mr. Jesse Friedman, an economist. As I recall, there are 29 members on the staff. The Department of Justice created a commission numbering 60 persons to carry on a part of the work which has been submitted to us for our examination. There is much work still to be done.

The report which was filed by the Department of Justice represents a very excellent study of cases which had been decided by the courts in the past. It is a very fine analysis of existing case law, as found by the courts; but it does not contain many recommendations, if any, dealing with the remedies which should be applied to gear Government to the modern world in such a manner as to preserve free enterprise. How often do we use that phrase, and how often do we think we are serving free enterprise

when we appoint a Committee on Small Business.

I well remember that the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed by the 78th Congress in the belief that Congress should be reorganized in order better to perform the task before it. The provision was written into that law that no special committees should be appointed. That included the Committee on Small Business. The next session had hardly met before that provision of the law was abandoned, because small business needed spokesmen in Washington to see what was going on.

Would Senators like to know why? The record was made clear in a recent issue of Fortune magazine, in the supplement to the issue of July 1955. This document contains Fortune's directory of the 500 largest United States industrial corporations. I obtained this copy from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I am sure it will be amazing to those who listen to me, or who may read my remarks, to know that some of the great corporations are larger, in financial assets, than most of the States and most of the cities in the entire United States.

This directory was not prepared by this committee. It was not prepared by any left-wing organization or by any subversive group. It was prepared by Fortune magazine. What are we to say, for example, when we read, at the top of the list, that the largest company, in terms of assets, is the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey? Its assets amount to \$6,614,743,000.

Mr. President, we talk about the Middle East. We talk about shipping tanks to that area. We talk about the danger of a third world war which would involve every family in the United States, if it should come about. Who stops to think that Standard Oil of New Jersey has oil interests not only in the United States but all through the world, including the Middle East?

We know that the Constitution of the United States prohibits any State from entering into any compact with any foreign country without the consent of Congress. But these giant corporations, created by States, do that which the States, their creators, are forbidden by the Constitution to do, namely, enter into compacts with foreign governments.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that testimony before the committee showed that some of the large corporations could borrow money at a much cheaper rate of interest than the United States Government could borrow money?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is my recollection. The corporations which I shall name now are more powerful in their financial assets than 90 percent of all the nations who are members of the United Nations. Let me read the list of the first 10 corporations:

Standard Oil of New Jersey, \$6,614,743,000; General Motors, \$5,130,094,000; United States Steel, \$3,348,659,000; Du Pont de Nemours, \$2,747,404,000; Socony-Vacuum Oil, \$2,256,691,000. That corporation is also interested in

the Middle East. Standard Oil of Indiana, \$2,187,358,000; Gulf Oil, \$1,969,052,000; the Texas Co., \$1,945,509,000; General Electric, \$1,691,000,000; Standard Oil of California, \$1,677,000,000; Bethlehem Steel, \$1,613,000,000; Westinghouse Electric, \$1,329,000,000; Union Carbide and Carbon, \$1,251,000,000; Sinclair Oil, \$1,186,000,000; Phillips Petroleum, \$1,092,000,000; Western Electric, \$1,073,000,000; Cities Service, \$1,053,000,000; Shell Oil, \$1,041,000,000; Chrysler, \$1,034,000,000; International Harvester, \$940,000,000.

Side by side with that list, I have a list of corporations which rank highest in sales.

In a few days the Senate will consider a farm bill. Armour, one of the big packers, ranks seventh among all the corporations of America in the amount of annual sales as of the year 1954.

In that year Armour sold \$2,056,149,000 worth of products. We are dealing here, as these figures show, with a gigantic new system of economy. Let me make it clear that in reciting these figures I do not do so in the slightest sense of criticism. I am merely pointing out that in the economy of the United States, organizations created by the States are carrying on businesses throughout the United States and throughout the world which are, so to speak, in the stratosphere, above the eyes and ears of the people who are affected thereby.

If Congress is unwilling to undertake studies which are necessary to bring about an adjustment of these great disparities, who will do it? The drift will continue without any obstacle at all, until the totalitarian program of business government will spread to political government. It was the centralization of economic power which brought about fascism and communism in Europe. We have before us the recommendations, as I have already stated, of two commissions which undertook serious studies. I assure the Senate that we are also undertaking serious studies.

I hand to the reporter the list of the 20 largest industrial corporations in terms of amount of sales and in terms of assets, and I ask unanimous consent that the list may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From Fortune magazine of July 1955]

Ranking corporations by sales

1. General Motors.....	\$9,823,526,000
2. Standard Oil (N. J.).....	5,661,382,000
3. United States Steel.....	3,250,369,000
4. General Electric.....	2,959,078,000
5. Swift.....	2,510,805,000
6. Chrysler.....	2,071,598,000
7. Armour.....	2,056,149,000
8. Gulf Oil.....	1,705,329,000
9. Socony-Vacuum Oil.....	1,703,575,000
10. Du Pont de Nemours.....	1,687,650,000
11. Bethlehem Steel.....	1,667,377,000
12. Standard Oil (Ind.).....	1,660,343,000
13. Westinghouse Electric.....	1,631,045,000
14. Texas Co.....	1,574,370,000
15. Western Electric.....	1,526,231,000
16. Shell Oil.....	1,312,080,000
17. National Dairy.....	1,210,329,000
18. Standard Oil (Calif.).....	1,113,343,000
19. Goodyear Tire.....	1,090,094,000
20. Boeing Airplane.....	1,033,176,000

Ranking corporations by assets

1. Standard Oil (N. J.).....	\$6,614,743,000
2. General Motors.....	5,130,094,000
3. United States Steel.....	3,348,695,000
4. Du Pont (E. I.) de Nemours.....	2,747,404,000
5. Socony-Vacuum Oil.....	2,256,691,000
6. Standard Oil (Indiana).....	2,187,358,000
7. Gulf Oil.....	1,969,052,000
8. Texas Co.....	1,945,509,000
9. General Electric.....	1,691,980,000
10. Standard Oil of California.....	1,677,849,000
11. Bethlehem Steel.....	1,613,444,000
12. Westinghouse Electric.....	1,329,120,000
13. Union Carbide & Carbon.....	1,251,636,000
14. Sinclair Oil.....	1,186,771,000
15. Phillips Petroleum.....	1,092,745,000
16. Western Electric.....	1,073,600,000
17. Cities Service.....	1,053,527,000
18. Shell Oil.....	1,041,886,000
19. Chrysler.....	1,034,529,000
20. International Harvester.....	940,052,000

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As was stated by my distinguished friend from Wyoming, a study was conducted in the Attorney General's office and the study lasted for several years. I understand that a report on that study was made to the Committee on the Judiciary. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me that with that report in hand all that remains to be done is for an analysis to be made and to follow through on the suggestions made as a result of that study. Is that not correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee has already done a part of it, I was about to say. We had splendid cooperation from the Department. Assistant Attorney General Barnes appeared before the committee and testified. In order that I may make clear to the Senator from Louisiana the gravity and the breadth of the problem, let me recite one or two small instances which happened. Mr. Barnes testified that the Justice Department had told four automobile companies, for example, that the Department would not prosecute them if they merged. This was the merger of Nash and Willys and the merger of Packard and Hudson. The Department of Justice held private hearings and listened to the arguments for and against the mergers, and came to the conclusion that it would not be injurious to competition, but would be an aid to competition if the mergers were permitted.

The companies went ahead and merged. About the same time the Bethlehem Steel Co. sought to merge with Youngstown Sheet & Tube. They appeared before the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. There the answer was: "No. If you merge, we shall prosecute."

So they have not attempted to merge. But it is obvious that the decisions to favor merger in two instances and to oppose it in the other were made not according to any rule of law which Congress had laid down, but according to the judgment of the officials, men of great intelligence, of great ability, and of great knowledge—I do not challenge that at all—and I point out that in the

case of Bethlehem and Youngstown one could easily have made the argument that the merger of those two companies might have produced better competition against the United States Steel Corp. than to forbid them to merge. I am passing no judgment on the matter; I am only saying what happened, in order to illustrate the gravity of the problem and how we work together with the Department of Justice. We could spend many days in hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact, though, that in determining whether a merger should be made or should not be made, reference is made to the same antitrust laws?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Hoover Commission has reported to us that there is great overlapping of laws, and that there is no certainty whether a particular matter should be taken up by the Department of Justice or by the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. ELLENDER. But a study of the antitrust laws was made and as a result suggestions were submitted?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Recommendations were not made. The report is an analysis of the case decisions. The magnitude of this study, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana, is so great that it is impossible for the Judiciary Committee, loaded as it is with claims, with immigration matters, with the appointment of judges, with patents, and all its other functions, to handle these matters without having the excellent sort of staff which we have had. The committee has the largest jurisdiction of any committee of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out to the Senate last week, this able committee obtains from the Senate as much money for its operations as is obtained by all the other Senate committees combined.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Hoover Commission obtained \$2,500,000, which is more than all the committees of the Congress obtained; and Congress is charged with the enactment of legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say it does not make it right if one committee gets 2 or 3 times as much as it should get—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I agreed with the Senator that we were getting too much I would not be on my feet. I do not agree with him. I believe Congress is starving itself. It would not be necessary for the Attorney General to appoint a commission of 60 experts, it would not be necessary to have a Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization, if Congress were equipped to do the job.

As I pointed out the other day, the total appropriations for the Congress is only \$69 million, while the appropriations for the various departments and agencies of the Government are in the hundreds of millions and thousands of millions of dollars. In the case of the Department of Agriculture, as none knows better than does the Senator from Louisiana, the appropriation last year was in excess of \$7½ billion.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is a matter which is under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is up to the Appropriations Committee to obtain sufficient help to look into these matters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. With all the work the Judiciary Committee is called upon to do, I cannot for the life of me see how 15 Senators can do it all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. That is the reason why we are asking for assistants.

Mr. ELLENDER. The trouble is that the attorneys will do the work and the Senators will not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. The Senator is not reflecting upon his colleagues in that manner. The Senators do the work. They sit as judges. If the Senator from Louisiana would take an hour tonight to write up the events of his official activity today, the number of people he met, the number of Senators with whom he had to talk, the number of problems presented to him, and put the notation into the RECORD, he would demonstrate by his own activity what the burden is upon the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have talked much longer than I had expected to talk. I see the genial and able minority leader on the floor. I note he is about to leave the Senate floor. That is not because he prefers to go to the lobby of the Senate, but because he has duties to perform. I know the Senator, and I know how hard he works. I was very much complimented that the acting minority leader left his chair to come to this side of the aisle to listen to what was being said about the gravity of this problem. We are dealing with the basic economy of the United States and the protection of the economic freedom of individuals. I wish to say to the minority leader, briefly, what I have already said at greater length, hoping he would enter the Chamber.

The Antitrust Subcommittee started on its work because of the report of the Attorney General's Commission, composed of 60 lawyers, chemists, and other professional men, for which Commission a substantial appropriation was made, and because of the report of the Hoover Commission, which recommended certain changes in the court system of the United States. For the Hoover Commission Congress appropriated \$2,500,000.

I say without any hesitation whatsoever that the Judiciary Committee has done a very substantial work with the appropriation given to it last year, and there is much work remaining to be done which affects not only the United States, but the entire world.

I am sorry to have to detain the Senator. I know there is important business awaiting him, and I thank him for remaining to listen.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I have had to attend a number of conferences. I am familiar with the work which the committee has done, and I know the Senator from Wyoming is handling the

matter for a Senator who is not present at this time.

The figures we had prepared indicated—and I am sure it has been brought out by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—that last year \$260,000 was appropriated and \$167,000 was expended. I was going to inquire of the distinguished Senator whether he feels that the committee could proceed, without its work being handicapped, with the sum of \$200,000, which is approximately the amount which was available last year. There has been some suggestion that since the committee expended only \$167,000, perhaps \$175,000 might be a reasonable sum. But I understand there have been some adjustments in the matter of salaries, and so forth, and that might not be an adequate sum for the committee.

We do not wish to handicap the work which is being done by any of the committees, and this is an important committee. We want the committee to be able to function.

But again I point out that the appropriations now being provided for committees are all over and above the amounts provided by the Legislative Reorganization Act. Some 3 Congresses ago, \$1,500,000 was being spent on special committees. In the 83d Congress, the amount for special committees was increased to \$3 million. In the 84th Congress, the amount has gone over the \$5 million mark.

If the committees find they need the funds because they are essential to the operations of the committees, I certainly want the legislative branch of the Government to be properly equipped and armed to do the job.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are members of the subcommittee. I have heard no objection to the appropriation from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. LANGER. One reason why the Senator from California might be confused is that the subcommittee was unable to get into operation for several months.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We did not begin functioning until May.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not confused; I think I have the figures. I have tried to inquire why there has been the constant necessity of getting up to as high an amount as has been reached in some of the committees.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator stated that \$250,000 was requested, but that we got along last year with \$150,000. That was because the subcommittee did not operate for several months.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I emphasize that we have been operating at the rate of \$240,000 a year, and it is expected that we will continue at that rate.

It is necessary to have the funds in order to enable investigators to travel in the course of their work, and the amount necessary for that purpose we can only estimate. But this I particularly wish to stress: These subcommittees exist on a year-to-year basis. Every year it is necessary for us to go before the Com-

mittee on Rules and Administration. We have had a staff consisting of some of the most brilliant antitrust lawyers in the United States. Our fund became exhausted on January 31, under the rule. We could not pay salaries beyond that date. The Senate, realizing that situation, agreed to an extending resolution for a period of 1 month.

It is undignified to call men of great ability, men who are capable of serving in Congress, to the service of the public, and then not to be certain of retaining their services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is not proposed that the authorization be continued on a month-to-month basis. We are trying to provide an appropriation for the full year, minus the amount for 1 month, which the committee has already received. I am certain there is no desire on the part of any Senator, on either side of the aisle, to have the committees function on a month-to-month basis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it is agreed that the subcommittee may have the full amount for the year, minus 1 month, then I have no objection. We have already received funds for that month.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Wyoming is so eloquent that I am trying to see if we can arrive at some area of agreement. Would the Senator be prepared to accept \$225,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am acting on behalf of the chairman of the committee, who is ill. I have advised client after client to settle rather than to fight. If the Senator from California will offer his amendment to reduce the appropriation by \$25,000, I will take it upon myself to accept that reduction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 2, line 23, to strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$225,000."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have sent to the desk may be read. I am very much interested in the monopoly which controls the production of farm machinery. Before the Senator from Wyoming agrees to the reduction to \$225,000, I ask that my statement, a petition, and a telegram may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

(The legislative clerk read as follows:)

Mr. President, I rise to support the appropriation of \$275,000 for the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the United States Senate, although I believe the amount to be entirely inadequate. It is similar to sending a boy with a slingshot to fight a man with a cannon.

For some reason or other, it has been impossible to secure enforcement of the Antitrust Acts passed as far back as 1890. As I said in a previous speech, a man responsible for buying up all the important dairies in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota in 1 day and joining them into the Dairy Trust, instead of being put in the penitentiary for violating the antitrust laws, was appointed an Ambassador, and that seems

to have been the general attitude of both the Democratic and Republican administrations through the years.

Robert La Follette, Sr., while a Member of this body, made desperate attempts to secure proper antitrust legislation and enforcement of the laws on the statute books. He was defeated in these attempts. We have seen thousands of mergers and the buying of assets of one corporation by another with the result that thousands of small-business men have been wiped out. Some of the large corporations are so powerful today that they can borrow money cheaper than the United States Government can itself. Any attempt to get a law passed to provide for long terms in the penitentiary for those violating the antitrust statutes and fining them up to \$1 million on each count has been met by failure. Yet nearly 30 years ago Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis fined the Standard Oil Co. \$29 million, and had the overwhelming support of the progressive-minded people all over the United States in that action.

Two years ago, when I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and after the committee unanimously had provided for a budget of a mere \$75,000, the Republican policy committee did what the Democratic policy committee apparently had done previously; namely, refused to appropriate the money to investigate even the price of farm machinery and kindred trusts.

We gave away that year nearly \$12 billions to foreign countries, but Congress refused to appropriate \$7,000 to find out why everything the farmer and laboring man have to buy is going higher and higher and higher while what the farmer has to sell has been gradually declining in price.

One of the Senators on my committee, living in a farming community, in 1944 invested \$1,100 in stock in a large wholesale grocery concern. Shortly thereafter there was a split of 2 to 1, and this gave him 200 shares for the 100 he purchased; then it was split later, and a short time ago he found he had 600 shares. The quotation on that stock today is \$25 a share, or his stock has a value of \$15,000. But, when I wanted to investigate the high cost of living, which is in the hands of the monopolists, I was refused the appropriation.

All that a Senator has to do is to go to any farmer to learn how during the last 15 years the price of farm machinery has risen and risen and risen and risen, until today it is practically impossible for our young citizens, including the veterans, to go into the farming business on even a small scale.

When out of the funds of my office and private funds I investigated the price a farmer was getting for his grain, I found the flax monopoly. The farmer was being systematically robbed at the exchange in Minneapolis. It developed that almost overnight one outfit had bought 140 elevators in Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota, wiping out competition in some of the small towns in these States, and later rules were promulgated by the Department of Agriculture which systematically robbed the farmers.

Although Attorney Wayne Smithey, of the Judiciary Committee, and I made a good start on this investigation, it has not been proceeded with since I left that chairmanship.

Guy Gillette, the former Senator from Iowa, upon this floor described the oil and gasoline monopoly in a much better way than I could possibly do it. Fixing of price by these monopolies has become such a scandal that the Department of Justice had to do something about it, but after much fanfare and big headlines the cases were dismissed just before Christmas, to the great disgust of the judge, who remarked, "This is certainly a fine Christmas present to the oil company."

There is the drug monopoly, as a result of which, for example, if we buy insulin from any of the four large manufacturing companies we find that the price is the same to a penny. Yet, Congress has sat idly by without lifting a finger to protect the consumer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there are a telegram and a petition, which was signed by hundreds of farmers in Illinois, which I want the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the telegram and petition.

The legislative clerk read the telegram, as follows:

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

Complying with your request am quoting prices Minneapolis Moline Machinery f. o. b. Minneapolis, Minn., 1944 and 1955 UTU tractor with 12 by 38 tires \$1,427-\$2,723. GD×4 harvester combine \$1,470-\$2,908. AFB plow 3 bottom \$172.00-\$395.50, 12-foot press drill \$394.00-\$956.50, 15-foot disc harrow \$165.50-\$319.50, 6-section harrow with drawbar \$82.50-\$178.75. These prices do not include freight and North Dakota State sales tax.

MAYRO THOM.

The legislative clerk read the petition, as follows:

To the Honorable Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS and WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Whereas propagandists have blamed higher prices of farm equipment to high labor costs and thus tried to turn farmers against town and city workers; and

Whereas the per-unit labor costs of making farm equipment is decreasing due to the increased productivity of farm-equipment workers; and

Whereas in spite of lower per-unit costs, John Deere & Co. and other companies have steadily raised prices of farm equipment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the undersigned, respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States investigate the spread between lower per-unit labor cost and higher prices of farm equipment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that in 1944 the prices to the farmer for the sale of grain were much higher than they are today. Yet, in some instances the cost of repairing farm machinery has tripled. It is no wonder that the farmer is disturbed, when he has to pay double and triple the

price he had to pay, while his products sell for less.

When I was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary I tried desperately to have investigated the matter of trusts and monopolies in farm machinery. Costs of farm machinery and repairs are so high as to be exorbitant. All a Senator has to do in order to ascertain the true facts is write any farmer in his own State who buys parts for farm machinery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was in line 23, on page 2, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$275,000" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, after consulting with the acting minority leader, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in line 23, page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in behalf of the minority leader, we accept the suggestion, and no objection is made to it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 23, to strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$207,250."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment on page 2, line 23.

The amendment to 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.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 9, to strike out the word "February" and insert in lieu thereof the word "March."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply cannot let this opportunity go by without paying tribute to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If he had done nothing else but investigate General Motors, all the appropriation which was provided last year would have been amply justified. Thousands and thousands and thousands of automobile dealers wrote to the committee, particularly to the distinguished chairman. As a result there was a meeting, which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming addressed. The Senator did a job of which every citizen of the United States can be proud. He did a remarkable job as chairman of the subcommittee. So far as I am concerned, I want every Senator to know it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from North Dakota is very kind.

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

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Have all committee amendments been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All committee amendments have been adopted.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 170), 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 make a complete and comprehensive study and investigation of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable to (a) clarify existing statutory enactments, and eliminate any conflicts which may exist among the several statutes comprising such laws; (b) rectify any misapplications and misinterpretations of such laws which may have developed in the administration thereof; (c) supplement such statutes to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of such statutes; and (d) improve the administration and enforcement of such statutes.

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 \$207,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1407, Senate Resolution 167.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 167) to examine the administration of the Patent Office.

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. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the patent system of the United States is in sad need of revision. For years nothing has been done except to codify the existing law. The subcommittee has received the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration for an appropriation of \$110,000. There has already been filed and published Senate Report No. 1464 of the 84th Congress, 2d session, which indicates some of things which have been accomplished. There is much still to be done.

At the request of the committee, the following distinguished and nationally known experts in patent law and in invention and in modern technology are cooperating with the committee by the preparation of a special monograph outlining what, in their opinion, is the need for American patent law.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, retired president of Carnegie Institution, whom everybody knows was one of the prime figures in the atomic energy development. He testified before us. He is writing for us a monograph such as only he could write.

Nathaniel Sage, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the director of the office of sponsored research, division of department of industry cooperation.

Dr. Walton Hamilton, former professor of law at Yale University.

P. J. Federico, Examiner in Chief of the Patent Office.

Mr. John Schulman, practicing attorney in New York City.

Prof. Leonard Emmerglick, of Georgetown University Law School.

Dr. Archie Palmer, national research council, former Chairman of the Government Patents Board.

Prof. Seymour Melman, department of engineering for Columbia University.

Prof. Murray Friedman, department of economics, Queens College, New York City.

Raymon Vernon, vice president, Hawley & Hoops, Inc.

These and other gentlemen are so convinced of the necessity for this study that they are cooperating with the committee.

Because of the inability to secure space after the appropriation was allowed, last year, we were not able to get into operation until about the 11th of May, as I recall.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's committee received an appropriation of \$50,000, last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of which approximately \$24,000 was returned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Has the study advanced sufficiently to indicate the desirability of making any changes in the patent laws?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. The committee already has recommended that there be a single Court of Patent Appeals. Judge Learned Hand, retired, one of the greatest of all the jurists in the United States, who has passed upon many patent-law cases, testified before

our committee, and urgently sought to persuade us to continue the work, pointing out how necessary he believed it to be.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the total amount called for by the committee amendment to the resolution is \$110,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator from Wyoming tell us whether that amount will be sufficient for the completion of the study of this subject?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe it will, and I shall make every effort to have the study completed. I want it completed. That is why I already have on file, and on sale at the Government Printing Office, our interim report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the subcommittee one of the standing subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is; it is the Standing Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights, and Trademarks.

Mr. ELLENDER. After the study is completed, I assume that the subcommittee will be dispensed with, and also the staff connected with it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. After we have ended the study, the special staff will leave; yes, indeed. We do not intend to keep it.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the Senator from Wyoming thinks this amount will be sufficient for completion of the work?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do, indeed.

Mr. President, I hope the committee amendments will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 3, before the word "consent", it is proposed to insert "prior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 13, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "\$128,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$110,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, in line 13.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is my belief that we should decrease the amount so as to allow for operation on an 11-month basis, rather than a 12-month basis, as is contemplated in the committee amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, to this committee amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated; it will reduce the amount to \$100,833.34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "\$110,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,833.34."

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 11, it is proposed to strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 167), 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 conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized (1) to 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 \$100,833.34, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me express my gratitude to the Members of the Senate for adopting this resolution and the one previously agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, before making a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of another measure, I wish to say to the Senator from Wyoming that the action of the Senate expresses the feeling of the membership of this body for the fine service rendered on the Judiciary Committee by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and particularly expresses their views with reference to the appropriations for these two subcommittees, in connection with the matters the Senator from Wyoming has presented to this body today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky is very, very generous.

INVESTIGATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1405, Senate Resolution 155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 1405, Senate Resolution 155, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate certain matters, and authorizing expenditures therefor.

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 (S. Res. 155) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate certain matters, and authorizing expenditures therefor, which was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make in explanation of the resolution.

On January 5, 1956, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and I submitted Senate Resolution 155. The resolution was unanimously agreed to by the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 10. It was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration on January 16.

For many years resolutions similar to this have been approved on an annual basis for the Committee on Banking and Currency. The amount of \$100,000 would be used because of our need to obtain additional personnel to supplement the regular permanent staff of the committee and to cover other expenses incident to exercising our committee responsibilities.

The workload of the committee is extremely heavy, as can be shown by this summary: During the last session of Congress, there were 150 working days. The Senate was in session 105 days, and this committee or one of its subcommittees was engaged in hearings or executive sessions on 91 days. Many of those hearings or executive sessions were carried on both morning and afternoon. This is exclusive of conference committee sessions. This workload has made it necessary to operate primarily through subcommittees, and this, in turn, has required a large staff.

We anticipate a workload at least as heavy, and possibly heavier, at this session of Congress. Practically every major legislative matter handled by the committee during the last session will have to be handled again at this session. In addition, we shall have many new studies, which may or may not result in legislative proposals. Some of them are as follows:

First. The administration's depressed areas bill, which has been referred to our committee.

Second. A study of Government policies toward industrial dispersal, which has been proposed by a bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Third. Newsprint shortages.

Fourth. The increase in volume of installment credit.

Fifth. Federal disaster insurance.

Sixth. Extension of export controls.

Seventh. A proposal to guarantee exports against certain political risks.

Eighth. A proposal to permit commercial banks to deal in State and local government revenue bonds.

Ninth. Bank mergers.

Tenth. Steel shortage.

In addition, a number of matters which grew out of last year's study of the stock market are still pending, and we hope they may be continued. Some of these relate to corporate proxy contests, institutional investments, so-called penny stocks, and fraudulent sales by Canadians to United States citizens.

These are, as I say, in addition to legislative proposals which were handled by the committee in the last session, and which must be handled again, such as amendments to the Defense Production Act, banking legislation, savings and loan legislation, rubber and tin legislation, Federal Reserve policies legislation, securities legislation, and nominations.

These matters, of course, are extremely complex. I should think that our committee's jurisdiction encompasses some of the most difficult matters considered by the Congress. This, of course, increases our need for expert staff assistance.

The amount we are requesting is the same as that which the Senate authorized last year under Senate Resolution 23. However, in actuality, we shall have authority to spend \$10,000 less. The reason for this is that the \$10,000 authorization for housekeeping for the 84th Congress has now been exhausted, and we expect to pay for these expenses out of the \$100,000 fund under Senate Resolution 155.

As of January 31, 1956 our unexpended balance under our previous resolution was \$17,648.85. However, approximately \$6,400 of this amount may be paid out as reimbursable to the Library of Congress for special research work, thus leaving a balance of \$11,248.55.

Last week the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] stated that the Banking and Currency Committee had 43 employees. This is incorrect, as the Senator later stated. The committee has 24 employees, plus 3 on loan from other agencies, making a total of 27. This includes all the employees on the regular committee staff, under the housing resolution, and under the resolution preceding the one which we are now considering. The budget under this resolution calls for employment of 9 persons. The budget for the housing resolution would provide for 11. These, with the regular committee staff of 10, make a total of 30.

Last week the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] referred to the expenditures last year as compared to those of the 83d Congress. So far as the Banking and Currency Committee is concerned, our total expenditures last year amounted to \$163,246.51. This compares with an amount of \$268,909.11 expended in 1954, the preceding session in the Republican 83d Congress.

I certainly think that the work of the regular committees should be supported. One of the reasons why there has been such an expansion in special investigations by select or special committees is

that many of the regular committees have not had the staff which the volume of their work would justify.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Senator realizes that the Senate has already provided \$100,000 for the Subcommittee on Housing headed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator also realizes that, in addition, the committee receives the standard \$111,400 allotment for its regular staff, which consists of 4 professional and 6 clerical workers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Also a standard allotment of \$5,000 a year for supplies in connection with investigations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That, I may say, has been expended already.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The committee came back for more.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; we did not come back for more. We will take care of the housekeeping out of this \$100,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. If this resolution is approved, the Committee on Banking and Currency will end up with more than \$300,000 being allotted to it for its operations this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have said to the Senator that that is correct. I do not think the \$100,000 for housing is too much. Aside from defense, that is one of the largest programs carried on by the Government today. Of course, if we do not think we can afford it, we can abandon the program. The Senator is well aware of many of the difficulties which arose in connection with the Housing Agency. It is an expensive agency, and it requires competent supervision. It is not wise economy to cut down on supervision over that agency.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not question the necessity for checking on housing. I did not raise any objection when the Housing Subcommittee appropriation came up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator mentions it. I think it is a justifiable expenditure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I simply wish to point out the total amount of money which is allotted to the Banking and Currency Committee.

I notice that the committee is divided into eight subcommittees, one of which is the Subcommittee on Small Business. To what extent does that conflict with the Small Business Committee, headed by my good friend from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which obtained from the Senate a little more than \$200,000 for its operations in 1956?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Historically the Committee on Banking and Currency has had such jurisdiction. The Small Business Administration, which, as the Senator knows, is a sort of successor to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was created by the Congress. It is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I am not here to defend the separate committee, or to comment on the separate Small Business Committee. How-

ever, the Committee on Banking and Currency has had this jurisdiction for many years. This activity does not constitute a very large part of the committee's responsibility. However, the Small Business Administration, and also small business industries under the Defense Production Act, are under the jurisdiction of this committee, and require our attention.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that the Select Committee on Small Business has no legislative jurisdiction?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that legislative jurisdiction is in the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, as the Senator has stated, this particular subcommittee is a small subcommittee, and no special funds are requested for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. No investigations are being undertaken.

Mr. ELLENDER. The \$100,000 which is being requested is to take care of all the subcommittees.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, the major responsibilities of the committee are very extensive. In connection with the banking system of the country, a great many questions are constantly arising in that field, involving such subjects as bank mergers and others. At present, there is on the calendar a highly controversial bill, namely, the bank holding company bill. Last year we spent a great deal of time on it. We are still conducting hearings on it. That is an illustration of one of the major fields.

Already at this session we have dealt with the rubber bill. The rubber bill is an illustration of the technical nature of many of the activities of the committee, with respect to which we must have competent staff members who understand such subjects, if we are properly to perform our task. Of course, we could get along with \$5,000, but that would only mean that we would not do anything, and the activity of the committee would be turned over entirely to the executive. This body could not perform its function. If we are properly to perform our function, we must have adequately trained personnel.

I think we have an excellent staff. We could let them go, but in the long run we would be sacrificing the welfare of the country and the efficiency of the Senate.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would it not be well to name some of the special functions which have been carried on by the Committee on Banking and Currency, all of which entail expense? For example, I refer to the stockmarket hearings and the hearings conducted with respect to the securities market.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee obtained a separate appropriation of \$50,000 for that purpose, as I recall.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was paid for out of this same appropriation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was taken out of this same appropriation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Out of this appropriation, about \$50,000 was spent on those hearings. I happen to believe that they were very beneficial. At that time the Federal Reserve Board increased its requirements with respect to the stockmarket. I think the hearings had a beneficial effect upon the market, and helped to create the stability which we still enjoy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The hearings were rather extensive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They were.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me develop one further point. More recently, following the floods in New England and in the Northwest, were not rather extensive hearings held, which could not have been held if it had not been for the availability of this special fund?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. That occurred during the recess. If we had not had this appropriation last year, we could not have held the hearings, which were demanded by Members on both sides of the aisle in this body. Senators from Connecticut, New York, and Oregon, were very much interested in the subject. We could not have held those hearings if it had not been for the availability of this fund. That is where some of the money has gone. We are still holding hearings on that subject.

That is an illustration of an extremely difficult subject. We need the very best advice we can possibly get in the development of legislation in that field. I am frank to say that I do not know whether we can develop satisfactory legislation or not.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Reverting to the sum which was appropriated to hold the hearings on the stock market, as I recall, the year before this sum was asked for, the committee had a special appropriation of \$50,000, and the argument was made that another \$50,000 was needed to investigate the stock market, and thereby the appropriation was increased to \$100,000. Now that the Senator has completed his investigation of the stock exchange, why should he continue to ask for the full \$100,000? Why does he not reduce his request to \$50,000, the amount he received before? During the second session of the 83d Congress, that was the amount the committee received. The great trouble, I find, is that once a committee gets a special appropriation for 1 year, it does not willingly give it up the next year. If the Senator will look back to Senate Resolution 248 of the 83d Congress, second session, he will note that his committee received \$50,000 in additional funds. Under Senate Resolution 42, 84th Congress, first session, his committee was given \$50,000. Of that amount, \$27,000 was carried over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That shows how careful we are in spending money.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand, but my good friend is going beyond the original \$50,000 asked for and received

in prior years. Just because his committee received \$100,000 last year, which included \$50,000 to investigate the stock exchange, he returns this year and asks for the same amount of money received last year for a special job. There is no effort being made to cut back. That is why I would suggest, inasmuch as his committee has completed its investigation of the stock exchange, that my good friend should, at least, be willing to reduce this year's request to the amount that was originally made available, namely, \$50,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to point out that last year we received \$100,000, and last year's total was \$163,246. The preceding year it was \$268,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the committee undertook a housing investigation that year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The housing investigation is included in both figures.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's committee had \$200,000. He had \$100,000 for housing and \$100,000 for investigations, making \$200,000.

I would not urge any objection to the committee receiving this year the same amount of money that it received in the past, less the special amount of \$50,000 received last year with which to conduct the investigation of the stock exchange.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would it appeal to the Senator more if we were to say that we need more money for the new matters that come up? For instance, there is disaster insurance, which is a very complicated matter, a new subject. The Senator cannot tie the appropriations down in the way he suggests. The emphasis shifts from year to year. Last year there was a stock market investigation. This year we have the subject of newspaper shortage. That has developed recently, and we are asked to look into it, to determine if something cannot be done about it. Then there is disaster insurance, in connection with which there is a great deal of pressure. Then there is the installment credit matter, which the President has mentioned. He has asked the Federal Reserve to look into it. Our committee will cooperate with the Federal Reserve System in writing any proposed legislation along that line.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I certainly believe that the Senator's committee is one of the most important committees of the Senate. I am in favor of giving the committee the money its chairman requests. The investigation of bank mergers, which the Senator has so ably undertaken, will have to go further, and I am sure he will need a considerable amount of money for that purpose.

In the Senator's study of the operation of the Federal Reserve banks, I suppose he has been concerned with the fact that in the past 2 years we have been exporting more gold than has come into this country. That subject needs the continuing attention of the Senator's committee. I realize that this country is no longer on the gold standard, but there is a relationship, I am

sure, between gold and our currency. Could the Senator explain that situation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. Our constant supervision of the Federal Reserve System and of the banking system of the country is one of the most important functions of the committee. That is directly related to the whole question of the stability of our economy. It is another aspect of the whole picture with which we are concerned.

It is a part of what we were concerned with in our investigation of the stock exchange. In that connection, we were not interested merely in the stocks on the New York Stock Exchange, but, rather, how the whole situation was related to our economy and its stability.

The same consideration applies to the gold supply. It is an indicator with regard to our balance of payments, our export-import policies, our tariff policies, and so forth. Eventually it affects the stability of our whole economy.

That is extremely important. Such a study requires competent people. We cannot hire hacks to study this subject, because the subject is very difficult to understand and to present, and to explain what it is all about.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am certain the Senator's committee will have much more work to do along that line.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNAMARA. Perhaps the pressure on our supply of gold will increase during the next year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let us consider for example the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank. Matters relating to those institutions come under the jurisdiction of our committee. Those matters are extremely important.

Mr. McNAMARA. They are highly technical, too.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. Those institutions are constantly expanding in their operations, and they need sympathetic understanding and consultation on the part of our committee. I did not begin to exhaust the subjects which come under our jurisdiction.

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not understand how the Senator's committee can get along with the small amount he asks for. The whole subject of the gold reserve is tied in with our national defense. Undoubtedly we should have a proper study made of what the situation is with respect to any change in the price of gold. It certainly will not help the farmer if we have a revaluation of the dollar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's comments. He is entirely correct. There is another aspect to this matter. If our standing committees are scaled down and are unable to do their work, then of course there is created such a situation that special investigations have to be made by special committees, with a large appropriation being given to them every 2 weeks. We think nothing of spending 2 or 3 or 4 hundred thousand dollars on investigations of that kind. Yet we think nothing of cut-

ting down support for a standing committee, whose primary responsibility is to prevent the development of abuses.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agree with the Senator. Only a few years ago we had in reserve 50 percent of the world's supply of gold. We are losing that. Our gold reserve is decreasing every year. Is it not also true that much of our gold is earmarked for other nations and that they can take possession of it at any time, and is there not also the danger that we may get below the necessary reserve of gold required to maintain the value of the dollar?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At the present time our currency is sound, but an increase in the export movement of gold would be dangerous, of course.

Mr. McNAMARA. Especially if there were to be an international emergency or war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that, as always, my good friend from Arkansas can find good subjects for special investigations. He never seems to run out of them. However, I want to emphasize again that for 3 successive years, beginning with the 82d Congress, second session, his committee was able to operate efficiently with \$50,000 additional each year, but in the first session of the 84th Congress it was found necessary to increase the amount by \$50,000, in order to take care of a special situation, namely, the investigation of the stock market in New York. A total of \$100,000 was asked for that year—last year. This work has been now completed. However, it seems that because the Senator asked for \$100,000 and received \$100,000 last year, he now returns and asks for the same amount for this year.

It demonstrates the fact that once a request is made and approved for a certain amount, the same request is made in succeeding years, and there is no end to it. This is just another example of how, once a committee makes a start and obtains a certain amount of money for special investigations, that amount is asked for year after year, whether or not the same special circumstances prevail in succeeding years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator generalizes. I do not wish my silence to be accepted as affirmation of what he says. I could cite, for example, a special appropriation our committee received, for a study of the RFC. That study was completed, and the subcommittee ceased to function. There are occasions when that happens.

If the stock market investigation were the only investigation conducted by the committee, there would be some force to the Senator's argument; but what does he propose to do about the study of the very complex question of disaster insurance? There is no denial of the pressure for it. Everyone agrees the investigation should be conducted. I should not be surprised if the time and effort involved would be as great as that involved in the study of the farm bill, because there is no precedent for it ex-

cept the wartime type of insurance. It is an example of a new thing which takes the place of an old thing.

I agree with the Senator that our Government has constantly been showing an expansion. Our troubles and our businesses are not getting any less. There are more activities and our expenses are greater. Fortunately, our national income is greater, or we would have been bankrupt by this time. I think the problems of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry do not grow less by the year. I suspect the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry spent more money in the hearings this year than was spent in the year before, and the chances are it will spend more next year.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee of which I am chairman did spend more in hearings, but we did not employ a corps of special investigators, as other committees have done. As I pointed out last week, my committee is entitled to select 4 professional assistants, but we have been able to get by with 1. We have only 3 clerical assistants instead of 6.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has a very fine committee, which operates in the restricted field of agriculture, as compared with the Banking and Currency Committee which covers a great many fields.

Mr. ELLENDER. My committee covers a great many subjects.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the sugar bill which should have been referred to the Senator's committee was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish it had been referred to my committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the record of the Committee on Banking and Currency has been a good one. I believe its responsibilities have been adequately discharged. In my best judgment, the points which we present are good ones. I hope the Senate will adopt the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The amendment was on page 2, line 14, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 10, to strike out "February" and insert "March", and in line 20, on page 2, to strike out "\$100,000", and insert "\$91,667.67."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 155), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, 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) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(4) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(5) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(6) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(7) securities and exchange regulation; and

(8) disaster insurance or indemnity.

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 \$91,667.67, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "HOW TO OBTAIN BIRTH CERTIFICATES"

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1394, Senate Resolution 144.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 144) to print as a Senate document a revised edition of a document entitled "How To Obtain Birth Certificates."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 144) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the revision of the document entitled "How To Obtain Birth Certificates" (H. Doc. No. 821, 77th Cong.), prepared by the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

GIFT OF WORLD WAR II PAINTINGS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1507, H. R. 8101.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8101) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

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.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the

Government of New Zealand, without compensation therefor, 25 German war paintings depicting New Zealand troops in World War II. The proposal would not authorize the expenditure of any funds of the United States to defray any costs of transportation or handling incident to the proposed transfer of the paintings to the New Zealand Government.

The enactment of this bill would not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8101) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF AID TO CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1506, Senate bill 1135.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1135) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish civil air patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes."

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.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this is a bill which came from the Armed Services Committee without objection from either side of the table. Its purpose is to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to senior members of the Civil Air Patrol who are injured or disabled, and to the survivors of those who are killed while engaged in activities authorized by the Air Force for the benefit of the United States.

Eligibility for benefit under this bill would be made retroactive to the organization of the Civil Air Patrol in 1941, but payments based on entitlement to FECA benefits would be authorized only after the date of enactment of this bill. No retroactive payments, however, are authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1135) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved May 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 274), entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for

other purposes," is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"Sec. 3. (a) Volunteer civilian members of Civil Air Patrol, except Civil Air Patrol cadets, shall, for the purpose of administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, be deemed to be civilian employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 40 of that act, and the provisions of that act shall apply to them in all respects, subject to the remaining provisions of this section.

"(b) In the administration of that act in such cases the following shall apply: (1) The monthly pay of such members for the purpose of computing compensation for disability or death shall be deemed to be \$300; and (2) as applied to such members, the term 'performance of duty,' as used in that act, shall mean only active service, and travel to and from such service, rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol, under direction of the Department of the Air Force, and under written authorization by competent authority covering a specific assignment and prescribing a time limit for such assignment.

"(c) When a claim is filed, the Secretary of Labor or his designee may inform the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee, who shall advise, if so requested, the Secretary of Labor concerning the facts with respect to the injury, including the question whether at the time of injury the member of the patrol was rendering service, or engaged in travel to or from such service, in performance or support of an operational mission of the patrol: *Provided*, That this shall not be construed to dispense with the reports of the member's immediate superior required under section 24, or other reports agreed upon under section 28a of that act.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall be applicable as of May 20, 1941, in the cases of members of the Civil Air Patrol as it existed under and pursuant to Executive Order 8757 of May 20, 1941, as amended by Executive Order 9134 of April 15, 1942, and Executive Order 9339 of April 29, 1943: *Provided*, That the time limitations in that act, in respect to notice of injury and claim for compensation, shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits under that act shall accrue or be payable in any case for any period prior to the date of this act, but this provision shall not bar the payment or reimbursement of medical and other expenses as authorized by sections 9 and 11 of that act, if not otherwise paid or furnished by the United States: *Provided further*, That, with respect to services rendered prior to the enactment of this act, the term 'performance of duty,' as used in that act, shall mean only active service, and travel to and from such service, rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol, under direction of the Office of Civilian Defense, the Department of the Army (War), including the Army Air Forces, or the Department of the Air Force: *And provided further*, That the entitlement of any person to receive benefits from the United States under any other provision of law in effect prior to the date of enactment of this act for an injury or death for which benefits are authorized by this act is hereby terminated.

"Sec. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed to confer military or veteran status upon any person."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

PROPOSED SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CORRUPT PRACTICES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished minority leader and of other Senators.

For myself and on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, I am about to submit a resolution in which I think the Senate has a vital interest. I shall ask that the clerk read the resolution for the information of the Senate, so that it may appear at the proper place in the Record. When the resolution has been read, I shall ask that it go over, under the rule.

For the further information of the Senate, it is expected that the Senate will vote tomorrow on the international convention to facilitate the importation of commercial samples and advertising material, but it is my understanding that the resolution I am about to submit will be laid before the Senate in the morning hour, since it will go over, under the rule. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now submit the resolution, and ask that it be read.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 219) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a special committee which is authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices.

SEC. 2. (a) The special committee shall consist of 8 members to be appointed by the Vice President, 4 each from the majority and minority Members of the Senate, and shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, select a chairman and vice chairman.

(b) Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 3. (a) The special committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1957, and shall include in its report specific recommendations (1) to improve and modernize the Federal election laws; (2) to improve and strengthen the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and related laws; and (3) to insure appropriate administrative action in connection with all persons, organizations, associations, or corporations believed to be guilty of wrongdoing punishable by law.

(b) Upon the filing of its report the special committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the special committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive-branch personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) For the purpose of taking testimony the special committee may provide that fewer than 5 but not less than 2 members shall constitute a quorum, providing that both the majority and minority are represented.

SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed \$350,000 and shall be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the special committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Under the rule, the resolution will go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that I shall make a detailed statement, at the appropriate time tomorrow, explaining the resolution, the various provisions it contains, and the reasons therefor.

I should like to say only a few words at this time. The question has been asked whether or not the January 31, 1957, date means that will be the earliest date of any report. The date on which the committee will expire, unless extended, will be January 31, 1957.

It is anticipated, contemplated, and hoped that the committee can organize as soon as the present select committee makes its report, and proceed diligently, on a full-time basis, to make its investigation and studies, and from time to time, and certainly during this session, file interim reports and make recommendations, and perhaps cause to be introduced for consideration proposed legislation.

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

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 205

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the select committee, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution which would amend Senate resolution 205. That resolution provides for an expiration date of March 1. The resolution I submit would change the date to March 10.

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

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 218), as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 205, agreed to February 7, 1956, establishing a select committee to investigate efforts to influence the vote of Senator CASE, of South Dakota, be, and the same is hereby, amended

by striking out in section 3 thereof "March 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 10, 1956."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution I have just submitted.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 218) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. As a part of one of the standing committees of the Senate, there now exists a standing Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, within whose jurisdiction, as I understand it, under the rules of the Senate, a matter of this character ordinarily falls.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from New York will yield at that point, I think he is not entirely correct. Only a portion of that matter could be within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee. For instance, that subcommittee has no jurisdiction over matters arising under the Corrupt Practices Act. Legislation affecting that subject would go before the Committee on the Judiciary. The Privileges and Elections Subcommittee has no jurisdiction over the Lobbying Act. That subject would go before the Committee on Government Operations.

The reason for creating the special committee is to keep four committees from doing work which one committee can do, and which committee it is hoped will comprise some of the finest minds and brains and some of the best men from all four of the committees mentioned.

The Committee on Government Operations, of course, would be responsible for presenting any recommendations which the special committee might find necessary in the field of lobbying and lobbying legislation. Of course, the Committee on Government Operations may want to conduct its own hearings after the special committee makes its recommendations.

The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over matters relating to the Corrupt Practices Act, and the distinguished chairman of that committee, or any subcommittee, may want to cover that.

The Committee on Rules and Administration has specific jurisdiction over Federal elections and campaigns, and it has delegated that function to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

The purpose of the special committee is to incorporate all those matters for the jurisdiction of one committee. We hope to be able to draw Senators from all those committees. We do not say that the membership will be confined only to those members, but it is hoped to have at least one member from each of those committees, so that we can expect them to say, "Here is what we expect to have done."

It is not the intention to have the special committee displace the Government Operations Committee at all. That

committee will be supreme in the field of legislation affecting lobbying. Under the Reorganization Act, no other committee has that jurisdiction.

The majority leader has had submitted to him three separate legal opinions on these questions.

I repeat, the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over matters arising under the Corrupt Practices Act.

If the Senate wishes to ignore lobbying, and give no attention to corrupt practices, if it is not concerned with strengthening the election laws or other related acts, the Senate could confine the matter to 1 committee or 1 subcommittee; but because the whole question has been raised, and because the attention of the country has been arrested by the so-called Case incident, I will say to my friend that the special committee will have the authority, for instance, to go into any of these matters which may be under the jurisdiction of the Labor Committee, involving, for example, provisions of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, and the committee properly might want to propose an amendment affecting conventions or elections affected thereby. The Senate could have 4 or 5 separate committees looking into those questions.

It was felt by those who had the responsibility, and the majority leader and the Democratic policy committee, and the minority leader, and I think every member on the minority side, that, rather than have 4 or 5 committees going off in all directions, seeking perhaps the sensational instead of substantial, it would be the wiser and more prudent course if the Senate could trust itself—and we certainly think we can—to pick out eight of the best Members of this body and have them operate in a bipartisan atmosphere, and dedicate themselves to uncovering any wrongdoing of any kind, with a view to accomplishing something constructive and perhaps bring up to date our archaic election laws, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and the Lobbying Act.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. For the 7 years I have been a Member of the Senate, so far as I know there have been only two select committees appointed for purposes that have had any relation to a situation of this kind. One was in connection with the proposed censure resolution of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

At that time I believed, and I think I was right, there was no committee of the Senate which was authorized to go into such a charge against a Member of the Senate. That was the first case of the appointment of a select committee. The second case was in connection with—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I disagree with the Senator. There were committees that had jurisdiction. It was determined by the leadership at that time, by the distinguished Senator from California and the Senator from Texas, that the fairer and better procedure was to have a bipartisan committee go into the matter; but existing committees had jurisdiction.

Mr. LEHMAN. At the time I understood that one of the reasons given for the establishment of the select committee was that, under the rules of the Senate, there was no committee having jurisdiction over a case of that sort.

The second instance of a select committee being appointed was in the case with which we have been confronted, namely, the charges or statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield, but the Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know, but I do not wish to interrupt my friend unless he is agreeable to having me do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York will remember that another select committee was appointed in the case of a mail cover. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was one member of that select committee; and the then Senator from Michigan, Mr. Ferguson, was the other member.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not recall that, but I have no doubt that the statement of the majority leader is entirely accurate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York will remember that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] charged that a cover had been placed on his mail by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and he desired to have that matter investigated. The Committee on Rules and Administration met, and the leaders discussed the matter; and it was decided that it should be investigated, and that the investigation should be handled in a bipartisan manner. The Republicans were then in the majority, and they appointed the then Senator Ferguson, of Michigan; and the Democrats recommended the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; and those two Senators made a very prompt report.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader another question. As he knows, and as I stated yesterday on the floor of the Senate, I believe very strongly that a vigorous, fair, thorough, and nonpolitical investigation should be made of this entire situation. Certainly that is necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am glad to hear my friend say that. If he will permit me to do so, I wish to associate myself with his statement, and to say to him that he has no monopoly on the desire to have the Senate proceed in that way.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have never claimed to have a monopoly on virtue, believe me, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand.

Mr. LEHMAN. But I have that feeling, and I believe that an investigation is necessary for many reasons, chiefly, to make it very clear that the Senate is not going to pussyfoot in any way on this situation, and will not attempt to whitewash anyone, but will, for the sake of its

own dignity and the respect in which it should be held by the people of the United States, make an investigation such as I believe could be made by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree with the general statement the Senator from New York has made in regard to what the Senate should do. I hope the Senator from New York does not insinuate that the Senate is not doing it by means of this resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not read the whole resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me state the purpose of it.

Mr. LEHMAN. But what worried me particularly, among other things, was the statement which was carried yesterday on one of the news tickers in the Senate lobby—and I wish to make it very clear that I do not believe everything I read in the press or everything I see on the news ticker—that on the committee, as a part of it, there should be, in addition to representation of some of the committees the majority leader has enumerated, also representation from the Senate Republican and Democratic campaign committees. That gave me a great deal of concern, because I believe that if this were done, it would immediately raise doubts as to the nonpolitical aspects of the investigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield at this point—

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say that I assume that the statement the Senator from New York read is the one I made in my press conference. I think it was correctly quoted. I do not have the statement before me now; but at that time I had in mind that if we were going into the field of limiting campaign contributions and their amount, and whether any contributions at all should be made in interstate commerce, and whether limits should be placed on contributions in connection with presidential elections and senatorial elections and elections in New York, Texas, and other States, the committee would want to have the judgment of some of the men who had had experience in that field. To be frank with the Senator from New York, I had in mind the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who serves on both the Democratic senatorial campaign committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration. Because a Senator serves on a campaign committee, I do not think he is automatically disqualified from participating in such an investigation. As a matter of fact, I think he is extremely well qualified to hear evidence and reach conclusions and determine a course of action for this body.

I have great confidence in every Member of this body. I just pointed out that it would be of little avail if, after lengthy hearings and 6 or 8 months of work, we decided we wanted to amend the Corrupt Practices Act in this respect, or wanted the Senate to place a limitation on campaign contributions and the operations of campaign committees in this

respect, and wanted to have certain action taken in respect to lobbying, if no member of those committees knew anything about the report or had been in on the decision or had been consulted. My experience tells me that then we would have a report which, as a practical matter, would merely be good for the Archives.

It is the purpose of the Senator from Texas—and, although I cannot speak for the minority leader, I believe it also to be his purpose—to encompass a twofold objective: First of all, to ascertain whether there has been any wrongdoing by any Member of the Senate or whether any person has attempted to influence improperly a Member of the Senate; and I should like to have a catchall phrase, so no one would say I had narrowed it. We want such matters exposed and brought to light. Second, we want the investigation to be constructive. We want to obtain from the investigation some constructive action which can be taken in the public interest.

At the present time we have colonial election procedures in a jet age, and we want to bring them up to date. So probably we shall have to amend the Corrupt Practices Act; and probably action of that sort will be taken before the special committee acts, because amendments to the Corrupt Practices Act are now pending before the Judiciary Committee.

So those are our purposes: First, to expose any wrongdoing; second, to have the committee submit in the form of interim reports any recommendations it may make to strengthen the laws to protect the public interest in the field of public elections.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I share the hope that, as a result of this discussion and the unfortunate situation reflected in the incident which was described by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], we shall take steps, through whatever committee may be designated, to look into the matter and ascertain the extent of wrongdoing. Of course, that must be the sincere hope of every Member of the Senate.

I think it is also true that we should do everything possible to bring about a necessary and a very belated strengthening of our election laws, which of course in many particulars have become a farce.

But I repeat that one of the things that caused me very great concern on yesterday, and resulted in the speech I made on the floor of the Senate on yesterday—unfortunately, the distinguished majority leader was not in the Chamber at the time—was the fact that I could see no reason whatsoever for designating as members of the proposed select committee, members of the Republican and Democratic campaign committees of the Senate, in their capacity as members of those committees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit—

Mr. LEHMAN. That was what the distinguished majority leader said, as he

has stated. It was recorded on the ticker yesterday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have never stated that there would be designated from any specific committee any specific member. I said it was hoped that the total membership of the committee could draw upon the experience of Senators who have operated in these fields, in the hope that we could obtain legislation which would be acceptable to the entire Senate.

I told the Senator—and I repeat—that I had in mind specifically the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is an experienced member of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. He was very active in the campaign 2 years ago. At present he is chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. I do not know how many other such Members there would be on the committee, but I rather suspect that there would be at least one other Member on our side of the aisle who would either have served on the campaign committee or would have had experience in either the House or Senate on one of those committees. I think that is important if we are to write an entirely new election code.

Mr. LEHMAN. The majority leader knows that I have a very high regard for him. I have not always agreed with him, but I have a high regard for him. I need not add that I also have a very high regard for the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is now chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. I feel that whatever my course of action may be when this question is brought up for further discussion and a vote tomorrow, it would be a very serious mistake to designate to help conduct this investigation anyone who would be identified as a representative of the campaign committee of either of the two great parties.

I think we are trying to do two things—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I do not wish to prolong this discussion. We shall have all day tomorrow, if we wish to discuss the subject.

I have tried to make clear to the Senator my purpose. I should like to ask him a question. Would the Senator from New York disqualify the Senator from Tennessee from serving on the special committee because he happens to be one of the most effective members of our Senatorial Campaign Committee?

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly would not have him go on the committee as a representative of the campaign committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No member is appointed as a representative from any campaign committee. Members with experience on the various committees will represent the Senate. They will not represent any committee. However, their service on various committees will contribute to the collective wisdom which will bring about a judgment which I hope will be acceptable to the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. In answer to the question of the distinguished majority leader, let me say that I have full confidence

in the Members of the Senate, just as he has.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is not what I asked. I asked if the Senator from Tennessee should be disqualified because he is at present serving on the Senatorial Campaign Committee.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator from Tennessee would be eminently qualified to serve on this committee as the chairman of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee. Indeed I can think of no one I would rather see both on the committee and presiding over it. But I do not think Senator GORE should serve on this committee as a representative of the Senatorial Campaign Committee of the Democratic Party.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator mistakes my intent. The Senator from Texas has never said that it is proposed to have the Senator from Tennessee serve as a representative of anyone except the people of the United States and the United States Senate. He would serve as the agent of the entire Senate. However, the fact that he has had experience in the field of election reform, election campaign requirements, and other subjects coming within the scope of the Corrupt Practices Act or the Lobbying Act, and has served on committees which dealt with such subjects, is a circumstance which I think would be generally helpful. I do not believe it would disqualify the Senator from Tennessee. I have not considered such experience as a disqualification.

I appreciate the Senator's advice. In accordance with the terms of the resolution as it is drawn, I shall make recommendations from our side of the aisle. I appreciate any counsel the Senator from New York may desire to give me. I am sure that when the committee is named he will not have any misgivings. I remember that he had considerable misgivings about the last select committee which was named. I think such misgivings as he had at that time disappeared to a great extent as the deliberations proceeded. I have no doubt that the quality of the membership of this committee will be satisfactory not only to other Members of the Senate, but also to the Senator from New York.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe that in the development of this discussion between the distinguished Senator from New York and the majority leader it should be made abundantly clear to all that Senate bill 636, a bill to reform election procedures and to amend the Corrupt Practices Act, which has not been amended since 1925, is in nowise to be foreclosed from consideration, or inhibited from coming before the Senate for consideration and action.

I have discussed the subject with the majority leader and have received assurance from him, as I understood him to give the Senator from New York assurance this afternoon, that it is of the utmost importance to report and pass now some legislation relating to cleaning

up a situation which we all know has gotten out of hand, and in which, under the law, elections are being conducted under obsolete and archaic conditions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. HENNINGS. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not the slightest hesitancy in saying to the Senator from Missouri in public what I said to him in private.

Mr. HENNINGS. My statement was not for the purpose of putting the majority leader on record in public. I accept his word as given to me in private.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I make the statement because I think it is important that the public know the facts.

The Senator from Missouri introduced a bill, which has been reported by a standing committee of the Senate. That bill has not been cleared by either policy committee. Certain questions have been raised about the bill in its present form, and there is substantial opposition to it, as the Senator from Missouri well knows.

The Senator from Texas has said to the Senator from Missouri that if he can draft certain suggested amendments so as to bring the measure into line and obtain the approval of the majority of the policy committee, the Senator from Texas will be one of the majority—if there be that many—who will vote to submit the measure to the Senate and permit the Senate to take the proper action.

The Senator from Texas does not believe in bottling up legislation in committee, although he has been severely criticized for not holding up the gas bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. There was no question in my mind as to the purposes or intentions of the majority leader. However, I wished to emphasize, for the benefit of those who may not have a full and complete understanding of the question, that the essence of the pending bill, which was drafted following extensive hearings covering a good part of last year, is the reporting of all contributions, so that the people may know from what sources the money comes, and, with the capacity to judge, may determine, from such reporting, the extent, if any, to which any predilection or bias may be ascribed or implied.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would say to my good friend from Missouri that I heartily favor such a provision, as he well knows, but that is not the controversial provision.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct. There are other provisions which are controversial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My State has such a provision in its law, and every dime that is spent must be reported. The Senator from Texas has had drawn various amendments to various acts which he plans to offer for himself and perhaps for other Senators in the near future. The Senator from Texas should like to have every Member of the Senate on notice that the measure proposed by the Senator from Missouri, which has already been reported to the Senate, and other measures which may be proposed during this period when all of us are so

interested in this subject, may be acted upon by the Senate before the special committee submits its final report. I have made it clear to everyone I have talked to on the subject of the special committee, that there is nothing in the special committee resolution which hinders the Committee on Government Operations from reporting any amendment to the Lobbying Act which that committee in its judgment feels is in the public interest. The same thing is true with respect to the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee. The same thing is true with respect to the Judiciary Committee. The same thing is true with respect to any other committee which may have jurisdiction in this field.

However, if Congress should act on legislation prior to the final report of the special committee, it might very well be that the special committee would say, "Well, we think this is about as good a lobbying act as we can get," or it may say "This is about as good a Corrupt Practices Act as we can get," and so forth.

However, we do not want to be subject to the charge—and I know that my colleagues do not participate in this—that I have been subjected to. I have on my desk a collection of 15 or more newspaper columns which were sent to me during the last 10 days, when I was in my home State. Most of the columns state that the Senator from Texas was trying to avoid an investigation; that the Senator from Texas had bottled up the resolution of the Senator from Missouri; that the Senator from Texas was trying to keep the Senator from Tennessee from doing this or that, or trying to prevent his conducting an investigation.

Nobody knows better than the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Missouri that the Senator from Texas had no such purpose. The Senator from Texas stated to the Senator from Missouri on that Monday, "You let me get this resolution adopted, to investigate the CASE incident, which I believe is my responsibility to have adopted as quickly as possible, and then if you offer your resolution, I will not object to it and I hope that it will be approved." Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. HENNINGS. I very well remember that. I am glad that the Senator has offered his resolution, which comports with the resolution I offered following his on that Monday when the Senate voted on the gas bill. In substance, it has the same objective and the same purport, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With that statement I cannot agree. I think it is in equal balance with respect to members of both parties, whereas the Senator from Missouri has confined his resolution to one industry. My resolution pertains to the whole field. As I remember, the Senator's resolution was rather narrow and limited. This resolution goes to all lobbying activities. It covers labor unions and manufacturing associations and chambers of commerce, and any impropriety of any kind. The Senator from Texas does not want to be identified, as he said on that day, and does not want to be the author of a

resolution while the gas bill was pending, which would investigate only one industry and one episode.

Mr. HENNINGS. My memory may not serve me correctly, but I recall that my resolution provided that we were to investigate all improprieties relating to any efforts at all to influence a vote in the Senate of the United States, either for or against the pending business, which at that time was the so-called natural gas bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There was nothing in the resolution which confined it to any bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not believe it spoke about the oil industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it did not, I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HENNINGS. In terms of the Senator's original resolution, it was an effort to extend and broaden the jurisdiction, so as to look into all possible elements of influence, whether it be an attempt to influence a vote for the bill or against the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas never objected to the Senator's resolution. The Senator's resolution is on the table by the Senator's request, not by the request of the majority leader.

Mr. HENNINGS. Nor did the Senator from Missouri object to the resolution of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. However, the Senator from Missouri has not been blamed for that. I have been blamed unfairly, unjustly, and almost unmercifully for bottling up the Senator's resolution. The Senator's resolution is on the table at the Senator's request. That is what I want the country to know. I do not say that the Senator from Missouri contributed to that. That has been done by a part of the press of this country and by some columnists. I am sure the Senator has read Marquis Child's column and the various Drew Pearson columns, and a number of other columns, in which the Senator from Texas is charged, in effect, with trying to hinder the Senator from Missouri from offering the resolution, when, as a matter of fact, the majority leader said, and the minority leader said, that they would offer no objection whatever, even if unanimous consent were required, to the Senator's resolution. I want the country to know that. I have already informed the Senator, although I did not have to do so, because he already knew it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure there is no useful purpose served in going over that ground again, except—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Missouri will understand the need, I am sure, after he gets about 15 columns of the kind I have received.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am referring to my lack of intent to go into any of these matters again, but I should like to say that the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee met in good faith, and at that time we were told by the distinguished majority leader and by the distinguished minority leader and other Senators that they thought we had jurisdiction of the matter. However, be that as it may, the main point I wanted to discuss with the majority leader—and I am glad he

brought out the point and clarified it—is that this resolution, irrespective of what other resolutions may have provided or failed to provide as to scope or breadth, or inhibitions, does not in any way have as its intent to postpone or unnecessarily delay prompt action upon an elections bill, which has been considered by the committee and reported by the committee, as well as reported by a majority of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and which is on the calendar, having been placed there on June 22 last, as I recall. On that point I believe the majority leader and I understand each other, but I did want the Senate to understand that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from Missouri again that we have that understanding. Whenever the Senator from Missouri can obtain, by his great persuasive powers and his reasoning and logic, a majority of the Policy Committee or a majority of the Senate to consider his bill, there is nothing in the resolution which prevents that being done.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to ask the majority leader this question, inasmuch as the majority leader has a bill which he proposes to introduce. We had a number of hearings and invited every Senator to appear before the subcommittee. We wrote a letter to every Member of the Senate to appear before the subcommittee and to give to the subcommittee his views upon this very vexing and complex question of regulating contributions and the reporting and spending of money in political campaigns.

Now that the distinguished majority leader has a bill—and he has indicated that he has—I would be very happy to cooperate with him. The bill to which I refer is coauthored with me by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. It seems to me that we might all get together with the distinguished minority leader and other Senators who have concern in this matter and who have been thinking about this question for many years, I know, and discuss legislation which can give us some relatively quick results, and that we might, even before we go into another campaign, get some action to regulate the inordinate contributing and spending of moneys and the lack of reporting and the withholding, in effect, from the people of the United States the sources of money that goes into campaigns. I say again that that is the heart of the proposed legislation.

I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Missouri, and I will assure him that as soon as the proposed legislation comes from the drafting service, I shall send a copy to him. There is nothing I desire more than the Senator's support of the proposed legislation. If this discussion has done nothing more, it has put the Senator from Missouri and me in complete agreement. I hope the Senators across the aisle will follow the example we have set, and I hope we can all join in a bipartisan

move to get the sort of legislation we desire.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, unfortunately, I was not on the floor when the resolution was read. I have the greatest personal confidence in the two leaders of this body, the very able Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the very able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I am very much disturbed however, Mr. President, by the situation which might develop from the introduction of the resolution and its consideration. There is no question that the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, under the Reorganization Act, has full power to deal with corrupt practices, and has full power to report legislation having to do with the suppression of corrupt practices and the control of contributions to political campaigns, or for any other purpose, whether those contributions are made by way of cash from the personal account of the president of a corporation who thus evades the direct prohibition of law regarding contributions, or whether they are made by check, or by any other method, direct or indirect.

Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Senate since the 1st of January 1934, and in every campaign I have waged for reelection, campaign contributions from the East have been poured into my State in an effort to bring about my defeat. I was always quite willing to trust my fortunes to the intelligence of the voters of my State. I was reelected upon every occasion I presented myself, except one. That was the campaign of 1952. I am happy to be able to state that my failure to win that election was not due to the contributions which came from the gigantic corporations of the East who tried to bring about my defeat.

I know several other Senators who have suffered from the same sort of attempts upon the part of gigantic lobbies to bring about the defeat of Senators who had the courage to stand upon the floor of the Senate and speak their own minds.

Whatever we say today or whatever we do today will not change the record which is before us. That record is that the Committee on Rules and Administration, on the 22d of June 1955, reported a bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes. The bill was sponsored by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. The Committee on Rules and Administration reported the bill. I have the report in my hand, and I see that with the exception of the few pages of minority views, which apparently are detailed—I have not read them—the majority of the committee favored the bill which now stands upon the calendar of the Senate as the fifth measure on the calendar. There are only four measures ahead of it.

The first is Calendar No. 1, Senate Resolution 17, by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The second is Calendar No. 235, Senate bill 300, to authorize the construc-

tion, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Frying Pan-Arkansas project, Colorado. That bill was introduced by the two Senators from Colorado.

The next is Calendar No. 364, Senate Joint Resolution 31, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and other Senators, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

The next one is Calendar No. 579, Senate bill 63, introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], to provide for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Then comes Calendar No. 629, Senate bill 636, sponsored by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and other Senators, to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

It is obvious that a motion may be made on the floor at any time to call up that bill. It can easily be amended to cover the case of a person who by cash or check or any other method contributes to any Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives any money or thing of value to influence the result of a vote. Such an amendment may be presented and may be adopted. If it should be adopted it would settle this whole business within a few moments. I have no doubt that the measure can be passed.

The special committee which is to be created has no power to present a bill of any kind to the Senate. It has no power to submit proposed legislation. It may recommend, but it may not submit proposed legislation. Any recommendation which comes from the special committee, if it is established, must go to some standing committee.

The report of the special committee, according to the terms of the resolution, is to be made some time in January 1957—after the general election. I want to see action on Calendar No. 629, S. 636, the fifth item on the calendar of measures reported by committees as ready for action, taken before the month of March is out. I think the Senate owes it to itself and to its own dignity to take action upon S. 636.

The Senate has just gone through many days of debate about the appropriations for the standing committees of the Senate. The measures have been debated on the floor for at least 3 days. But there is not as yet a line in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas to suggest the amount of money which the new investigating committee may have in order to carry on its operations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Louisiana tells me that the resolution provides for \$350,000. I am very happy to know that amount is included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I submitted the resolution, and, under the rule, it will go over. But for the information of all Senators who are interested, either by

being present or by reading the RECORD, I submitted the resolution and asked that it be read. That was done. The resolution provides for an appropriation of \$350,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator place the resolution in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It has already been read into the RECORD. That was done so that all Senators could be aware that it would be considered tomorrow.

My information is that the measure to which the Senator from Wyoming is addressing himself, the bill to revise the Federal election laws, introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and other Senators, was reported, I believe the Senator from Missouri said, on June 22, 1955.

The Senator from Wyoming will recall that that was a short time—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh yes, of course; it was a short time before the adjournment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That was not what I intended to say. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That was 8 or 9 days before I went to the hospital on July 2. That bill, S. 636, was reported by a 5-to-4 vote of the committee. The Senate is divided 49 to 47. Every Democrat on the committee was for the bill; every Republican was against it.

The bill was discussed by the policy committee, which has the responsibility for scheduling proposed legislation on the floor, in the 9-day interim before the Senator from Texas went to the hospital. Many questions were raised about changes that should be made, which I think appealed even to the author of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought the Senator from Wyoming would like to have that information.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I want the information; certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think I speak correctly when I say that not only a majority, but a substantial majority, of the policy committee thought the bill in its present form should be considered further before being sent to the floor.

Early this session, I met with the assistant majority leader, the Democratic whip, and the secretary of the conference, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. We reviewed some of the objections. The Senator from Missouri was told at that time that if he wanted to schedule the bill in the form in which it was, so far as I was concerned, he had my vote, not for the bill, but for the consideration of the bill by the Senate, and the Senate in its wisdom could take whatever action it saw fit to take.

The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] agreed, just before I left for Texas, that the staff of the policy committee and the staff of the Senator from Missouri would meet to try to answer some of the questions which had been raised by the op-

ponents of the measure. They have done so. Many of the questions have not been completely answered even yet, because the staffs do not know the answers. They do not know the interpretations which will be given.

There has been great concern by the labor unions as to how they are affected; there is uncertainty whether the term "committee" applies to a political committee; and whether the limitation is sufficient in a State as large as the State of New York.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may say to the Senator—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit me to finish—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have every confidence in the Senator from Texas. I know of the concessions he has made upon the floor. I know he wants to dispose of this matter as much as does any other Member of the Senate. Nothing I say casts the slightest reflection upon the Senator from Texas or the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who has joined in submitting the resolution. I am merely pointing out the difficulties which present themselves to me as I look at the situation.

The 1956 election will soon be upon us. The bill which was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, in the functioning of its authority under the law, is before the Senate, ready for action and for amendment in any way the Senate desires to do so. It is my judgment—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I beg the Senator's pardon. The bill is not before the Senate. The membership of the policy committee has not scheduled it, and the minority policy committee has refused to clear it for consideration until some of the language can be clarified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Texas misunderstands me. The bill is before the Senate in the sense that it is on the calendar of reported measures. Of course, it has not been taken up; that I grant. I know that as well as the Senator does. But the bill is before the Senate because it is on the calendar, and a majority of the Senate could take it up tomorrow, if it wished to do so.

I do not wish to displace the farm bill; I think that is an important measure. But, in my judgment, S. 636 should be made the unfinished business immediately after the disposition of the farm bill.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. First, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Wyoming for his very lucid and clear exposition of the circumstances as they are. It is true that we are concerned with having appropriate legislation enacted. We wish to bring before the Senate a bill which has a fair chance of passage. As the learned Senator has already suggested, the proposed legislation is susceptible of amendment. Extensive hearings were held. The subcommittee tried to do an honest job. It

reported its efforts to the Committee on Rules and Administration. That committee, by a majority vote, reported the bill to the Senate. The Senator from Wyoming is exactly correct about that.

I realize that many considerations affect some Senators which do not affect others. Some Senators, for example, contend that primary elections should not be included. I do not hold to that view. It seems to me that primary elections are exceedingly important; and in one-party States they are virtually the final elections.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not wish to prolong the debate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall take only a moment longer, if the Senator will yield further.

Without going into the terms, so far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that, in keeping with the distinguished Senator's suggestion, we can come before the Senate, with the concurrence, and I hope with the assent and approval, of the majority leader and the policy committee, with a bill which is a respectable one, a bill which will be reasonable, sensible, and practical, and will afford a basis upon which the Senate may begin to consider the subject matter. There are minor differences of opinion. Many persons say the bill is too cumbersome. But, for my part, I am willing to let that question be the subject of discussion and debate, to see what can be done about amending the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My point is this: I have no objection to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California; but I do not want to see that resolution be made the peg upon which postponement of action can be taken with respect to the bill of which the Senator from Missouri is the main sponsor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's having said that. I so tried to express myself to the distinguished majority leader. I believe he has given us the assurance that that will not be the case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have given that assurance to the Senator from Missouri, and I have given it also to the policy committee. I have given that assurance to the Senator from Missouri every time I have talked with him. I gave it to him at least 2 or 3 times before the Senator from Wyoming raised the question. I again repeat my assurance.

But at any time the Senator from Wyoming or the Senator from Missouri desires to proceed to the consideration of the bill in which they are interested, they will be perfectly within their rights to make such a motion; and if a majority of the Senate supports them, the Senate can then proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are in complete agreement on that. I only say to the Senator from Texas that we do not enact legislation by assurances; we do it by votes.

The President of the United States, in the veto message which he sent to the Congress on the natural gas bill, for which bill I voted, castigated the lobby which was operating here for that bill,

and used the word "arrogant" in describing the activities of that lobby.

I agree that when the president of an oil company has a personal fund from which he makes—or attempts to make, I should say—cash contributions through an agent, who asks of a Member of the Senate, "How are you going to vote upon the natural gas bill?" that is a corrupt practice and highly deserves the appellation of arrogance as applied to it by the President.

I should say to my friends in the Senate that we can defend our own integrity and our own dignity only by proceeding at once with respect to the matters of which we have knowledge. There is not a Member of Congress in the House or the Senate who does not know how campaign contributions are used these days. The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Clerk of the Senate have evidence now of the contributions which were made.

So, Mr. President, I could not let this evening pass without having the RECORD contain a statement of my position, which is in favor of immediate action upon a pending bill which is on the calendar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have felt that because of the pendency of the work of the select committee, I should refrain from commenting on the matters which have been presented at this time. Therefore, I trust that my failure to make a statement at this time will be understood, and not misunderstood.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8320) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF FARM BILL

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, previous announcement was made of the scheduling of Executive Q. 83d Congress, 1st session, for consideration following the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that following the consideration of that convention, Calendar No. 1503, S. 3183, to provide an

improved farm program, be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ARMS FURNISHED TO COUNTRIES OF THE NEAR EAST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is now clear that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hear from the Secretary of State on the middle eastern question. I hope, however, that our investigation into our Near East policy will not be confined to an inquiry into the sending of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia. The disclosure of this action in itself is a matter of serious concern. It raised serious doubts as to the sincerity of our desire to prevent an arms race in the Near East. In addition, the off-again on-again performance of the administration showed vacillation, equivocation, and a lack of a clear and firm policy.

We should investigate why we are sending arms to Iraq as well as to Saudi Arabia—and how much—and why we insist on strengthening forces in the Near East which are not committed to democracy, but are at war with democracy. We should review our policy toward Egypt in the light of Nasser's increasing drift toward Moscow. We should ask why the administration has not yet agreed to sell arms to Israel, which is a democracy with whom we have the closest ties. We should ask whether our continued hesitancy to grant Israel's request is costing us the friendship of the people of Israel and the respect of other democratic peoples throughout the world. We must ask whether our policy is not having a boomerang effect. Are we not heightening the threat of a new Arab attack on Israel?

What we do on this issue may weaken our cause if other nations come to believe that we are not firmly determined to strengthen democratic elements in the resistance to Communist aggression.

We should investigate fully our Government's attitude toward the Arab boycott and blockade as they affect American business and the rights of American citizens. We should ask how long the Johnston plan will be delayed through Arab refusal to accept it, and whether it is the intention of our Government to proceed with the Aswan Dam in Egypt while deferring action indefinitely on the Johnston Jordan development plan.

These are only a few of the issues which must be thoroughly canvassed and explored by Congress. Our Near East policy has been changed several times within the last few years. We must know what it is and whether we have really developed a carefully planned policy which will lead to peace, economic development, and democratic strength in the Near East.

I have brought these questions to the attention of the Senate this evening because I desire that they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that when the Secretary of State appears before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations he will know something of the scope of

interest and of the inquiries which may be directed to him.

It is my intention, Mr. President, to question the Secretary, within the limits of the time available, very definitely and in detail about these particular matters, as well as other subjects to which I have addressed myself from time to time in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two editorials concerning the shipment of arms to the Middle East. One, entitled "Arms to the Middle East," appeared in the New York Times on February 18, 1956, and the second, entitled "Over the Oil Barrel," appeared this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald. I commend them both to the attention of my colleagues.

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

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1956]

ARMS TO THE MIDDLE EAST

The blunder of the State Department in at first authorizing the shipment of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia is one of those inexplicable aberrations that sometimes hit the official mentality. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota (not to mention the Israeli Embassy), called the decision "incredible" and that was a good word for it. In stepping in to cancel the shipment, President Eisenhower was doing only what he had to do, but the mystery is why he was put in such a position.

Since it is an ill wind that does not blow some good, this incident may at least force the administration to stop floundering around on the business of arms to the Middle East. The original decision to hold back on the sale of arms to Israel was understandable. It was and is important to avoid an arms race, if possible. In addition, public opinion here and throughout the free world was shocked by the brutal reprisal raid of the Israelis against the Syrians on December 11. If that was what arms were going to be used for, we certainly wanted to have no part of it.

However, the situation today is different. Our policy, which is shared by Britain and France, is to try to keep a rough balance of armed strength in the Middle East as a deterrent to both sides. As it happens, the balance has now been upset by the large shipments of Iron Curtain arms to Egypt. While it is true that the Egyptians have not had time yet to master these arms, the fact remains that they have a potential edge on Israel, especially in the air. The twin jet IL-28 bombers supplied by the Communists, for instance, are much the most powerful striking weapons today on either side. Israel has nothing comparable, and it is arguable that she should be sold bombers for defense.

The danger of a conflict started by either side is still great, and the United States, Britain, and France must quickly take measures to be ready to stop a conflagration or even prevent one. Sending tanks to Saudi Arabia would have been like pouring oil on a fire.

[From the Washington Post of February 21, 1956]

OVER THE OIL BARREL

Well, the State Department is back over the barrel in the shipment of tanks to Saudi Arabia. In the circumstances there may have been no reasonable alternative to lifting the export ban temporarily imposed by the President. The decision to let the shipment go after all certainly has given an on-again-off-again cast to American diplomacy; but the ban did permit exploration of the

facts after an instance of seemingly remarkable forgetfulness in the State Department. Examination disclosed (1) that the 18 tanks had already been paid for by Saudi Arabia under a legitimate contract executed last summer in conformity with the 1951 arms agreement and (2) that the ban also was holding up shipment of spare parts and logistic supplies to Israel.

Saudi Arabia was not to blame for the confusion; indeed, the Saudis behaved with restraint. The question was whether this country would honor a commitment in good faith. The State Department had to consider whether a refusal to send the tanks would induce the Saudis to accept one of the proffers of Communist arms in the fashion of Egypt—proffers which the Saudis so far have declined. And, though the question of oil did not immediately arise, no one could remain indifferent to the strategic consideration that Europe is almost totally dependent for its oil on the Arab countries of the Middle East.

At the same time there is no disguising the fact that this shipment and the vacillation in American policy will increase the sense of insecurity in Israel. That in itself is dangerous. The episode has damaged this country's moral position in seeking to calm the tension, and it will increase the demand for arms to Israel. This is the fruit of a practice of throwing arms indiscriminately around the globe, especially in areas where there is no peace and arms do not furnish an answer.

In the immediate situation, if this country is not to discriminate against Israel and at the same time is not to abet the arms race, some diversion must be found. We return to a suggestion we made on this page last week—that this country in company with Britain and France establish an arms for peace stockpile at a NATO base on the island of Cyprus, the arms to be made available by airlift to the victim of aggression if Arab-Israeli war should start. Approval of the United Nations Assembly could be sought for such a stockpile as an essential supplement to the 1950 tripartite border guaranty.

Efforts are now in process to expand the neutral zones between Israel and her Arab neighbors. If more of a neutral belt could be established, the danger of an accidental clash would be diminished. Any foray across the neutral belt in all probability would be deliberate aggression. General Burns, the U. N. truce supervisor, might well be entrusted with the task of determining when there had been aggression.

Obviously there are some shortcomings in such an approach. Israel fears air bombardment by Egyptian jets. Although this probably is not an immediate worry, it could become a threat within a few months. Perhaps the fears could be assuaged by affording Israeli (as well as Arab) crews training in jet planes that would be made available promptly in the event of aggression; or perhaps the stockpile could be augmented by a declaration that air units of the Sixth Fleet would intervene to repel air attack. But the important thing, it seems to us, is to place emphasis on maintaining the peace by making it clear to both sides that the injured party could count on immediate aid against aggression.

THE NEW CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an illuminating article by Walter Lippmann which appears in this morning's Washington Post. Mr. Lippmann canvasses the new challenge to American foreign policy. His analysis covers the Saudi Arabian

tank affair, our failures in the Middle East, the administration's lack of coordinating State Department and Defense Department policies, last week's revision of Soviet doctrine, and the new, broad-gaged challenge which Soviet policy is giving us in the uncommitted areas of the world.

It is an important and significant article, and I hope my colleagues will consider it carefully.

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

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A REVEALING BLUNDER

The affair of the Saudi Arabian tanks is a ludicrous but damaging example of what can happen in a big and complicated government when it is not clearly led and firmly administered from the top. For months, this Government has been faced with the dangerous problem of arms shipments to the Middle East. On this subject there has recently been a conference at the highest level between the President and the British Prime Minister. There have been many pronouncements about arms for the Middle East. How then could it happen that the State Department had forgotten about its own approval of the sale of the Saudi Arabian tanks, that the Defense Department was operating without realizing what a mess the shipment of these arms would now cause, once the facts became known?

The reason for this incident must be that there is no high policy for the Middle East which comes from the top and is administered all the way down the line from the policymaking officials to the operating officials. The President has not, of course, been truly in command, certainly not since his illness, in fact not really since he went to Denver last August. Yet it is only the President who can effectively coordinate two great Departments like State and Defense. He can coordinate them only if at Cabinet meetings and elsewhere he makes the heads of these Departments understand clearly what the policy is. It is only too obvious that nothing of the sort has happened during the past 6 months, or could have happened.

The lack of a high command has been aggravated by the way Mr. Dulles conceives the office of Secretary of State. He thinks of himself as a roving negotiator, who represents the President's constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs. He works out high problems by personal negotiation, and then leaves the policies to be administered and operated in his absence by officials who do not know at first hand what they are. Mr. Dulles is not in Washington long enough or continuously enough to command the operations of his Department. The effect, as the Saudi Arabian tanks illustrate, is to leave the immediate business of the Government to be operated by bureau chieftains on their own notions without overhead directions from the top.

The administrative confusion is not the only, or indeed the most serious, consequence of the way our affairs have been conducted during the past 6 months. There has been nobody at the top whose business it has been, or who was able, to face up to the new Soviet challenge which has confronted us since the first Geneva meeting. The President has been too ill to deal with it, and Mr. Dulles has been too preoccupied with his travels, his negotiations, and his speeches. In these past 6 months we have suffered the biggest and most serious setback since the Communist victory in China.

The fundamental cause of the setback is that the Soviet Union has been developing a new foreign policy since Geneva whereas

we have remained frozen and inflexible in the policy of the pre-Geneva period. That is why there is scarcely a country from France and Italy and Germany and Greece to India and beyond where the pro-Western and pro-American parties and politicians are not in trouble. With nobody at the top in Washington who can and will take new decisions, our diplomacy is almost everywhere fighting unattractive rear-guard actions.

It would be interesting to know who, in the high places where decisions can be taken, has been putting his mind on the speeches delivered last week at the Communist Party Congress in Moscow. They are very long speeches. But they are exceedingly important. Their common theme is that within the Communist world, they have an industrial system which is, in the terms of national power, not only in arms but also in the means of capital development, already reaching equality with the West. The Soviet leaders have been declaring that the rate of economic growth in the Soviet Union surpasses that of all countries, and that, therefore, they will become a more and more formidable competitor in the economic and political markets of the world.

I do not know whether all the statistics that were put out last week are correct. But the world will not doubt the great fact that the Soviet Union is now the strongest power in Eurasia. It is this economic fact which accounts for the extraordinary tone of confidence that pervaded all the speeches made in Moscow last week. It also explains the ideological and political declarations about how Khrushchev and his people expect to win the cold war without revolutionary violence. They believe that in the competition with us for influence in the uncommitted countries they can make more attractive offers than we are likely to make.

Even if they cannot offer as much economic aid as we could, they will be able to offer more than Congress will allow us to offer. Moreover, whatever they offer, they can offer on terms which are politically more attractive than the terms which Congress insists that we should impose.

They are in a stronger bargaining position in the uncommitted nations, for they do not ask, they do not need to ask, for military pacts or their equivalent. They are able to identify themselves with the popular longing to remain unentangled. What is more, in the underdeveloped countries, which are by definition without capital resources, the governments must necessarily play the principal role in capital formation. This suits the Socialist ideology of the Russians. It runs at cross purposes with our own anti-Socialist ideology.

The new challenge of the Soviet Union is very formidable, indeed. If we are to meet it, we shall have to reverse ourselves on a number of things which are strongly believed in here. We shall have to be willing to export capital on a considerable scale. We shall have to be willing to do that without insisting on military terms, without penalizing political neutrality, and without expecting the underdeveloped but old and crowded countries to adopt all the principles of the American free enterprise system. We shall, in other words, have to be willing to contribute capital to countries which, as neutrals and as Socialists, will be unlike the United States.

The alternative, I believe, is to go on losing our influence in the uncommitted world.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order of the Senate, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, un-

der the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 22, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, help us daily to sense the privilege and opportunity of sharing in the glorious task of bringing the members of the human family into a peaceful and happy relationship.

We penitently confess that we are frequently very selfish and self-centered and very thoughtless and indifferent toward a world that has in it so many desperate needs and longings.

Make us more eager to cultivate and speak the language of the heart, the language of understanding and appreciation, of considerateness and kindness, of brotherhood and good will.

Inspire us to think and act in terms of humanity and to make a helpful contribution to the welfare and blessedness of men and nations everywhere.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution 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.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF GOVERNMENTAL INFORMATION

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Under Secretary of Commerce is guilty of misappropriating governmental information which came to him by virtue of his high public office and applying it to his own personal use and benefit.

Yesterday, Mr. Louis Rothschild admitted he furnished a list of Federal airport grants, totaling some \$38 million to

the Republican National Committee before he released the information to the rest of the country. This may make Mr. Rothschild a big man with the Republican Party. These airport grants are public funds and do not belong to him personally. Nor are they the property of the Republican Committee.

It may be argued that this information is of only slight value. Perhaps that is so. But, I ask, if a sub-Cabinet officer is so weak he cannot resist the temptation to misappropriate governmental information of slight value, does this demonstrate traits of character which will protect him against weakness when greater temptations come before him by virtue of his high public office?

BROUGHT TO TASK

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read an editorial entitled "Brought to Task," which appeared in the February 14, 1956, edition of the Leavenworth (Kans.) Times.

I call this article to the attention of Congress because I feel that all too often we tend to take for granted the decent things in life, including wholesome attributes of our young people, and pay disproportionately large concern to the weaknesses in our fellow men. Certainly we must not disregard the many reports of juvenile delinquency so prevalent in these times, but we should also not overlook the inherently good characteristics of the majority of our young people.

The more I see of modern youth the more convinced I become that the future of this Nation will be in good hands. It has been my pleasure to meet many intelligent young persons since I have been in public life, and they have furthered my faith in the future. I think my colleagues will agree the actions of these young citizens lend a refreshing note to an otherwise staid and trite adult existence. May American youth always be as imaginative, impartial, and impromptu as they are today.

The editorial follows:

BROUGHT TO TASK

The editor of the Times has been brought to task by students of the American history class of Leavenworth High School about statements made in two recent editorials.

The points they bring out are well taken and we feel complimented rather than resentful of the criticism, because an editor seldom knows if anybody takes the trouble to read his columns. It is especially pleasing and encouraging to discover that there are readers of high-school age. Here is the letter:

"DEAR SIR: We have discovered an error in your editorial of January 31, entitled 'Constitution Is Restrictive.' It was stated that 'Under the guidance of Thomas Jefferson, the Constitution was designed to restrict the power of Federal Government.' We would like to inform you that Thomas Jefferson had nothing to do with the writing of the Constitution since he was away in

France at the time, and furthermore, his first impression of it was of disapproval.

"We have acquired this information from our study of the Constitution last fall in our American history class and would like to offer this as proof that high-school students are not 'woefully ignorant about the simplest aspects of national and world affairs,' as was stated in the December 4, 1955, issue of the Leavenworth Times. If there are 'glaring weaknesses in our vaunted system of education,' as was stated, they are not of recent origin.

"Very truly yours,

"BETTY ANN JOHNSON.
"SUE TINSLEY."

Of course we had to give an answer in self-defense. In our answer, we pointed out that the statement concerning "glaring weaknesses" was not the Times' statement but a direct quotation, and so indicated in the editorial, by a prominent Ohio educator, the president of Miami University.

We may have used an unfortunate choice of words about Thomas Jefferson. Instead of "guidance" it might have been better to have used some such phrase as "influenced by." The actual writers of the Constitution could not have helped but be influenced by Jefferson's ideas. He helped write the Declaration of Independence and subsequently expressed himself through articles, letters, and speeches about his ideas on the requirements of a satisfactory Constitution, even though he had no actual part in the writing of the document.

A newspaper editor needs more criticism like this. It will remind him to keep on his toes.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENT REGULATIONS ON WHEAT

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are small farmers. Some of them have protested from time to time because of the application of the acreage allotment regulation on wheat. It prevents them from planting sufficient wheat to be used exclusively for feeding livestock on their small farms.

This is an utterly ridiculous situation, particularly in view of the fact that the Members of Congress on both sides of the House continually speak about the small farmer, and helping the small farmer, and how desirous they are of assisting him solve his problems.

Maintenance of the existing law is solely in the interest of the big farmer. The tradition of the American farmer has been one of independence, one of trying to help himself. To think that today if you are raising chickens or if you are raising livestock you are not permitted to grow enough on your own farm to take care of feed requirements. Many are forced to buy in the market, although historically they have been in a position to raise sufficient feed for consumption on their own farm. It poses a question that I think should be corrected by the Congress immediately.

Recently, members of the New Jersey Farm Bureau meeting in Washington with their congressional representatives, urged a change in the law. They

strongly support the exemption from acreage control of farmers who grow feed only for consumption on their own farm.

Just this week, one of the farmers in the Seventh Congressional District wrote me in protest of the application of acreage allotments. His name is Paul C. Wirtz, and his farm lies near Lebanon in Hunterdon County, N. J. I am quoting from his letter to me, in order to more forcibly bring home to you the problem faced by small farmers, who certainly merit the serious consideration of the Congress and prompt favorable action on their behalf. Mr. Wirtz stated in his letter:

In regard to the farm-subsidy program, I was deeply shocked to learn that hundreds of thousands of dollars were paid annually to individual wheat farmers, while a few cotton farmers were paid over \$1 million each. No wonder we have surpluses.

When in 1954 I protested our 17-acre wheat allotment on a total of 300 acres, I was shunted from one paid committee to another; finally was ordered to appear in the Flemington Courthouse before a State committee to state my case. Mind you, all I wanted was to plant feed grains on our own land to feed to our own livestock. None of the wheat would be sold. When I explained this to the office manager administering this program, he told me that the wheat acreage law applied to wheat and its byproducts, and since eggs and chickens were byproducts of wheat, the law applied also to wheat consumed on the farm.

In the courthouse I was made to wait for several hours together with a number of other farmers, who had committed the terrible crime of overplanting their wheat quota by 2 or 3 acres, and for which they had been or expected to be fined \$50 or \$60.

What a mockery. On the one hand Congress insists on making millionaires out of a handful of operators—showing money on them to buy more land, more machinery, and more fertilizer to grow more surpluses for the taxpayer to pay for—while on the other hand it hauls the small farmers, who are just trying to raise enough feed for their own livestock into court like common criminals. I have no objections to large farms, efficiently run by ingenious individuals, but I do object when these giant operations are set up in business with the taxpayers' money.

I feel confident that the membership of this House would overwhelmingly support this suggested exemption, and if the Agriculture Committee refuses to report out such an amendment, it is decidedly acting against the best interests of our small farmers. I intend to support favorable action for this exemption until simple justice is accomplished for the farmer seeking to produce for his own needs. The small farmers in this category have not contributed to the huge surpluses overhanging and depressing the farm economy. It has been the large subsidized farmer who has with every acreage allotment plan intensified his production on the remaining acreage, because he has been assured of Government protection.

LET OUR FARMERS GO

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], who just called attention to the situation which confronts our farmers should not get discouraged because some day some time, they will be released from these restrictions which one Member of the House describes as similar to those imposed on farmers in Russia. Accepting the invitation of the Committee on Agriculture, some Members of the House went over there yesterday, but we did not get anywhere. They take care of the boys who grow, sell, and chew tobacco and the fellows who grow and eat peanuts and the fellows who grow, wear, and sell cotton, and the rice boys, and let me see—I think the corn growers—they take care of them—you can grow corn, as I understand it, and make it into moonshine, but you cannot grow wheat and feed it to your poultry. Now, I hope some day the Members of the Congress will realize this legislation of which we complain is class legislation. The gentlemen on the other side try to say that the Republicans are to blame for the present ruinous farm policy. So far as the farmers in my district are concerned and so far as the wheat-growing business goes, for the injustice that affects them, the Democrats are directly responsible. I hope everybody in the House on our side will tell our farmers about it, place the blame where it belongs on the Democratic Congress.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I called to the attention of the House the conduct of Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Louis S. Rothschild, when he prematurely released the Federal aid to airport list of projects. Yesterday, upon questioning in the other body, Mr. Rothschild admitted it. So it is a proven fact now. But when the charge was made several days ago, the National Republican Committee flatly denied it. But I call to the attention of the House the fact that it is established as true despite the denial of the National Republican Committee.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 372) to provide additional expense to conduct the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 114, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 114 of the 84th Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the problems of small business, not to exceed \$160,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such study and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I would like to ask the gentleman to make a short statement as to how much funds are presently available for use of the committee.

Mr. BURLESON. The sum of \$170,000 was appropriated in the 1st session of the 84th Congress. As of February 1 there was an unexpended balance of \$28,352. The committee appeared before the Subcommittee on Accounts with a justifying budget which was, in turn, submitted to the full committee, and satisfied the committee that these funds were necessary to carry on their activities during the remainder of this session of the 84th Congress.

Mr. ARENDS. I have no desire to hinder the activities of the committee. They likely require additional money. One disturbing fact came to my attention the other day. I believe I have my figures correct in that this committee, presently asking for additional funds, now have employed personnel on that committee which, in numbers and in aggregate monthly expenditure of money, exceeds the numbers employed and the total amount of money used by the great Committee on Armed Services of this House of Representatives. In other words the Small Business Committee now has more employees at more money per month than does the Committee on Armed Services of the House. That raises a question in my mind as to how far we are going in this matter of providing these additional funds.

Mr. BURLESON. I can assure the gentleman those questions were raised before the Committee on House Administration. Although new employees have been recently added they did state to the committee that in their activities and in the scope of their investigations the added employees were necessary.

Mr. ARENDS. I hope the gentleman will in the future pay the closest attention to such requests for additional funds for this committee. We want to give the committee what they need but not more than what they can constructively use.

Mr. BURLESON. I agree with the gentleman and will assure him that such has been the practice in the past and will be so in the future. I further assure him that this will be done not only insofar as the Small Business Committee is concerned, but all other committees as well.

THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE SHOULD HAVE SUFFICIENT APPROPRIATIONS TO CONTINUE ITS PRESENT HELP TO SMALL BUSINESS IN 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, these are difficult days for small business. Like the farmers, they are not enjoying prosperity. Their big brothers are receiving the favors of desirable trade winds. Therefore, Congress must be more alert than ever before to the problems of small business and there is a greater need today than ever before for a strong and adequately financed Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives.

Your Small Business Committee can be of enormous help to small business. We need help by putting the facts of particular problems before the Members of the House. Reporting the facts usually goes a long way in bringing about the case. In addition to our investigations, we have a continuing volume of business in trying to help out individual small-business men and groups of small-business men. This is what we call our case load.

When small-business people come to see or write to the Members of the House about problems that are especially knotty and take a lot of time and work to get straightened out, our committee usually gets those problems. These are problems, for the most part, where the small-business firm is being mistreated or has gotten snarled up in some procedure of the executive agencies, such as when a defense contract has gone haywire or a loan application is fouled up in a backlash of redtape. All of these cases require a great deal of time in conferences.

In a period of about 7 months since June 21 of last year, the committee has received from Members of the House 313 inquiries, from 155 different Members of the House, about problems of small business. In each of those instances in which a small-business man was involved and needed help, our committee responded in assisting the member in getting the needed help for his small-business constituent. In a great many of these instances our staff participated in conferences and investigations regarding actions by the agencies of the Government and in getting reports thereon to the Members for their use in advising their constituents. These instances have included Members on both sides of the aisle. Our staff is devoted to the cause of assisting all Members in dealing with the small-business problems.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES

While we have carefully coordinated our work with the work of other committees, where we impinge upon the same matters, we have also cooperated with and lent our assistance to other committees where they have been engaged in work that is particularly important to small business.

For example, I have myself testified three times before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, on matters which are vitally important to small business.

Our committee has likewise assisted the Committee on Banking and Currency, with its consideration of two bills revising the Small Business Act. We assisted in drafting the revised law which passed last August, which created a greatly improved and more liberal loan program for small business.

Similarly we have cooperated with the Committee on Armed Services, and provided them with such information as we had which we thought would be helpful in that committee's current study of defense contracting methods.

INVESTIGATIONS HELP SMALL BUSINESS

I do not want to claim for our committee credit for things which may be mere coincidence, but I might point to a striking record.

In the 24 months between the time Mr. Howrey became Chairman of the FTC, until our committee began investigating that Agency, the FTC issued 6 complaints charging price discriminations in violation of section 2 (a) of the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman act. Most of these complaints were issued shortly after Mr. Howrey took over, and may be assumed to have been already in the works. In the second full 12 months after Mr. Howrey took over, the FTC issued only one such complaint. In the 9 months since our committee first began investigating the FTC, the FTC has issued 12 complaints charging price discriminations in violation of section 2 (a).

There is a similar record with reference to cease and desist orders issued under this section of the law. In the first 2 years after Mr. Howrey took over, his FTC issued no such orders in contested cases. Since our committee started investigating 9 months ago the FTC has issued 4 such cease and desist orders.

As this committee may know, price discrimination is the most serious and most deadly thing militating against small business in our economic system. It is a pure abuse of power which results in the bigger firms destroying the smaller firms without respect to efficiency or any other merits, and the problem is not limited to any one industry.

In our investigations of SBA, beginning early last year, we have called attention in the House to the very small disbursements which SBA has made on small business loans. It may be coincidental, but the fact is that SBA's disbursements to small business in the past year were 1½ times as great as its disbursements in the preceding year and a half. These disbursements are still small, but it is true that some improvements have been made.

CEMENT

When our committee began investigating the cement shortage last year, it was plain that there was need for a substantial expansion of cement capacity. Cement was generally short throughout the United States, and in many sections of the country, there were acute shortages. Small distributors could not get cement and small contractors could not get enough cement to finish projects

they had under way. We called attention to this matter, and we sent questionnaires to cement users which called the attention of the cement companies to the amount of unfilled demand.

Here again it may be coincidental, but after we got this investigation under way, there was a rapid increase in the cement companies' expansion program. I suspect that we may have helped make these companies aware of the need for expansion. At least several of the companies wrote to the committee telling us about their decisions to expand, even before they announced them publicly.

What I have said about cement is more particularly true of aluminum. On two occasions after one of our subcommittees investigated the aluminum shortage, and showed the difficulties small fabricators were having in obtaining aluminum, the Office of Defense Mobilization cut back on deliveries scheduled for the stockpile, in order to make more aluminum available for civilian uses.

RUBBER

Early last year our committee analyzed the plan for selling the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. We called attention to the fact that this plan did not meet the standards laid down in the Rubber Disposal Act of 1953, in that it would not create a free competitive industry, and that the sales contracts did not provide assurance that small rubber fabricators would receive a fair share of available supplies. We further pointed out that the world shortage of rubber, natural and synthetic combined, was such that the buyers of the synthetic plants would be in a position to raise prices. While the Government had held the price of synthetic rubber at 21 cents a pound, and was making a good profit at that price, the price of natural rubber was then about 30 cents a pound.

During the debate, and as a result of our objections, the big rubber and oil companies purchasing these plants gave Members of Congress firm assurances of good behavior, if they were allowed to have the plants.

After the plants were sold, the price of natural rubber continued to rise. The price averaged better than 42 cents per pound during the last 9 months of 1955, and synthetic rubber could have been raised to that level. But the new owners have, so far at least, held the price at not much above 21 cents a pound. If they had raised prices of synthetic rubber up to the going price of natural rubber, which would have meant doubling the price, then the 1.6 billion pounds they sold in the last 9 months of 1955 would have cost consumers at least \$337 million more.

Several Members of the House have told us it was our factfinding last year that saved consumers this \$337 million. I would hesitate to accept full credit, but I am inclined to think we were in part responsible.

I am also happy to report that to date, there have been very few complaints that small fabricators could not get supplies of synthetic rubber, although the shortage has continued since the plants

were sold. The few complaints about being denied supplies have been in situations where the small fabricators have made some new inventions which were about to take business from the big rubber companies, so I can say that in general the rubber companies' behavior in sharing the available supplies with the small fabricators has, so far, been good too.

Perhaps it is not claiming too much credit to say that our committee was at least in part responsible for saving consumers \$337 million in the cost of synthetic rubber last year, and in helping small fabricators obtain a share of available supplies of such rubber.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE SHOULD BE MUCH BIGGER

We are mindful that our efforts to help small business in the respects we have enumerated have not pleased some people. Some big businesses have objected to our efforts to help small business. However, those objections have not deterred us when we were right. In our hearings we have carefully considered all objections from all sources, including big business. We gave weight and credit to those we found to be sound and well made. We rejected all others and proceeded with our help to small business even in the face of the objections. So you can expect to be urged to cut us down and tie our hands. You will hear excuses, such as that we have gotten out of our bailiwick or that we are duplicating the work of other committees, and so on. The fact is that there are so many things needing to be done, that are vitally important to small business, and are not even being touched upon, we do not need to look aside for things to do. What we can actually do, with our limited time and resources, compared to the things that are crying to be done, is like trying to bail out the ocean with a teaspoon.

In fact, it is obvious that the Small Business Committee should be enlarged to include 25 members and that appropriations should be approximately a half a million dollars. Money spent in this way would amount to very, very small crumbs as compared to the tens and hundreds of millions of dollars which the work of such a committee would save consumers. But, at the moment I do not know of another 14 Members of the House whose present work schedules would permit them the time to serve on the Small Business Committee. So I am not asking that the committee be expanded during this session of Congress.

Despite the opposition and the quibbling which we expect, our request contains no padding. We do not wish to try to jockey with this committee, and we think the correct thing to do is to put before you our best estimate of the exact amount we actually need and expect to spend.

Our resolution calls for \$160,000 plus our unexpended balance from last year. The unexpended balance as of December 31, 1955, was \$39,823, making our total request for the year 1956 \$199,823. This is the amount we actually need and expect to spend for essential things.

Last year we had total appropriations amounting to \$170,000. Our initial appropriation was \$135,000 and we received a supplemental appropriation of \$35,000 in August of last year.

When we asked for the supplemental appropriation last year we expected to have hearings during the fall on two subjects which—as it turned out—we were unable to do. When we debated this supplemental appropriation in the House on August 1, I then told the House that this money would be spent only for absolutely necessary things and if it turned out that the money was not actually needed for such things, it would not be spent. It was not spent.

Our committee was reorganized last year, and we built up almost a completely new staff. Consequently, we were slow in obtaining a full staff. We proceeded cautiously, to make sure we got especially competent people. The committee may note the amounts of salary payments month by month, which are shown in the report I submitted to the chairman on January 10. The total funds which our request would make available from January 1, 1956, will cover 12 months salaries at our present salary rates plus \$35,000 for travel.

I would like to describe briefly, the principal projects in which we are engaged.

IRON AND STEEL SCRAP INDUSTRY

One new project which we have undertaken is to make a thorough investigation of the iron and steel scrap problem. As the committee may know, tremendous tonnages of scrap are now being exported to foreign countries. These exports are now at a much higher rate than ever before in history. With the resulting shortage in the United States, prices have risen to neighborhood of prices for new metal.

We have been receiving complaints from the small semi-integrated steel companies and from the steel and iron foundries. These companies are caught in the squeeze. The semi-integrated steel companies, for example, use a very high proportion of scrap in making steel. Many of these mills are designed to use scrap exclusively.

Of course, the big integrated mills use some scrap too, but they use a small proportion of scrap; their main raw material is their iron ore.

The scrap shortage also raises problems for all kinds of small steel users. It contributes to the steel shortage and when there is a shortage small steel users in all lines of business tend to be squeezed. For example, we have complaints that only the big steel companies can bid on construction projects on the St. Lawrence Seaway, for the reason that small contractors cannot get structural steel. The big steel companies now have their own erecting crews who operate in competition with local contractors, and when steel is generally short the big companies can and do refuse to let the construction companies have steel, so they are eliminated from the bidding on construction projects.

We have a big project ahead to get all the facts and figures on this problem and

make an appraisal which will really be sound. Our foreign policy may be involved in the problem.

ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY

Another new investigation which has been undertaken is in the electronics industry. As the committee may know, this is a relatively new industry which has sprung up and mushroomed, mostly during and since World War II. It is a coming industry. And it is almost unique in that the industry is made up of a great many small manufacturers. These small firms have been progressive, highly competent, and they have made most of the inventions that have been made in the electronics field.

Our committee has recently, however, been receiving a number of very serious complaints about one thing or another in this industry. There seem to be some serious problems developing in the Armed Services with reference to the procurement of the communications equipment of some of these manufacturers. The complaint is that a few of the big boys seem suddenly to have tied up the business at the Armed Services, although the indications are that the Armed Services previously found the equipment of some of the smaller makers to be superior. I do not want to go into this fully at the moment.

AUTO PARTS INDUSTRY

Another new investigation which we have undertaken involves auto parts. We are receiving complaints from the auto parts wholesalers and retailers about the pricing and contracting methods in the industry. The complaints are to this effect: The automobile manufacturers buy parts from the parts manufacturers at a much lesser price than the independent auto parts distributors can buy them. Then the automobile manufacturers sell these parts to retailers at a price less than the independent distributor can get. On the other hand the independent distributors and wholesalers could sell to franchise auto dealers at a lesser price than these dealers are paying the auto manufacturer for the same part, except that the auto manufacturer has the franchise dealers sewed up. I do not want to prejudice these complaints. We have enough allegations to indicate, however, that a serious problem exists, and we plan to make a full investigation.

AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Another investigation which we have had on our agenda since the beginning of last year, but which we are just now getting seriously into, is the aircraft industry.

I suspect this committee knows the broad lines of the problem in that industry. The big aircraft assembly companies are, in effect, subsidiaries of the Federal Government, except that they enjoy most of the benefits of Government with few of the responsibilities of Government. Up until about a year ago the Government let prime contracts for most of the parts, subassemblies, instruments, and so on, that are assembled into the completed aircraft. But a little over a year ago this longstanding practice was changed and given one of the new fancy

names, which is called the weapons system concept. This simply means that the Department of the Air Force turned over to the aircraft assembly firms the privilege and responsibility for contracting with the parts makers. Most of these parts and instrument makers are, as the committee may know, small companies, and there are many of them. Here again we have a new industry which is very efficient and progressive and has not yet become monopolized. It is time to find out now, I think, how the new contracting methods are working out and whether or not the weapons system concept is a concept of favoritism or possibly a monopoly concept.

NICKEL INDUSTRY

We have been gathering information for making a preliminary appraisal of the problems in nickel, and we expect to start holding hearings on this industry soon.

Lest the committee be under any misapprehension, I might state we are not interested in the management of the Niciaro project; and we are not interested in whether Mr. Mansure has done a good job or a bad job of managing that project. We are interested in the economics of the nickel industry—the supply and demand outlook for nickel and the allocation systems being used by the Government and the private companies.

As this committee may know, the International Nickel Co. supplies the great bulk of all the nickel available in this hemisphere. It appears that this company is able to determine who can use nickel and who cannot, which steel companies, for example, can make nickel steel and which cannot, and which of the little electroplaters can have nickel and how much.

There is an increasing black market, or gray market, in nickel, with electroplaters reported to be paying as much as \$3 a pound for nickel.

In addition to these things we expect to continue with our more mature investigations.

ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

The hearings on the aluminum problem are now complete, unless some new development occurs, and we are in the process now of drafting our report. This will be a very complete and extensive report and one which I hope will make some important recommendations. The problem in this industry grows out of two important conditions: First, not enough aluminum to go around; and, second, the producers of primary aluminum going into competition with their fabricator-customers and squeezing them out when they no longer need them as customers.

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY AGENCIES

Our investigations of the independent regulatory agencies will continue. We have virtually completed with the Federal Trade Commission and are taking up the other regulatory bodies, with investigation of the FCC and the CAB actively underway.

The other regulatory agencies for the most part are engaged in handing out privileged monopolies. In a sense, their

grant of a license to do business is just like the Royal Charters that were handed out to the king's favorites back in the days before the American Revolution. These agencies decide who can have the monopoly privileges and who cannot.

Of course they are supposed to be independent agencies, making their decisions on the basis of policy standards laid down in the law. But they are of course under pressures; and the Hoover Commission reorganization plans have tended to lift these agencies out of their independent status and put them under control of the White House. The best safeguard we can provide against these agencies being pressured into favoring big business and discriminating against small business applicants, is to have them know that they are being investigated and being investigated thoroughly by the Small Business Committee.

SBA AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

One other continuing job which we have to do deals with the Small Business Administration and the activities of the Federal procurement and the surplus property disposal agencies. This job is so big and difficult I fear that we can never accomplish what ought to be accomplished. As to procurement activities, drastic revisions in law are badly needed, in my view, both to make the policy of the law more specific and to require more informative accounting by the armed services for their handling of the vast funds appropriated to them. Until such new legislation is passed, however, we are compelled to do what we can do to try to find out what is going on.

One of the most serious items we have discovered is that the armed services are handing out about a billion and a half dollars a year in subsidies for industrial research and development. They even allow the companies who make inventions on the use of this money to take out patents on the inventions. Substantially all of this money is being given to the very big corporations. Less than 7 percent of it is being given to firms having 500 or less employees. We plan to investigate this matter, provided we succeed in getting the Department of Defense to give us any information about it.

PX AND SHIP STORES

We plan also to begin a new investigation of purchasing methods being used by PX and ship stores services. The committee is receiving complaints about favoritism and noncompetitive purchasing methods. These services are neither quite fish nor fowl—they are neither official agencies of the Government nor unofficial agencies of the Government—and they raise peculiar problems, but these are important problems because the volume of business runs into staggering sums.

CONCLUSION

Agencies in the Federal Government and the national committees of the major political parties have a growing awareness of difficulties now being faced by small businesses. They are reporting statistics which show that for the first 9 months of 1955 the net profits, after taxes, of manufacturing corporations with assets of \$250,000 or less,

dropped more than 39 percent below what they were for the first 9 months of 1952. During that same period, the net profits, after taxes, of corporations with assets of \$100 million or more increased more than 27 percent.

Last year, a year of great business boom, business failures were at a rate of 42 for each 10,000 firms. This compares with an average rate of 20 failures for 10,000 firms in the 10 years prior to 1953.

On April 13, 1955, the Committee on Appropriations submitted to the House, Report No. 417 regarding an appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary and related agencies for fiscal year 1956. An item in that appropriation bill provided for an increase for the Offices of Referees in Bankruptcy. At page 13 of the report on the bill this statement appears:

The committee was advised that approximately 65,000 bankruptcy cases will be filed in 1955, that a total increase to 75,000 in 1956 can be expected. This would be the highest number of bankruptcies recorded in the history of the country.

Those statistics reflect conditions. No one can deny that the conditions are causing small-business men to cry out for assistance. Their crying out for assistance gives rise to an issue when their cries go unheeded. Now we are told that small business failures rates as 1 of the 10 top issues before the American people in 1956.

We are asking for an adequately financed Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, not for the purpose of creating or enhancing a political issue over failure to help small business. We are asking for proper financing of such a committee in order to help small business. Simple justice requires us to act in the behalf of small business.

I am confident that you and the distinguished and able members of your committee will agree that the sum we ask for small business is indeed a modest sum with which to tackle the enormous job before us.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 373) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 203, 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$100,000 in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such studies, investigations, and inquiries, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical,

stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$75,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE PRINTING OF A COMPILATION OF VETERANS' LAWS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 64 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a compilation of laws pertaining to veterans, enacted during the 82d, the 83d, and 84th Congresses, to be prepared by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, be printed as a House document, as a supplement III to House Document 78 of the 82d Congress.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held by said committee during the 84th Congress, 1st session, on the national highway program.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES FOR 1955

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 387 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed 10,000 additional copies of the report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the year 1955" (H. Rept. No. 1648, 84th Cong., 2d sess.), for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT REGARDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 398 authorizing the printing of the 34th annual report of the board of actuaries of the civil service retirement and disability fund together with the Comptroller General's report on audit findings relating to civil service retirement and disability fund, United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, as a House document, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the 34th annual report of the board of actuaries of the civil service retirement and disability fund together with the Comptroller General's report on audit findings relating to civil service retirement and disability fund, United States Civil Service Commission, for fiscal years 1954 and 1955, and that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF STOCK MARKET STUDIES

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 to print for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency, additional copies of hearings entitled "Stock Market Study," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency 1,000 additional copies of the hearings entitled "Stock Market Study," held before the above committee during the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 60, authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on automation and technological change for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 1,000 additional

copies of the hearings on automation and technological change, held before said joint committee during the 84th Congress, 1st session.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF JOINT COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "FEDERAL TAX POLICY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND STABILITY"

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, authorizing the printing of additional copies of the joint committee print entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability," for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report 1,000 additional copies of the joint committee print, entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability."

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. TSI AU LI ET AL.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1887) for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor) with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor)."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "fees" and insert "fee."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "aliens" and insert "alien."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "four numbers" and insert "one number."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the 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, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out all after "act", down to and including "\$500,000," in line 5 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."

Page 2, strike out all after line 10 over to and including line 2 on page 4 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 fourteenth call in the deed dated 24 February 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 15.53 feet, north 88 degrees 32 minutes 20 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 87 degrees 23 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 82 degrees 42 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 76 degrees 46 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 70 degrees 20 minutes 40 seconds east 50.00 feet, south 64 degrees 09 minutes 40 seconds 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."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized by the Armed Services Committee to state that in a meeting this morning these amendments were agreed to. The first amendment simply provides that in lieu of getting \$500,000 for the release the Government will have built for the Army a concrete warehouse costing \$500,000 under jurisdiction of the proper authorities. The second amendment is a correct description of the boundaries and area of the property.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the first bill (S. 101) for the relief of Fernanda Milani.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fernanda Milani shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fernanda Milani, Spirodon Karousatos, Romana Michelina Serini, Mojsze Hildeshaim, Ita Hildeshaim, Angel Feratero Madayag, Jirair Mazartzian, Gertrude Mazartzian, Mario Mazartzian, Santiago Landa Arizabalaga, Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens."

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 117) for the relief of Ana P. Costes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana P. Costes shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana P. Costes, Wolodymyr Krysko, Rosa Tomasina Maria Puglisi (Rosa Tomasina Maria Sano), Shima Shinohara, Hsi-Lin Tung, Ruth Min-Kwong Leung Tung, Sumie

Legasse, Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, Sympcha Shpak, Richard Karl Hoffman, Marcelina Anderson, Gerassimo Trolanos, Markos Demetrius Spanos, Maria Gabriella Byron (Maria Gabriella Michon), Dolores Maria Gandiaga, nee Seijo, Chang Ho Cho, Chia-Yi Jen (also known as Charles Jen), Catherine Samouris, Kerson Huang, Cirilo Jose, Meliton Topacio Tapawan, Alvaro A. Jose, Hedi Gertrude Spiecke, Vaclav Majer, Irma Majer, Vaclav Majer, Jr., and Chocura Yoshida, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens."

DR. LINCOLN ROY MANSON-HING ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1212) for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 202 (b) shall be held not to apply to the case of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, who was born in British Guiana.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", strike out the balance of the line and lines 5 and 6 and insert the following: "sections 201 (a) and 202 (b) shall be held not to be applicable in the cases of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing, and Collin James Manson-Hing."

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS to the committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the name "Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing", strike out the word "and."

On page 1, line 9, after the name "James Manson-Hing", strike out the period and add the following: ", and Jennifer Lynn Manson-Hing."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The following amendment to the title, recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, was considered:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Man-

son-Hing, Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing, and Collin James Manson-Hing."

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute to the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS for the committee amendment: "Amend the title so as to read: 'An act for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing, Collin James Manson-Hing, and Jennifer Lynn Manson-Hing.'"

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

FACILITATING THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 396) for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Theresa Pok Lim Kim, the fiancée of Anthony F. Pampalone, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Theresa Pok Lim Kim is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Anthony F. Pampalone, and (2) that she is found otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Theresa Pok Lim Kim, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Theresa Pok Lim Kim, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Theresa Pok Lim Kim as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "visitor", insert the following: "and may be admitted to the United States."

On page 2, at the end of the bill, add new sections 2, 3, and 4, to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edith Kalwies, the fiancée of William H. Crandall, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor and may be admitted to the United States for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Edith Kalwies is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said William H. Crandall and that she is found to be otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of that act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited and prescribed by section 213 of the said act. In the event the marriage between the

above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Kalwies, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Kalwies, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Edith Kalwies as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

"Sec. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp, shall, if otherwise found admissible to the United States, be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

"Sec. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rosa Roppo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Michael Roppo and Julia Roppo, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens."

LAND CONVEYANCE, PHELPS COUNTY, MO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7723) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Phelps County, Mo., to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands, comprising a portion of a tract of land previously donated to the United States by such Chamber of Commerce in connection with the program of the Civilian Conservation Corps: Parcel of land in Phelps County, Mo., described as the south half of lot 118 of the railroad addition to the town of Rolla, Mo., being the same as the south half of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10, township 37 north, range 8 west.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN PATENTS WITHIN THE BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4604) relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE BOARD OF NATIONAL MISSIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6990) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land designated as follows: Lot 5, block 20, of the Indian Village of Neah Bay, Wash.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "United States", insert "and the Makah Indian Tribe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO DAVID PETERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6607) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to David Peters, an Indian of the Hoopa Valley Reservation, or to his heirs or assigns, title to 18½ acres of land in California which is held by the United States in trust for him and which is described as follows:

The northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 15, 10 acres; that part of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15 lying east of the center of the south fork of the Trinity River, approximately 7 acres; that portion of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, described as follows: Beginning at the northwest quarter corner of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, thence due west 120 feet, thence due south 660 feet, thence due east 120 feet, thence due north 660 feet to the point of beginning, approximately 1½ acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other

purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9390, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we bring before you today the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1957. There is more contained in this bill today for the Forest Service than at any time in the history of the Congress. There is more money in it for the parks than at any time or in any annual bill presented to the Congress. The bill carries a total amount of approximately \$416 million, which is \$10 million below the budget estimate, and there is a difference of only \$25 million between the appropriation figure and the income received from the agencies. I again repeat, there is just a difference of \$25 million. There are only about 5 agencies that make up the sum of \$79 million over last year: Museum of History, \$31 million; Federal aid to highways, \$14 million; construction of facilities in parks, \$10 million; Indian education and welfare, \$8 million; and forest management, about \$6 million.

Every year this bill is brought to the floor of the House I have made this statement: My only regret is that the bill is not for a billion dollars. I again repeat here today, with our great forests, our soil conservation, our great parks all the work of God, our minerals, our water, geological survey and everything else, all we are spending on America, this great country, in this bill is only \$25 million more than we receive coming back to the Treasury of the United States.

It was my privilege after we adjourned last summer to drive 5,000 miles throughout this country. I traveled through the State of Arkansas, and it was very warm, in the month of August. I traveled all the way down to Florida, and it was very warm. I visited various projects and parks. I went through the Smoky Mountains, which last year had more visitors than at any time in its history. From what I understand the utilities and the services of the parks are only capable of taking care of 20 million people, yet 50 million people went into them last year. I remember attending a theater there in the evening; a fine performance in the hills. It was a fine amphitheater, a good cast and everything, and the next morning driving with the supervisor of the park I saw men, women, and children coming out of the

brush, and I asked the supervisor, "Are they thinking about getting a new play or something to impersonate Braddock trying to take Fort Pitt?" Then they explained that was not so, that they had been camping there during the night, that there was no place for them to stay. There were no sanitary facilities.

To my surprise, with all the knowledge that these people had of conditions in their own department, they could not persuade the Bureau of the Budget to approve more than \$5 million for the parks for purposes of construction. I have heard a good deal about Mission 66. That has a beautiful title—Mission 66. They have distributed a great many pamphlets about it, and so forth. But money is needed for the parks this year, not 3 years from now. Money is needed for the parks in 1956 to repair the damage that has been done in the parks through the years.

When the Director of the Park Service appeared before us I asked him, "Can you use \$10 million for construction in the parks?" He did not want to answer, because his superior was present. But finally he admitted that he could. When I said, "I will double what the budget approved," somebody called the White House. They had a special meeting of the Cabinet. The Director of the agency appeared before the Cabinet and they sent up a supplemental estimate for something like \$8 or \$9 million. The committee, in its wisdom, never recognized that supplemental estimate. They had a job to do to help put those parks in proper condition. Every member of the committee agreed to make the total \$15 million for construction in the parks for the benefit of the people who visit the parks.

I know we all have a bleeding heart for a pine tree, for the parks of the country, for the Forest Service, and so forth. This is a good bill. It took the full Committee on Appropriations only 18 minutes to approve this bill. Not a single member of the full committee asked a question, either from the Republican or the Democratic side, indicating they were satisfied with this bill.

As I said, there is more money in this bill than any similar bill that was ever presented to the House for the Park Service and the Forest Service. So I am asking the Members of the House to pass this bill and pass it quickly. I do not mean that we are in a hurry to get out of here, but this is a good bill, one of the best ever presented to the House.

I think of how we have neglected our parks and our forests and our natural resources as a whole in this country, how we have permitted them to be robbed and looted for almost 300 years, and how little we have spent on America when we are spending billions for the rest of the world. If we are going to continue to spend a great deal of money surely we can afford to spend some money on this country to keep abreast of developments in research, to preserve and develop our mineral resources, and so forth.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has said that this is a good bill and scolded the Bureau of the Budget somewhat because there was not enough money in the bill. I note that the bill carries \$10,785,000 less than was recommended by the Budget. How does the gentleman reconcile those two facts? The gentleman said he would like to have this bill appropriate a billion dollars and yet, as Chairman of the committee, he comes in here with a bill that is approximately \$11 million below the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KIRWAN. We have not eliminated anything from this bill. Some years ago the Congress in its wisdom passed a bill to build Jones Point Bridge across the river here. Under the terms of the act the Secretary of the Interior was to be responsible for the construction of that bridge.

On Sunday, the Washington Evening Star in an editorial said that this committee refused to approve \$13 million for Jones Bridge until they did what the act called for. A new bill is going to be introduced for the consideration of the Committee on Public Works, to put the jurisdiction of that project where it belongs, and take it from this committee.

The bill we are presenting calls for more money than the Bureau of the Budget approved. But the elimination of the item for Jones Bridge makes the total amount less.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this is a good bill and I hope that the House, in its wisdom, will approve it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as our good chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has just told you, this is the largest recommended appropriation for the different agencies that come under this Interior Department Appropriation bill that has ever been requested by the President of the United States. The Budget has approved a larger amount than has ever been requested before. The committee has gone along very closely with the President and the Budget.

As the chairman has just stated, there is no controversy in this bill so far as the regular subcommittee is concerned. We agreed on every item in this bill before it left the subcommittee and went to the full Appropriations Committee, and the full Appropriations Committee without a dissenting voice approved the action of the subcommittee.

The revenue which is derived and covered into the Treasury of the United States from the several agencies under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department amounts to \$390,395,000, which is only \$25,568,200 less than the total we recommend in this bill. Most of that revenue is derived from the Bureau of Land Management in grazing fees, in mineral leases, and the like. Also there is considerable revenue derived from the Forest Service from the sale of timber, so it is almost a self-supporting agency of this Government now under the management of Secretary Douglas McKay

who is doing better than a good job of running this important Department of Government for the American taxpayer. We have an item in this bill of \$550,000 for research in the utilization of saline water. I am happy to say that progress is being made in that field. We have a number of research pilot plants which are showing considerable progress in the desalting and demineralization of water to make it fit for commercial use. We hope at some future time to have the cost of desalting and demineralization reduced to such a point that ocean water may be used for irrigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am interested in the comments the gentleman made about the desalting of water. In the city in which I live we bore down several hundred feet to get water. Since Stockton is only about 12 feet above sea level, although 80 miles from the Golden Gate, we are fearful that the water might get brackish. Is this research going far enough so that it will be adequate to prepare the water for human consumption as drinking water?

Mr. JENSEN. The experiment has not yet arrived at the point where it is economically feasible for that purpose. However, as I said, progress is being made quite rapidly in that direction. We hope that in a very few years, possibly within a couple of years, a new process will be developed to the point where a municipality will be able to purchase a plant which will desalt ocean water so economically that it can be used for municipal and commercial uses.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. About 3 or 4 years ago, as I recall it, the Navy made a thorough investigation of this matter also, and since that investigation scientific studies have been going on in that subject and great progress has been made up to the present time; is that not a correct statement?

Mr. JENSEN. Indeed, that is correct. We are already desalting ocean water cheaper than the Navy is doing it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to thank the committee for putting this provision in the bill. It will prove to be a very useful provision in many parts of the country.

Mr. JENSEN. We appropriated \$150,000 more this year than we did last year for that purpose. So you can see the committee is quite encouraged with the progress that is being made.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BATES. I compliment the gentleman for the fine work he has done on the problem of desalting water. He has blazed the trail in this field and is to be highly commended for it. I have a question which I would like to ask the gentleman, and I believe he is familiar with the Maritime installation at Salem, Mass. It is a national park, but when you look at it you are more likely to come to the conclusion that it is a national disgrace.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] was there this summer as well as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. Both of them concur that something should be done about it. I understand now there are some \$10 million in this bill provided to take care of projects along that line?

Mr. JENSEN. \$15 million is provided in this bill for such purposes.

Mr. BATES. \$15 million. The gentleman is familiar, I believe, with the site that I mention, Derby Wharf at Salem. Does he not believe with me that something should be done to clean it up?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, indeed, I do.

Mr. BATES. Either that or give it back to the local people who can clean it up themselves.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, and I shall be happy to go to the Director of Parks, as I know the gentleman from Massachusetts will do. You know the old saying—the wheel that squeaks the loudest gets the most grease.

Mr. BATES. Well, let us do a little greasing on this one.

Mr. JENSEN. You will talk to the Director of Parks?

Mr. BATES. I already have, but I wanted the RECORD to show the situation and also I wanted to have the benefit of the point of view of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman; he is very generous.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The gentleman is well aware of the very great interest I have had in our State concerning the blackbird menace which destroys hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of crops in New Jersey each year as well as in the States of Delaware and Maryland.

I am appreciative of the interest that the committee has taken in this subject in the past. May I ask if they have made provision for that in this present bill.

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] that I took up that matter with the Fish and Wildlife Service when they appeared before the committee. I asked them if there would be funds available in fiscal year 1957, comparable to the amount that has been appropriated for blackbird control in New Jersey during the past several years. They assured me there would be. We all recognize the problem in New Jersey and you may rest assured that the Fish and Wildlife Service will carry on the program of blackbird control in New Jersey as they have done in the past several years.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I thank the gentleman for the interest he has taken; also the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee who have been so willing to help us in this matter.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say that every member of the committee has been greatly interested in your problem, and they all want to be of assistance to you whom we hold in the highest esteem, and to the people you represent so ably and well.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wish the gentleman would say something about

"Construction Costs: For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings and utilities," I note they allow \$4 million and the request is for \$7½ million. I am wondering if that is sufficient to carry on the program of the Department.

Mr. JENSEN. The language in the report under "Construction" reads: "For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems" is \$7,500,000. The committee has allowed \$4 million, or a reduction of \$3,500,000 in the budget estimate. The program as set forth in the justification is approved. The amount allowed plus the unobligated balance of previously appropriated funds which will be available on June 30, 1956, will be sufficient to continue the construction program without delay.

That is the best answer I can give the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It seemed to me a somewhat larger reduction than some of the other departments; about a 40 percent reduction.

Mr. JENSEN. There was a carry-over in this fund, and the committee felt, after hearing the testimony of the officials, that \$4 million plus the carry-over, would be sufficient to carry on without any delay whatsoever.

We have increased the "Soil and Moisture Conservation" item on Indian lands above the budget request by the sum of \$100,000. I do not have to tell any Member of Congress of the great need for soil and moisture conservation on all of our public domain, including the Indian lands. I, and I am sure every member of the committee, feel that it is money well spent to conserve our priceless topsoil, whether it be on private land or on the Government domain. So each year the committee has found it necessary to increase by a modest amount the budget request for soil and moisture conservation on our public domain.

If you will take the time to go into the Western States, you would see with your own eyes the great benefits which have been derived from the comparatively small amounts that the Congress has appropriated for soil and moisture conservation on our public domain.

Mr. Chairman, I can only say that I was happy to go along with the other members of the regular subcommittee for an increase of \$9,800,000 for our national parks for utilities, roads, and dwellings for park employees.

The President recommended a supplemental request for \$10 million more than was requested in the regular budget which would have made a total of \$15,200,000 for this purpose for fiscal year 1957.

The Bureau of the Budget approved \$8,350,000 of the \$10 million requested by President Eisenhower.

The committee raised that to \$9,800,000 which is only \$200,000 less than the President requested, making a total of an even \$15 million for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, unless there are further questions I will yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has consumed 16 minutes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, as many of the Members know, the St. Louis delegation in the House, along with other Members from Missouri and both of our Senators, assisted and supported by Members from adjoining States, have been working over a period of years for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the St. Louis waterfront.

The purpose of the memorial is not merely to give St. Louis a dramatic attraction in our riverfront area. Instead, it is to commemorate one of the great events of our national development—the Louisiana Purchase and the opening of the western wilderness. No event in American history has had greater significance in terms of our present day greatness.

The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial has been in the process of construction since 1934. But to this day it is still little more than a parking lot—a vast open wasteland. The reason for this situation is, that the Federal Government has not up to now provided the very modest sum of \$5 million to carry out its share of the agreed-upon, authorized project. Its formal authorization was in a law enacted in 1954—a bill which I had the honor to introduce. This was the formal authorization. Actually, the Government was committed to this project in 1934 by action of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I am not taking the time of the House today to give the history of the project. A number of us have spoken about it previously—spoken about it frequently here in the House. I am taking the time today merely to make clear why the Members from St. Louis are withholding an amendment which we have had prepared for the Interior Department appropriation bill now before the House. It was our judgment in view of special circumstances that we would not submit the amendment today.

At the same time, however, I want it clearly understood by the Interior Department that this decision on our part is based on a desire to give the Interior Department an opportunity to bring this matter before Congress in the regular manner. If we do not get action in this respect in the very near future, then we will follow whatever steps we feel are necessary to assure appropriation of the necessary funds this year whether or not the Interior Department and the President cooperate with us in that objective.

I might explain to the Members of the House that we have been assured that a supplemental budget request covering work on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is en route to the Congress—that it is somewhere between the National Park Service, the Interior Department Budget Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the White House. We have been assured there will be a request, but so far I have not been able to find out the exact amount which administration officials have in mind for the project. I have put in a bill for a \$5 million appropriation to cover the full

cost of the Federal Government's authorized share of the work. At least \$3 million would be necessary for a substantial start on the work.

The suggestion has been made to us by the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee that we wait on this matter for a supplement if one is on the way to the Congress. We have been advised that if we were to try to amend the bill without such a supplemental request we would have the opposition of the subcommittee at this time. Yet we know that if there is a supplemental budget request, the subcommittee will look favorably upon this project, for it is a great project commemorating a great event in which the entire West is vitally concerned.

I am sorry to see this bill go through the House today without definite earmarking of funds for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. But I think in a situation of this kind it is more important not to risk and jeopardize the project than it is to make gestures of seeking to amend the bill when that might only hurt us. I do not want a record of the House vote against this project in case the appropriation of funds should hinge on House concurrence to a Senate amendment.

I appreciate the courtesy of the subcommittee in discussing this matter with me so often in the last few weeks. I am disturbed that it has taken the administration so long to make the formal request for this appropriation. If it does not come up very shortly, then we will have to proceed outside the regular order, either through amendment of this bill in the Senate or through a provision inserted in another appropriation measure.

We are tired of waiting for action on this project. Twenty-two years is too long. The amount at issue is modest indeed. The event which would be commemorated deserves greater respect.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am again deeply concerned because of what may be termed the blackbird menace that has caused such great losses to the farmers of south Jersey located in those counties that border on the lower Delaware River.

A survey has shown that flocks of blackbirds come at a certain time each year to Gloucester, Salem, Cumberland, and Cape May Counties. They come by the millions from the South. They devour certain crops, particularly corn. In one county last year it was estimated the loss was as high as \$100,000.

For several years I have brought this situation to the attention of the Interior Department Appropriation Committee and requested funds to combat the menace. The chairman of the committee, Mr. KIRWAN, and Mr. JENSEN, the ranking Republican member on the committee, have been very helpful. They have again this year listened sympathetically to my plea. The result is a substantial amount allotted to Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior

to continue its efforts to control the situation.

To accomplish all that is necessary there must be cooperation between the States and the Federal Government. There are aspects that must have State assistance, and, certainly it is necessary to have Federal assistance as the birds are of a migratory character. They are a growing menace in South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware, as well as New Jersey.

It is encouraging to realize that this problem that causes the farmers such great losses is recognized by the Congress. The problem has become so bad that through the influence of the farmers of New Jersey other States are being interested. They are at last realizing that this is not the battle of just New Jersey. Consequently, they are entering into the fight. With this added help we can reasonably expect to make more progress next year in the matter of appropriations that are so necessary.

This bill now before us has many more excellent features, but none more important than that which gives assistance to the farmers of New Jersey in their effort to eradicate the blackbird menace. Without such help our farmers were becoming discouraged. They could not adequately handle the problem as individuals. It had to be attacked on a large scale, hence the appeal to the Federal Government.

I ask that the bill have the full support of the Congress, House and Senate.

As part of these remarks I have sundry documents I wish to insert in order that there may be a more full understanding of the matter and what is being done by interested parties:

JANUARY 4, 1955.

A meeting of the Wild Life Committee was called on the above date by Vice Chairman Lloyd W. Yeagle at 2 p. m., in Seabrook conference room.

Those present were: Lloyd W. Yeagle, William P. Watson, Charles C. Butler, R. B. Harris, Laurence Bohn, G. W. Mingin, Lee Towson, J. T. Linehan, Robert T. Mitchell, Alvin String, P. G. MacNamara, F. B. Schuler, J. M. Pancoast, Sr., E. S. Harvey, R. B. Harris, Jr., W. M. Runk, Joseph Hancock, James Mecum, Ken Roberts and G. I. Ball.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

Robert T. Mitchell presented a report of research work done during 1954 by J. T. Linehan and himself in New Jersey and Delaware. This report included results of the use of bomb exploders used in Delaware, 12 and 18 grain bull dog salutes in New Jersey, poison bait, corn variety tests, etc. It was reported that the area of damage in New Jersey had widened out because of the use of scare devices.

Several farmers remarked that some method of control of bird numbers is necessary to lessen the damage in New Jersey and Delaware.

Trig Holme discussed and demonstrated a carbide exploder developed at Seabrook Farms in 1954. This exploder has great possibilities as a scare device with certain improvements. One tank of gas lasted about 7 days and covered an area of 10 acres.

It was reported by Towson and Ball that an amendment to the I. C. C. interstate shipment of fireworks had been proposed to increase the charge from 12 to 18 grains. This change had been strongly suggested by this committee.

The fireworks law passed by New Jersey in 1954 and placed in the labor department

for administration, along with the rules and regulations as compiled by this department, was discussed thoroughly.

The fees set up by the labor department were felt to be exorbitant especially for selling and storing. Only 3 dealers were reported handling salutes in New Jersey, 1 being the manufacturer. The fees required by the department pushed the price per gross to the farmer much too high, thus reducing the amount used on the farm.

A motion was made, seconded and carried that a meeting be arranged with Mr. Krueger of the labor department and the fees be readjusted. W. P. Watson to arrange for meeting with Mr. Krueger and a committee of Yeagle, Towson and Ball to represent this group.

The matter of financing the work for 1955 was brought up for discussion. Mr. Schuler, representing Mr. Gascoyne, stated that his department did not know what had been requested as this was a policy of the national director, J. L. Farley, to figure out.

W. P. Watson introduced Mr. C. T. Butler, National Farm Bureau, Director of Land and Water Use, Washington, D. C. Mr. Butler stated he had been assigned the job of investigating the blackbird situation and would be glad to work with the committee on this problem. He was requested to contact Mr. Farley regarding appropriation for blackbird control work in 1955. He also was given the names of agricultural agents in Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Georgia, where corn was grown in large areas.

Messrs. Yeagle and Ball reported on a meeting of Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey committees held in Newark, Del. At this meeting it was agreed that a sum of \$30,000 was needed by fish and wild life department in order to do a job of control.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p. m.

G. I. BALL, Secretary.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1954.

A meeting of the South Jersey Blackbird Committee was called by chairman, Dr. Frank App, at 8 p. m., in Seabrook office annex.

Those present were: Dr. App, Lee Towson, Larry Bohn, Alvin String, Lloyd Yeagle, George Lamb, Wilbur Runk, George Ball, Robert Mitchell, Al Gallino, Jack Linehan, J. Troist, Al Jones, and H. Greenwald.

A letter was read from J. L. Farley, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, stating the viewpoint of his Department on various methods of blackbird control.

A report from Lee Towson on the meeting with Federal Fish and Wildlife Service at Washington, was given and is attached to minutes. Project to be conducted under Robert Mitchell.

Alfred Jones, game supervisor for southern New Jersey, stated that the State had assigned J. Troist to assist Mitchell in this project.

Harry Greenwald, Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, has been assigned to this project to assist Mitchell. Greenwald cited previous experiences with fox, skunk, etc., in Pennsylvania.

Work to be done this fall with farmers who request service and are willing to cooperate.

Lee Towson reported on gas chamber perfected at Seabrook during summer which shows promise as a scare device. One machine could protect 10 or more acres.

A letter received from Underhill was read stating there was no law preventing the use of poison bait in New Jersey. He pledged cooperation of his department in the proposed control measures.

It was suggested that we use the term "experimental control" in any correspondence or news release.

Meeting adjourned 10:15 p. m.

GEORGE I. BALL, Secretary.

MAY 24, 1955.

A meeting of the Blackbird committee was called at 7:30 p. m. by Chairman Frank App at Seabrook conference room.

Those attending were: Dr. App, George C. Onkst, H. E. Greenwald, George W. Mingin, Lawrence Bohn, L. W. Yeagle, A. L. Towson, Paul Hickie, J. T. Linehan, Robert T. Mitchell, Robert J. Hawley, J. R. Patrick, J. M. Pancoast, F. P. Sowers, R. B. Harris, Sr., N. E. Harris, Jr., W. F. Saunderlin, William Driscoll, Arthur H. Lange, E. H. Brothers, J. B. Gross, and G. I. Ball.

Minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

Lloyd W. Yeagle reported on meeting with Mr. Krueger of the Labor Department regarding fees to be paid for firecracker usage in 1955 to prevent damage to corn by blackbirds. The fees proposed are \$1 for farmers permits, \$2 for dealer permits, and \$15 for manufacturer permit.

A. Lee Towson reported on proposed committee substitute for S. 104 which would include the term "as pest control bomb." This change would bring the New Jersey law in line with ICC regulations and allow the manufacture of 18-grain salutes in New Jersey.

Mr. Lange, Southern Oxygen Co., Vineland, demonstrated two types of exploders which his company has experimented with at Seabrook Farms. One machine operated on regular battery and the second on dry battery plus alarm clock works. Acetylene gas is used on both machines.

Paul Hickie, Chief, Research Division, Fish and Wildlife Service, explained that finances to run his Department came from various sources as well as direct grant from Congress. The amount of \$10,000 allocated by Congress for blackbird control in New Jersey is apparently not a cash grant but a transfer of moneys within the Department. This statement led to discussion from the floor as to the most efficient method of carrying out the work to reduce the number of birds rather than more research on scare devices. It was pointed out from the farmers standpoint that they were more interested in reducing the number of birds than in scaring them from one farm to another.

Robert T. Mitchell, biologist, Research Division, who conducted the research work in 1953-54 and will continue in 1955, presented the proposed program for 1955. Mitchell outlined a program of banding nestlings in the spring (April-June), more extensive program of use of poison baits (sweet corn fields), comparative tests of firecrackers, bombs, exploders, etc., corn variety test using three distinct planting dates to coincide with wild rice feeding of birds (before, during, and after).

This discussion led to various questions from the floor regarding the advisability of putting more emphasis on reduction of numbers of birds not only in New Jersey and Delaware but in Virginia and Carolina. Growers feel that the reduction in flocks is more essential than continuance of scare devices. It was pointed out by both Hickie and Mitchell that scare devices are essential regardless of reduction in numbers because of the roving feeding habits of red wings and grackle.

A motion was made by R. B. Harris, Sr., seconded and carried that a small committee of four be formed in New Jersey to cooperate with R. T. Mitchell in forming a program of research more in line with needs. This committee, appointed by Chairman App, is Lloyd W. Yeagle, chairman, A. Lee Towson, Russell B. Harris, Sr., and Norman Harris, Jr.

Motion was made, seconded, and carried that a committee be formed to cooperate with similar committees from Delaware and Maryland to form policies both legislative, research, and game management, whereby a constructive policy can be carried out to relieve the amount of damage being done to

crops by red wing blackbirds in the various States mentioned.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p. m.

G. I. BALL, Secretary.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF NEW JERSEY,

Salem, N. J., January 18, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOLVERTON: In order to keep you informed on the blackbird situation in Salem County and south Jersey, the following data is enclosed. In November a delegation of farmers attended a board of freeholders meeting and insisted that they (freeholders) appoint a committee to investigate the work being done by Federal Fish and Wildlife Service in their endeavor to reduce numbers.

This past year there was a tremendous number of red wing blackbirds in August and September. Even though 2,850 gross of firecrackers were used the damage to sweet and field corn was greater than ever before.

The freeholders appointed a five-man committee and our Salem board of agriculture invited them to a meeting to acquaint them with the facts. Out of this meeting a resolution was drawn up by the group, presented to the whole board on December 28. This resolution passed and will be distributed to all legislators in New Jersey, New Jersey Senators and Representatives, fish and game commission, sportsman groups, Ducks, Inc., Audubon Society, and other interested bodies. The main issue is asking that red-wing blackbirds and grackle be removed from the international agreement with Mexico and put in the unprotected category. (Resolution enclosed for your file.)

The county board of agriculture passed a similar resolution on January 13, 1956 and will circulate it to all those mentioned.

I am also enclosing my report on conditions in Virginia and North Carolina and our viewpoint on combined efforts to control this predator.

We feel very strongly that a program should be carried on by the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service to reduce the number of red-wing blackbirds and grackle all along the eastern coast of the United States of America if we are to have reduced damage. We also feel that any moneys appropriated for this work should be turned over to game management. Research has accomplished a great deal but our group feel the job should now be carried on by game management because of the wider scope and a greater number of Federal men in the field.

We will supply you with any future data which may be agreed on.

The Farm Bureau has arranged a meeting with legislators in Washington for January 31. We expect to have 3 or 4 fellows attend this meeting. I know they will be prepared to see you on this occasion and brief you on all phases of the situation.

Very truly yours,

G. I. BALL, Agricultural Agent.

P. S.—Those who will attend the January 31 meeting in Washington will be Russell B. Harris, Sr., David Grier, Samuel Crystal, and Roland DeWilde.

RESOLUTION

"Whereas red-winged blackbirds have been protected as a migratory song bird since 1933 by an act of Congress under an international agreement with Mexico whereby the Country of Mexico agrees to protect ducks migrating from the United States in exchange for the United States protecting red-winged blackbirds; and

"Whereas by order of the Department of Interior of the United States dated May 13, 1948, farmers in the United States were permitted to shoot red-winged blackbirds when

they caused or were about to cause damage to crops with the provision that said birds could not be sold; and

"Whereas since 1933 the number of blackbirds have increased in alarming numbers so that they have become a detriment rather than an asset; and

"Whereas crop damage from said birds has increased in New Jersey to a point where farmers have a serious problem in carrying out crop rotation; and

"Whereas the greatest damage is to sweet corn and field corn and small grains which are all grown in the State of New Jersey and especially in Salem County, N. J.; and

"Whereas reliable reports have been received informing this body that tremendously large flocks of red-winged blackbirds cover an area of the five States, namely, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina; and

"Whereas additional reports have been received that large concentrations of red-winged blackbirds are now found in the States of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Ohio, Indiana, New York, Michigan, and all of the New England States; and

"Whereas it has been reliably reported that in Salem County, N. J., the wild oats and wild rice in the tidal meadows have been almost entirely destroyed by the said red-winged blackbirds thereby destroying most of natural duck food; and

"Whereas the damage to the crops in Salem County, N. J., has mounted steadily until it is now estimated to be over \$100,000 annually; and

"Whereas the use of scare devices to disburse the concentration of said birds has proved expensive and very unsatisfactory; and

"Whereas the research work performed by the research division of the Federal Fish and Game Life Service, Department of the Interior of the United States, during the past 3 years has failed to solve the serious problem: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Salem, That due to the tremendous numbers of red-winged blackbirds and the increasing amount of damage to field crops in Salem County, N. J., and in the State of New Jersey, the said board does hereby petition the Legislature of the State of New Jersey to pass necessary resolutions or other appropriate acts requesting the Congress of the United States to withdraw protection of red-winged blackbirds so that the citizens of Salem County and of the State at large may take appropriate action to destroy this damaging predator; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the body be and he is hereby authorized to send a certified copy of this resolution to each member of the Senate and House of Assembly of New Jersey, New Jersey Department of Fish and Game, Research Division of Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior of the United States, Ducks Unlimited, Inc. (the New Jersey chapter), and the Audubon Society of New Jersey and to the appropriate committees of the State governments of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina.

"Dated: December 21, 1955."

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the county of Salem at its regular meeting held on the 21st day of December 1955 in the Salem County Courthouse, Salem, N. J.

CLIFFORD A. SWEETEN, Sr.

Clerk.

REPORT ON RED-WINGED BLACKBIRD SURVEY
(By George I. Ball, Salem County agricultural agent)

During a recent vacation in North Carolina and Virginia, enough time was taken to make

a survey of the migratory habits of the red-winged blackbird. For a long time it has been the thought of the wildlife committee of the Salem County Board of Agriculture that the birds which have done so much damage in our county and State, must winter in the Carolinas and Virginia. With this thought in mind, the committee felt that they would like more information and requested such a survey be made. Seven days were spent in North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland interviewing agricultural agents, biologists, wildlife patrolmen, farmers, and others to determine the habits of this predator.

One very interesting day was spent with Dr. Thomas Quay, biologist at North Carolina State College, Raleigh. Dr. Quay outlined the areas of the State where known roosts of redwing were located, gave pertinent information as to the range inland and facts regarding the feeding habits. He also expressed an interest in our problem, and furnished leads for future studies.

Discussions were carried on with Walter E. Price at wildlife refuge, Hoffman, N. C., and Agricultural Agent Garrison, at Carthage, N. C. (Monroe County) reported a flock of grackle was located at Vass, N. C., but no damage report in that area.

The areas affected in North Carolina extended roughly from Wilmington, N. C., north to northeast to the border and into Suffolk and Princess Anne Counties, Va.

Individuals were interviewed in the area around Wilmington, N. C. The consensus of opinion there was that birds ranged in small flocks about 20 miles inland. Very little damage to crops reported. Birds arrived in late September and left in April. Average size of flocks, 2,000 and not too many here.

The large concentration of redwings is located in the area around Lake Mattamuskeet (Hyde County) and Elizabeth City in North Carolina. This concentration is in the millions and growing larger each year. No serious damage is reported from New Bern, Edentown (Chowan County), Hertford (Perquimans County), Camden (Camden County). Agricultural Agent S. L. Lowery, Elizabeth City, stated that late corn received small damage in his and adjoining counties. There are large areas of meadow land in the sections mentioned, affording natural roosting places for redwings. Some birds stay all year but 90 percent leave in April and return in September.

In Princess Anne and Suffolk Counties, Va., the same picture exists. Large concentration of redwings are located in the two counties. Here we seem to have damage to peanuts in shock during October and November. However, the amount of damage is reported small at this time. The range of activities seems to be from 20 to 40 miles inland at this point. Some small damage to sprouting grain and corn has been reported here.

Maryland is right in the path of migration both to and from New Jersey and comes in for more crop damage than either Virginia or North Carolina.

SUMMARY

It is the opinion of this writer that red-winged blackbirds leave New Jersey and Delaware in September, journey south to Virginia and North Carolina for the winter months and return in April and May. This time table fits in exactly with the appearance and disappearance of redwings in New Jersey and Delaware. From all reports in the area covered in this survey, comparatively little damage is done except for peanuts. All agreed that the concentration of red-winged blackbirds had increased over a period of years to a point where they are a serious factor.

The range inland in all States visited appears to be about 30 to 40 miles. Flocks of grackle are reported in areas of North Caro-

lina but these are thought to be migrants from Ohio, western Pennsylvania and other Midwest States.

If this problem is to be solved, cooperative work in the States of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina is called for both from a local, State, and National level.

It is also suggested that further studies be made by interested States toward a common solution, and brought to the attention of Wild Life Department at the national level.

GEORGE I. BALL,
Agricultural Agent.

(The above survey was carried on in April 1955. In October the agent visited three counties in Virginia while peanuts were in stacks. Agent from Nansemond County, Va., reported later on damage from \$3 to \$52.50 per acre (peanuts). He quoted farmers' viewpoint that more damage by redwinged blackbirds this year than ever before.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, it has indeed been a pleasure to have served on this subcommittee for the past 10 years.

In that time we have seen the membership of this committee change almost every session of Congress, with the exception of the 2 ranking majority members and the 2 ranking minority members. Consequently, we have enjoyed a fine working relationship.

Congressman KIRWAN, our present chairman, has indeed been very fine and courteous to the members of his committee.

The same goes for Congressman JENSEN when he was chairman.

Both those men are, in my opinion, well versed in the affairs of the Interior Department.

The gentleman—and he is a gentleman—from Arkansas, our colleague [Mr. NORRELL] has always been a keen observer and adviser in our deliberations and in our hearings in this subcommittee.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] have also contributed much as members of our subcommittee.

Over the past several years great emphasis has been placed on development and conservation of our natural resources in the United States, together with rehabilitation of our present facilities and methods.

Never before in our history has it become so necessary and an obligation for the Congress to recognize these facts and provide the money to take care of the resources of this country.

If we are to continue as a leader in worldwide affairs and give all the aid possible to friendly nations, then it becomes certain that we must take care of our own resources.

It is with those things in mind that we have approached the amount of money allocated to the Interior Department for fiscal year 1957.

The budget estimate for 1957 for the Interior Department and related agencies was \$426,748,200, and your committee allowed \$415,963,200—a reduction of \$10,785,000.

As has been pointed out the revenues that will be derived from the agencies

in this bill amount to \$390,395,000 for 1957, about \$25 million less than the full appropriated amount.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been doing a very outstanding job as far as the Indian children are concerned.

Several years ago there was a condition existing in which 28,000 or 30,000 Indian children had never been to school.

Under this appropriation it will permit the placing of 5,000 more children in schools which will make an enrollment of almost 80,000 Indian schoolchildren, in contrast to 66,822 in 1955 and 74,225 in 1956.

The relocation services which are to assist the Indian population to settle and secure permanent employment in non-Indian communities away from the reservation, and to adjust to the new living and working conditions encountered are having some success.

For instance, 3,459 individuals were relocated in 1955 and it is expected that 5,000 will be relocated in the current fiscal year and 10,000 in fiscal 1957.

The committee allowed the full budget estimate of \$31,602,000 for the Geological Survey.

With the increased volume of requests for mapping of all sorts, topographic, geologic, and mineral and water resources, it is quite apparent that this fine agency must have the funds to do the necessary work.

I thoroughly agree with the new Director of the Geological Survey in his statement:

Although the several phases of the work are described in the justifications, I do want to mention the principles and the assumptions we have used in developing the programs. First of all, only insofar as they either directly or indirectly support the well-being of the Nation do they merit your support. I believe they do.

The Geological Survey has done a magnificent job under Dr. W. E. Wrather. Dr. Wrather has just retired and Dr. Thomas B. Nolan, his able Assistant Director, has been advanced to the directorship.

BUREAU OF MINES

The budget estimate for fiscal 1957 was \$23,697,300 and the committee allowed \$21,697,300—a decrease of \$2 million.

This decrease of \$2 million was taken from the conservation and development of mineral resources item although there will remain a net increase of \$1,270,000 over the 1956 appropriations.

One million dollars of the decrease developed from conditions existing in the research work in mining on oil shale at Rifle, Colo.

Also \$200,500 from the programed research work at Laramie, Wyo., on oil shale.

The \$1 million decrease at Rifle stems from the fact that a fall of roof occurred at the oil shale mines and the committee is of the opinion that the Federal Government has gone far enough in financing this type of research and that private industry could pick it up. There will still be available \$307,000 to continue basic research on oil shale.

The item "Minerals Research, Unclassified" was reduced to \$300,000 from \$751,500 as has the research on construction material from \$486,426 to \$244,626.

From the collection analysis and distribution of statistical and informational material programs, there is a reduction of \$286,200.

The health and safety program budget estimate was not touched—neither was the general administration expenses item.

Before adjournment last year the Congress appropriated \$8,500,000 for a cooperative mine drainage program with the State of Pennsylvania.

I am informed that the Federal Government through the Bureau of Mines are all set to proceed with the project and just as soon as the State of Pennsylvania puts up their \$8,500,000 the project will get started.

The accident rate in the coal mines of the United States while reduced in numbers since the Coal Mine Inspection Acts is still high and the most prevalent cause of the accidents is falls of roof.

It would seem to me that any research done in mining should be directed towards making the mine roof safe.

NATIONAL PARKS

The budget estimates for 1957 for the National Park Service was \$71,713,000. However the committee reduced this figure by striking out the item \$13,825,000 for Jones Point Bridge. This was done because of current representations to the Legislative Committee on H. R. 7228 which alters the design and cost of the bridge together with our understanding that firm commitments have not yet been secured to assure the participation of the States of Virginia and Maryland in connection with the approaches to the bridge.

The final figure of \$67,688,000 was arrived at by increasing the budget estimate of \$5,200,000 in construction to \$15 million an increase of \$9,575,000.

With the increase in the number of visitors each year, we believe the recommendations of the Park Service people and the administration should be adopted.

Our parks and the facilities therein need to be rehabilitated and new roads and trails developed.

From an estimated number of visitors in 1946 of 21,752,315 there has been a rapid increase each year. It is estimated that there will be 54 million in fiscal 1957. It is also estimated that 10 years from now there will be 80 million people visiting the parks.

It is because of this increasing of the parks' visitors that it will be necessary to adopt such a plan as mission 66—a 10-year plan proposed by the Park Service and the Interior Department—as presented to the administration.

FISH AND WILDLIFE

The Fish and Wildlife Service received the full amount of the budget estimate.

TITLE 11, RELATED AGENCIES

The Commission of Fine Arts, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, Indians Claims Commission, Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission, Smithsonian Institute, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission have all been granted the various estimates of the Bureau of the Budget.

FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The full budget estimate of \$96,773,000 for the Forest Service has been allowed by the committee which is an increase of \$6,157,871 over the appropriations for fiscal 1956.

FOREST SERVICE

The Forest Service budget request was not cut and the 1957 fiscal amount is an increase of \$6,300,000 over the current year.

THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

The National Capital Planning Commission budget requests were decreased by \$275,000. The request for salaries and expenses was \$210,000—the committee allowed \$185,000. The estimate for land acquisition was \$1,500,000—the committee allowed \$1,250,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I would particularly like to commend the committee for increasing funds for construction in our national parks as was recommended by President Eisenhower. This is sometimes referred to as the buildings and utilities appropriation. The committee has recognized that an increase in this appropriation is necessary to bring about an expansion of public use facilities, both as furnished by the Park Service and as furnished by the concessionaires. The committee is to be commended for recognizing this need, and recommending an appropriation of \$15 million for this purpose. A continuing appropriation at this level or above will be necessary for the next several years to take care of the demand.

One reduction in budget requests has been made in the bill which I think further consideration will show should be restored. The budget request for the Bureau of Mines research laboratory at Laramie, Wyo., has been reduced \$200,500. I believe that as additional information is made available to the committee in the other body concerning this research program, and the effect of the reduction, the funds should be and will be restored. The continuing source of petroleum, with adequate standby reserves, is essential to the civilian and security needs of our Nation. A research program must be continuous. We will reap the benefits of today's research in future years. We cannot hold back on research until we are actually in a distressed condition. The funds allowed will permit the continuation of fundamental research, but will result in the elimination of any applied research. Applied research is directed toward the development of technical knowledge that will make possible the improvement and development of better retorting and refining processes for shale oil. The effect of the restriction will be to freeze all progress in future process development. This research is essential if this source of fuel is to be available in time of need.

Besides the oil shale research, many other valuable research programs are conducted at the laboratory. Some of these activities include improvements of production methods of crude oil, research in secondary recovery methods, and research on other minerals, includ-

ing coal. The importance of this to the national economy can be appreciated when we recall that secondary recovery programs have usually resulted in the recovery of as much, or more, oil than was recovered by primary means.

Funds for the operation of such a facility as this cannot be placed in separate categories with mathematical certainty. Heat, light, equipment, maintenance, and personnel, etc., necessarily overlap. Such a cut as has been made with regard to one program necessarily affects the others.

I am confident that as the Bureau of Mines makes available additional information with regard to this problem, it will appear that the funds should be restored, and the full budget recommendation allowed. I am sure that this fine committee will give proper attention to this additional information as they have always done when the matter is again considered in conference.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], for his success in presenting this bill to the Committee today despite earlier opposition to it.

Today, in Europe, one beholds the discomfort that overwhelms its people in the cold wave. Our Department of Defense in Europe has answered the call to relieve the cold, the hungry, and the needy. The airlift of food to Italy by our flyers is a case in point.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to a point in this country where, in or out of war, in an emergency, the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Department of Defense must assume close liaison to feed, clothe, and shelter some 60 million of our people that might of a sudden be thrown in flight and need from an act of nature or an act of man.

We have some 18 to 23 great clusters of population in this country. In the event of a disaster, we have no standby plans, to my knowledge, to receive people from them thrown in flight. The conference of mayors the other day brought that out. Our civil-defense plans are outmoded. Plans to move a person from one street to another or from one suburb to another is not enough. It seems that the present scope of our thinking on this is inadequate; the Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Department of Defense must be ready to receive millions of civilians in modern bivouac; plans for this and funds to do it must keep current with plans and funds for H-bombs, electronics, Operation Sage, and intercontinental bombing missile. If our people are destroyed, what then do we defend? God will, as he always has, take care of His globe with its oceans and continents. But if He gives man the chance to provide for man's salvation and man muffs it, should one wonder at trying the Creator's patience? Right now Defense, Parks, and Forest Service are not able to do that. They are not set up to bivouac, clothe, and feed, if need be, 60 million Americans suddenly thrown upon them. Our standby facilities are ab-

solutely shameful. Little has been done to accommodate people in the big parks since the CCC improved picnic tables and cooking facilities in the early thirties. Congress has been tightfisted with its funds on this front. I repeat, if we were suddenly caught in some disaster in this country, in or out of war, especially in the great metropolitan areas and wanted to lessen plague and disease and keep as many as possible of our people alive, we stand absolutely flat-footed in being able to handle their survival. That is why Mission 66 must come about and be brought into being in 3 years if possible. Otherwise our plea for funds for intercontinental missiles, for Operation Sage, for atomic weapons, and Armed Forces will ring hollow. The test should be from home plate to the outfield and the bleachers. If a pop bottle breaks through and "conks" the batter he is out. The same with us. A lateral or overhead missile from the bleachers would "conk" out the city it struck. It would cause other cities to be promptly emptied. Where would the Pied Piper lead our people then? To the drink? To Canada? To Mexico? The Department of Defense, the Park Service, and the Forest Service should have an answer. I trust they will. From them should come plans for our counter-attack in survival. I trust those plans will be in being when this bill comes before the House next year. This is a good bill. It should pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, as one who has in his district a large number of Indian people, I do not want to pass this opportunity to express to the great Committee on Appropriations, to its chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the deep appreciation which all Members from districts having large numbers of Indian people feel for this committee for the breadth of vision and for the understanding which they reflect in a bill which shows an increase for Indian education and for the placement of Indian families in communities where they can become self-sufficient. I deeply appreciate this consideration of the problem that we have in the Indian areas of our country, and it is a welcome thing to see American money being spent for Indians here inside the United States and not in a distant continent. I also appreciate very much the appropriation of \$200,000 to finance distribution of funds to the Creek Indians. Some Creek Indians have been waiting for approximately 50 years for funds due to them which have been resting in the Treasury of the United States without drawing interest. I think it is a recognition of this problem, and the provision of funds for it is a forward-looking and a generous act on the part of this committee. I want to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the people of the Second District of Oklahoma to this committee, and I hope the bill will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask some member of the committee 2 or 3 questions concerning the Rifle demonstration plant for the processing and mining of oil shale. The synthetic fuels research program as originally authorized called for an expenditure of some \$87,600,000. During the last 2 or 3 years we have had considerable difficulty securing committee approval of the expenditure of substantial funds for the particular facility at Rifle, Colo.

I notice that the Bureau of the Budget has requested for fiscal 1957 an appropriation of \$1,507,500 which the committee has reduced to \$307,000. Will some member of the committee advise me what the recommended \$307,000 is to be expended for?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The remaining funds, I might say to the gentleman from Colorado, are for fundamental research in oil shale petroleum.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand my good friend from Washington then, no moneys are to be expended at all at the Demonstration Plant at Rifle; is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. That means that that portion of the \$87 million plus which was placed into the installation at Rifle, will have been expended on a plant that is left standing high, wide and handsome, so to speak, without any returns?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was the feeling of the committee that research in the mining field had been carried along far enough by the Government and that private industry perhaps should pick it up from here.

Mr. ASPINALL. Was that the feeling of those representing the Bureau before the gentleman's committee? I have read the hearings and I think the answer is "Yes," is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I ask my friend what has been provided to take care of the facility at Rifle to see that it is properly policed and kept in a proper standby condition so that the physical values that are there are not wasted?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The balance of the \$1 million that they had for the current fiscal year is available for that purpose.

Mr. ASPINALL. Are not those funds already pledged to carry on research in mining operations that were begun with the approval of that appropriation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not as I understand it, if this action of the subcommittee is ratified by the House today.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague very much. I do not approve the action that has been taken. I think we have practically thrown away the money we have spent to date on the Demonstration Plant for the synthetic fuel program. We might just as well admit that we have no answers and one of the reasons why the committee has seen fit to take the action it has taken is because of the fact that the Bureau has been unable to come up with answers which the committee at least and perhaps I, too, feel should be available to us at this time. But as far

as accomplishing the purpose for which the authorization was originally intended, we have accomplished very little, in my opinion.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the subcommittee, under its distinguished chairman [Mr. KIRWAN], especially on its foresight and forward-looking provisions for the National Park Service. It has been my pleasure over a term of years to have visited every national park in our country.

I have been especially interested in the recreational facilities of the parks; or shall I say, the absence of adequate picnic, camping, and other recreational facilities in these parks.

In some parks in the last few years I have observed an absolute need for available sanitary facilities and have also observed picnic tables in dilapidated conditions, and these conditions have prevailed too often in the very areas where thousands of people attend and other thousands would like to attend.

It should be crystal clear to all of us that with the shortening of the workweek and the workday there is a rapidly increasing national problem confronting us with what to do with our leisure time. Too much leisure is not less dangerous than too much overwork. And a man who has nothing to do is not unlikely to waste his resources—mental, physical, and spiritual.

Every year the distance between the great centers of population and our national parks is growing less and less on account of the rapidity of automobile transportation to these areas, and the increasingly good roads which are available. This improved method of transportation means that whole families seek the inspiration and joy of going to these great national park areas. The attendance in all of them rapidly increases from year to year; yet, we have not kept the physical properties and facilities in these areas up to keeping to meet this rapidly increasing use by the increasing thousands. I have always found the National Park personnel courteous, resourceful, and willing to work to make the visitors to their respective national park areas happy and contented, pleased and proud. But, they cannot do something with absolutely nothing. This increased amount of approximately a million dollars for strengthening the national park management and park and recreation programs will not meet the entire need. But, it is a beginning of a change of philosophy by our Budget Bureau and by this Congress which will, in my judgment, work wonders for the good and happiness and health and the solidarity of American families.

I believe it to be literally true that a family which has opportunity to play together, and does so, will stay together and the improvement to these recreational facilities and programs in our national parks will make it more possible for hundreds of thousands of American families to play together. During the time they are in these magnificent park

areas they will have increasing inspiration and happiness together. Such experiences in a national park logically result in their going home more solidly and soundly an American family; more happy and cordially respecting each other's opinions and more helpfully cooperating in their homelife as a result of their happy, cooperative experiences in our national park areas.

Recently I was asked by a fellow Member of this great legislative body why I claimed so much of value for adequate playgrounds, parks, and recreational areas, and I related to him I had had the experience, as a layman and nonprofessional, of serving as president of a municipal recreational organization—without pay—for about 15 years before I first came to Congress nearly 10 years ago. He then said he understood my vigorous expression in support of keeping our playground and park areas well equipped and the facilities therein adequate and in good condition.

I hope that this splendidly prepared bill will be unanimously approved.

I again wish to compliment the subcommittee on its recognition of the place and value and power toward the strengthening of the sinews of our beloved Nation, as result of more rapidly making our national park areas adequate in their respective park facilities and programs.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to impose upon the House by taking this time, but I want to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and the other fine members of the subcommittee, for the courtesies extended to me in allowing me to come before their committee with projects so important to the citizens of southern Illinois. I was shown the utmost of courtesy and I appreciate it very much. I certainly hope this bill passes without a dissenting vote.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the statement made by my distinguished colleague [Mr. SULLIVAN] in connection with the appropriation for the Jefferson National Memorial in St. Louis. This bill contains \$150,000 for this project. It is understood that the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department have agreed to request an additional appropriation which did not get down here in time to be included in this bill. I should like at this time to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not he can give us assurance that when this does come down with budget approval and the approval of the National Park Service it will be included in the supplemental bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Speaking for myself, and I think the rest of the committee may feel the same way, I will be happy to do so if it has Budget approval.

Mr. KARSTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly want to join my colleague [Mr. KARSTEN] and my colleague [Mrs. SULLIVAN] in support of this measure which has for so many years remained dormant right in the center of the city of St. Louis.

Mr. KARSTEN. I wonder if at this point the ranking minority member of the committee will give us assurance that this project will be given consideration in the supplemental bill if this item comes down with the approval of the Budget Bureau and the National Park Service.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, I could not commit myself or any member of the whole committee or the subcommittee. You just do not do that, because you may run afoul of someone on the committee that may not agree with you.

Mr. KARSTEN. I certainly appreciate that. I would not want the gentleman to commit the whole committee. However, I wonder if he would speak for himself and give us assurance that he will go along with the Budget Bureau and the National Park Service.

Mr. JENSEN. My answer can only be that if and when the supplemental bill comes up for consideration I shall give this item my personal attention. I shall listen to the justification and I shall then make up my mind, which I hope will be favorable on this matter.

Mr. KARSTEN. Knowing the gentleman's great sense of fairness, I am going to let the case rest there.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Research in the utilization of saline water

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the act of July 3, 1952, as amended (66 Stat. 328 and 69 Stat. 198), authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, \$550,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to congratulate this subcommittee and to thank them as well for their treatment of the forestry appropriation, which is in the Interior Subcommittee at this time.

As many of you know, I have felt rather strongly that the forest-cooperative program, the forest fire fighting, and the various things that are interrelated with agriculture, particularly in the present bill, should be handled jurisdictionally along with the agricultural program. I think there are very sound reasons for that; but if they saw fit to give that jurisdiction to Mr. KIRWAN's committee, they could not put it in better hands. However, they should be considered together.

So far as the Forest Service is concerned, that is another matter, but these are decisions that are beyond my reach. They were not decided by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] or myself. But I want to say that no one could handle this program any better than this sub-

committee has. They have given excellent attention to the forestry programs. I know those who are interested in those programs appreciate it, as I do.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Minerals Mobilization

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities, including cooperation with the metals and minerals industry, with respect to the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including solid fuels, \$300,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of this time to inquire with regard to an item contained in the Department of Interior budget in connection with a report on the advisability of establishing a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y., in the amount of \$10,000. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that there is included in this bill the money for this purpose and honoring the 256 Maryland heroes who fell in combat during the Battle of Brooklyn on August 27, 1776; is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the distinguished chairman and the members of his subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The clerk read as follows:

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law; \$16,000,000, and in addition, \$350,000 of the Revolving Fund for Loans, Bureau of Indian Affairs, shall be used in connection with administering loans to Indians.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question in connection with some correspondence I have received from one of my constituents asking me to find out, if I can, what has happened to the revolving fund which is now supposed to have a sum in excess of \$6 million for tribal loans. The information given to me in this letter is that there has not been one loan out of this fund since 1952; that the Indians have used this fund ever since it was established in 1934 for the purpose of helping themselves develop new resources and new business projects. Can the Chairman tell me what the status of that fund is?

Mr. KIRWAN. The fund is still there and the Indians are drawing money from it.

Mr. YATES. Is the money available and are they using it?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, it is available the same as it always has been.

Mr. YATES. The criticism is made in this letter that because of the high-interest rate and the opposition of the Secretary of the Interior, the Indians are not able to use this fund. Can the

Chairman tell me whether that is so or not?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is not so. The fund is there and is being used the same as it always has been used.

Mr. YATES. I thank the chairman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 15, after line 17, insert "Jones Point Bridge: For expenses necessary for the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River authorized by the act of August 3, 1954 (68 Stat., 963-964), \$13,825,000."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I have no serious quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations for postponing the appropriation of this \$13,825,000 by deleting it from the Department of the Interior appropriation bill even though it was recommended and requested by the Bureau of the Budget. I say that I have no serious quarrel or disagreement with the committee because I understand that based on the information that they have received, there is some confusion as to which agency has jurisdiction over the construction of this bridge and in fact there is a bill now pending before Congress to change that jurisdiction. Furthermore, I understand that there has been some confusion as to whether or not the States of Virginia and Maryland have made the necessary commitments in regard to providing their share of the cost of approaches to the bridge.

Therefore, it is my understanding that the committee is not objecting to the appropriation of these funds as such but merely to the question of whether or not this is a proper bill in which to include it and whether or not the States involved have fulfilled their obligation as required by the basic law. Because most certainly there should be no real objection to the appropriation as such for Congress has recognized their responsibility and the need for this bridge and, therefore, authorized it in the 83d Congress. In addition, the planning money of \$600,000 has been appropriated and the plan is underway. The necessary land has been acquired and this appropriation is essential in order to carry out its completion in an orderly and economical manner.

The purpose of my offering this amendment is not to flatter myself into thinking that I can get the House to approve the amendment over the objection of the Committee on Appropriations because as I stated before, in the light of the information that the committee has received, their reasons for postponing this appropriation could possibly be justified. However, I am attempting to appeal directly to the Committee on Appropriations as well as to the House in the light of more up-to-date and accurate information as to the

two points that the committee considered as their reasons.

First of all, it is true that there is a bill pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia to transfer the jurisdiction for the construction of this bridge from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce where it should be. The Committee on the District of Columbia acted on that bill this morning and I can assure you that there is certainly nothing controversial about it. As I stated before, the authority for the construction of this bridge should have been delegated to the Department of Commerce and their Bureau of Public Roads in the beginning. In addition, the pending bill referred to as stated by the Committee on Appropriations also authorizes a slight change in design by lowering the elevation of the bridge and changes the type of drawspan which will mean an estimated savings of approximately \$500,000.

There certainly should be no objection to this bill and it should be passed by the Congress in due course in the very near future. The bill was requested by the Department of Commerce during the last session of Congress but due to our crowded legislative schedule, we were unable to get to it prior to the adjournment.

In regards to the States of Virginia and Maryland not yet having made the necessary commitments insofar as approaches to the bridge are concerned, I would like to point out that there definitely must be some misunderstanding. There was testimony brought up in the meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia this morning stating that sufficient plans and commitments have been made in regard to approaches to facilitate sufficient traffic getting onto the bridge to justify its construction. In fact, the approaches on the Virginia side are almost exclusively within the city limits of Alexandria and under the jurisdiction of the city of Alexandria. The city of Alexandria has officially committed itself to all the costs of the approaches necessary to justify the construction of the bridge and reaffirmed their position before the Committee of the District of Columbia once again this morning.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman not agree that the Maryland part of the bargain is being fulfilled?

Mr. BROYHILL. Oh, yes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman further agree that in the hearings there was nothing brought out to show that Maryland and Virginia had not lived up to their part of the bargain?

Mr. BROYHILL. That is correct.

Mr. LANKFORD. And I am sure the gentleman will also agree with me that the Jones Point Bridge is badly needed, not just for the residents of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia, but for all of the thousands of visitors that we have in our Nation's Capital, because of the traffic problem we have.

Mr. BROYHILL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I appreciate his ob-

servations as well as his assistance in helping to clear up this confusion.

Now the language referred to in the basic authorizing legislation which the committee referred to in regard to the approaches is language which I, myself, proposed as an amendment to the bill. I do not state this with any pride of authorship but I felt at the time as did other Members of Congress that the States of Virginia and Maryland should be required to meet their obligation of providing adequate approaches before the bridge was constructed. Most certainly I feel and I think the Bureau of Public Roads also feels that the basic intent of this legislation has been complied with in that there are adequate approaches provided for in the plans provided by the States to sufficiently justify the construction of the bridge.

I repeat that if the Committee on Appropriations feels that this pending legislation transferring the authority for construction from the Department of Interior to the Department of Commerce makes it improper to include this appropriation in this particular appropriation bill, I will not quarrel with them. I do feel, however, that since we have previously appropriated money for the plans which are now being drawn and due to the urgent need for the construction of the bridge, we should remove these elements of confusion and uncertainty in order that the appropriation will be forthcoming this year. I call to the attention of the committee that it will take from 2½ to 3 years to construct the bridge after we get the money and the plans are completed. So, I do hope that the committee will be a little more lenient and allow the appropriation to be included in this particular bill rather than to delay it until the Department of Commerce bill is before the House which will be at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, there is \$600,000 still available for planning. They have not got the plans completed. I do not think anybody in the Congress could condemn the Committee on Appropriations for not wanting to appropriate for something that has not been completed as far as the planning is concerned. They had the money last year for the plans. We gave them a full year to go ahead. They requested \$600,000 for plans last year and they have not completed it. So I do not think the Committee on Appropriations, speaking for the members of that committee, would want to give construction money under the circumstances. As the gentleman said, they reported out a bill this morning. When that is cleared up and it goes to the proper place, in the Department of Commerce, if they will hurry a little, they will get it over on the other side. But I do not think this body should appropriate for something for which the plans are not yet finished.

I hope this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask someone whether the only obligation of the States of Virginia and

Maryland is to build the approaches to this bridge?

Mr. KIRWAN. That may be, but it was not the Committee on Appropriations that authorized the building of the Jones Point bridge in the first place.

Mr. GROSS. This proposed bridge does not touch the District of Columbia at any point.

Mr. KIRWAN. That was discussed on the floor when it was passed.

I am not arguing with the gentleman; all I am trying to say is that it is not the duty of the Appropriations Committee to appropriate money for something where the plans are not yet ready.

Mr. GROSS. I will go farther than my friend from Ohio, and say that it is not the obligation of Congress to build a bridge over the Potomac for the benefit of the States of Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will not the gentleman agree with me that this is the Federal District, that what we are now doing benefits all the people of the United States, and that it is up to this body to provide transportation, roads, and bridges for the people of the Federal District and the people of the Nation so they can get through the Federal District or go around it? This is not just a bridge for the use of Maryland and Virginia; it is for the use of the millions of people who come here to the Nation's Capital, and to relieve congestion in the downtown area.

Mr. GROSS. Following that argument to its logical conclusion, then a bridge across the Mississippi River from Iowa to Illinois is for the direct benefit of people traveling to Washington, but not one person coming here on a direct route from my hometown can cross that bridge without paying a toll. Why not make this a toll bridge at Jones Point? Let private industry build it.

Mr. LANKFORD. Because the Congress thought otherwise; and, the crossing over the Mississippi is not within the Federal District.

Mr. GROSS. Neither is this proposed bridge within the confines of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANKFORD. It is to be used for the benefit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Is it?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. It is also to be used for the particular benefit of the States of Maryland and Virginia. I am opposed to this business of building a six-lane highway bridge across the river at Alexandria, Va., connecting the States of Maryland and Virginia at the expense of all the taxpayers. Let these States build their own bridges. That is what we have to do out in our part of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I can readily understand the anxiety of our colleague [Mr.

BROYHILL, who would like to have an appropriation for this bridge in this bill, but the fact of the matter is, as the chairman has said, the plans and specifications for the bridge have not yet been completed. Also jurisdiction over the bridge will soon be taken away from the Interior Department, and lodged in the Bureau of Public Roads.

I have always held my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, in the highest regard in subscribing to the needs he thinks justify the people of his district in asking assistance from the coffers of the Treasury of the United States. No one will ever accuse him of not fighting for the welfare of his people.

But there are times such as this when a committee, this committee in the present instance, simply is not justified in providing the appropriation he would like in this bill. I would, of course, like very much to be in a position where I could say "Yes" to my friend, and yield to his pleadings, but it just cannot be done under present circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. Mr. Chairman, this is just a small matter, but I like to see consistency in our bills.

If the gentleman will look on page 36 he will notice we allow a per diem for expenses for Members serving without compensation. For the members of the Jamestown - Williamsburg - Yorktown River Commission a per diem of \$20 is allowed, but on the same page for the National Capital Planning Commission a per diem under like circumstances of only \$15 per day is allowed. It seems there should be some uniformity and particularly since both of these rates are in excess of what are allowed other people in the Government service for subsistence. Unless there is some very good reason for this I shall offer an amendment to make the two rates uniform.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, the per diem allowed is what was approved by the Bureau of the Budget according to the needs of the members of these commissions. We felt that we could rely on their judgment and that is what we approved.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think there should be some uniformity? In other words, they are serving in comparatively the same positions; they both have to eat, they both have to sleep, they both have to do all of these things and it seems to me we are making a difference between the two. If there is no other reason than that the Bureau of the Budget recommended it, I shall offer an amendment to reduce the \$20 to \$15 a day so that the rates will be uniform within the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 36, line 2, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$15."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 21, noes 44. So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO INSERT CERTAIN STATEMENTS AND EXCERPTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain statements and excerpts immediately preceding the passage of a resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLISON] today, authorizing funds for the Select Committee on Small Business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, southern California spokesmen had adopted the attitude of the arrogant Marie Antoinette in their attempt to prevent the four States of the upper Colorado River Basin from using water rightly theirs.

Southern California's new reply to the thirsty residents of four sovereign States is: "Let them make rain."

I have here a copy of a report published February 14, 1956, in the Los Angeles Times. My hope is that the Members of the House will receive the "let them make rain" advice as the French peasant did Marie's famed "let them eat cake" dismissal of their starvation. The article to which I refer reads as follows:

STUDY SPURS APPEAL FOR DAM DELAY—CLOUD SEEDING IN UPPER COLORADO AREA TERMED PRACTICAL

Delay by Congress in the controversial billion-dollar upper Colorado River project was urged yesterday as the result of a Presidential committee's just released report.

The report is that of President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

It stated that production of additional rainfall by cloud seeding is a practical and established scientific fact.

As a result, an urgent appeal was made in California yesterday that Congress hold off an impending vote on the upper Colorado River project until the possibilities of creating additional rain in the Colorado Basin are studied.

REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE

The plea came from Jacqueline Cochran Odum, of Indio, aviatrix and Republican candidate for Congress in the 29th Congressional District, which includes Imperial and Riverside Counties—an area that would be tremendously hard hit by the upper Colorado River project. Present United States Representative of the district is JOHN PHILLIPS who is retiring after this term.

Great interest in the report of the President's committee was voiced in Washington yesterday by Representative PHILLIPS.

"It has been the view of many western Congressmen that the amount of water available is a key factor in the Colorado River situation," he said.

HAPPY SOLUTION

"That is why we have wanted a determination of many factors in the Supreme Court before attempting a decision on the upper Colorado River matter. Now, from the report on the President's Committee on Weather Control, it appears that the upper Colorado River Basin States are offered a happy solution through scientific additions to their rainfall.

"Therefore, it appears that action on any upper Colorado River bill should be deferred pending a full investigation of this possibly advantageous solution which would be welcomed by all of us."

Strong endorsement of the request for delay came yesterday afternoon from Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of Long Beach, who was in New Jersey for a Lincoln Day dinner. HOSMER said he will present the matter to Congressmen in Washington today and urge further studies of the cloud-seeding idea as a preliminary to any consideration of the upper Colorado River measure.

PAUL WAMSLEY

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, Paul Wamsley will be sorely missed, not only by us in Buffalo, but by advocates of the principles of Americanism throughout the Nation. Here was a man hailed as the ideal American, a man nationally recognized for his leadership in the

American Legion's fight against communism.

Best of all, he practiced his precepts of Americanism from a vantage point unequalled for effectiveness, because Paul Wamsley was for 32 years prior to his untimely death, principal of our School 51. Who can gage the value of his contributions to the youth of our area from that important point of influence? His programs of Americanism brought national recognition to both himself and the school.

His Know Your America Week, which he originated in Buffalo in 1951, is observed today in hundreds of communities. This is but one of countless contributions which Paul Wamsley made, but he will probably be best remembered for his genial and friendly personality, and his warm and ready smile.

It is rare that we are privileged to know a man who contributed so significantly to the public awareness of the ideals of Americanism, which we all hold so dear.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, upon several occasions President Eisenhower has made the remark that the overseas information job was too great for Government to do alone. Victory in this battle for men's minds demands the cooperation of individual American citizens, of business groups, and of all our many private organizations.

In line with this thinking, the United States Information Agency has created an Office of Private Cooperation, with the specific assignment of helping individuals and groups who wish to carry on such programs, and of stimulating widespread interest in such activities.

The projects already in operation include letterwriting, overseas advertising, mail inserts, exhibits, town affiliations, book and magazine collections, and tourist orientation.

The Information Agency feels, however, that as yet it has scratched only the surface in this field. American know-how in public relations has yet to make the contribution it can and should.

The Agency hopes this year to step up this program, and will launch a vigorous campaign to interest potential participants. It is my personal belief that there are a great number of persons and groups who need only to be reminded of their responsibilities in this field. And it is a responsibility. All Americans have a stake in the issue. It could well mean their personal survival. It certainly concerns the survival of freedom, as we know it, not only in this country but the world.

It is my hope that the United States Information Agency will go ahead with

its plans, and the means to do so will be provided.

It seems very obvious that Communist leaders have decided that they do not now want a war in which their people would be directly involved. I say now, because they, undoubtedly, would be willing to risk a war if they were certain they could win. The uncertainty of success, however, holds them back. Communists are not gamblers. They may be fanatics, but it is a calculating fanaticism. They never attack unless the odds are on their side.

It seems equally clear, however, that they have not abandoned their ambitions. Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Communist Party boss, for one, has been very frank upon that point. You will remember him saying last September, "If anyone believes our smiles"—they were still smiling at the time—"involve abandoning the teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he deceives himself but poorly."

Other Communist leaders have been, and are, equally candid. The struggle between international communism and the free way of life will not be relaxed for one moment.

Having abandoned force, and the threat of force, the Communists are placing their hopes on ideological tactics. The greatest "war for men's minds" in all history is now on.

The Communists think they can win this kind of war. They are today highly confident. They have had forty-odd years of experience in the field and they think their opponents either cannot or will not make the effort necessary for victory. Frankly, they believe, and I think honestly believe, we just haven't got what it takes to make the sacrifices demanded.

It is up to us to show them that we have. And I know we have if we will only face the facts. President Eisenhower, however, put it very aptly when he said in the state of the Union message that we would win this struggle only if we were willing to devote to the effort the same resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency, that we in the past had mustered in times of war.

The increased appropriation asked by the President will give the United States Information Agency the support it must have. Half measures in this struggle will not win. It is an all-out fight and we must take all-out measures.

If we face the fact that this is a war, I do not think we will hesitate one moment. Our weakness, as the Communists know well, is that we are not facing this fact.

I do not believe that we can afford not to give the President what he has asked.

WE SHOULD INVITE MORE ITALIANS TO SETTLE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Italian people contribute some of the best qualities in the making of our common American citizenship.

We, in Massachusetts, know this to be true from our own personal experience.

All of us have cherished friends, whose ancestors came from Italy. Their hospitality, their loyalty, their expressive intelligence ranging over all the arts, and their true devotion to religion and democracy warm our hearts.

We would like to welcome more of their friends and relatives from the old country. For we know that they would find happy fulfillment here. In so doing, they would also enrich our American way of life, as we make progress, hand in hand.

But there is a law on the book that prevents us from inviting more Italians to come across the ocean and to live here with us.

It is known as the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

That law was passed during the Korean war.

In its concern for shaping an immigration policy that would protect our national security, it naturally reflected some of the high-tension fears and prejudices of that period.

It also failed to revise the old-fashioned and unfair quota system that was established in 1924.

Under this quota system only 154,657 immigrants from all countries are permitted to take up residence in the United States each year.

This formula is based upon the 1920 population of the United States.

Even in 1924, it was heavily weighted in favor of immigrants from the countries of northern Europe.

But the people from these countries do not want to come to the United States. Year after year, their quotas are not used up.

Furthermore, these balances are not transferred to other countries whose quotas are oversubscribed.

It is my belief that the people of Italy, Greece, Poland, and Lithuania should be given the opportunity to emigrate to the United States under these unused quotas.

In addition, the total quota should be increased, based upon the 1950 census, because our country is much richer and stronger than it was in 1924 and is thus able to provide more opportunities for immigrants.

The President, in his special message to Congress on this subject February 8, 1956, recommended improvements in our immigration law. Among other points, he emphasized the advisability of admitting 65,000 more quota immigrants each year, bringing the total to about 220,000 admissions annually.

Furthermore, he recommended that the Congress provide, separately from the increased annual quota, for the admission of 5,000 aliens annually without regard to nationality or nation origin.

Use of these numbers would enable us to meet some of the needs of this country

which develop from time to time for persons with special skills and cultural or technical qualifications.

Finally, he advised a change in the private bill system of handling and providing relief for individual immigration cases. In the last session of Congress, out of a total of 880 bills passed, 413 dealt with private immigration measures. This interferes with the consideration of more urgent national problems. The President recommends that the Attorney General be given the administrative authority to pass these hardship cases. Such discretion should be limited to aliens with close relatives in this country, to veterans, and to functionaries of religious organizations, regardless of the technical statutory ground on which the alien is inadmissible, or subject to deportation.

My good friend on the Republican side of the House Judiciary Committee introduced several bills covering these improvements for the administration.

On the Democratic side, I have filed identical bills.

Italy is overcrowded.

Despite great efforts by the Italian Government, with some assistance from the United States, over 10 percent of the population is unemployed.

There are beautiful shops and apartments in Rome, but in southern Italy a man considers himself lucky if he can earn \$150 a year.

Emigration is the only answer.

The United States, traditional friend of Italy, and indebted to her for a great religious and democratic and cultural heritage, must open her arms to friends in need.

We must work for a more liberal and humane immigration law.

That will permit more Italians to come to the United States today to strengthen our American society of tomorrow.

AN APPEAL FOR THE MIDDLEWAY ON THE SCHOOL BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, events of the last 10 days have demonstrated unmistakably that the paramount domestic issue confronting us is not the income of farmers, but the more momentous problem of furnishing wise guidance and leadership which will preserve our Constitution and ensure the gradual but orderly integration of our schools as decreed by the Supreme Court.

It is plain now that the Congress itself must face up to this issue when the school construction—Kelley—bill is placed on our agenda. I know that many Members are sorely perplexed by the dilemma posed by this bill and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. Speaker, compromise is the indispensable working tool of this body, and I have asked to address the House today in order to ask if there is not an honorable, middle-ground alternative to our colleague's amendment—some proposal which might enable us to simultaneously

build the schools our children so desperately need and implement the mandate of the Court.

Last week the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] suggested in a speech on the floor that my bill, H. R. 6803, has the essential features of such a compromise. If on further thought I am convinced that this measure can win support it will be my purpose to offer it at the proper time as a middle-way alternative.

First, let me say that I did not conceive this legislation as a vehicle for compromise. It was prepared and submitted last June as separate legislation without regard for the Kelley bill. However, shortly after it was introduced, our colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL] discerned its worth and at one time he agreed to withdraw his amendment if the House Committee on Education and Labor would incorporate this idea into the Kelley bill. Unfortunately, such a compromise was not consummated, and the committee bill did not take cognizance of the school desegregation question.

AID TO INTEGRATION VS. POWELL AMENDMENT

Subsequently, our colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL] undertook to broaden his amendment to include some of the concepts embodied in H. R. 6803. However, I have carefully studied his amendment and it is plain that its aid-to-integration features are largely meaningless and unworkable in the context of the Kelley bill itself. Therefore, I believe Members should have an opportunity to consider H. R. 6803, slightly amended, as an alternative to the Powell amendment.

I think my colleague and I are agreed that Congress cannot ignore decisions of the Supreme Court in writing school construction legislation. We differ only in our concepts of the role that the legislative arm of government should play.

As I read his amendment, in essence my colleague would deny school construction funds to States that are unable to affirm compliance with the requirements of the Supreme Court. On the other hand, my aid-to-integration amendment would set up a special program to provide massive aid for communities affected by the Court's decision; further, it would fix responsibility on the Federal Government to construct outright all new school facilities required by school districts which are carrying out, or are prepared to carry out, integration programs. My amendment would contain no prohibition, and the eligibility of noncomplying areas would be left for determination by the courts acting within the framework of the Supreme Court decisions.

But let me explain more fully the philosophy which underlies the program embodied in H. R. 6803:

THE PHILOSOPHY OF H. R. 6803

First of all, this amendment would incorporate and put to use the well-tested Federal impact principle which is already imbedded in the policies of the Congress. Even more important, it adopts the major premise that local communities are sovereign in school matters, and that integration will succeed best on a school district by school district basis.

For more than a half a century many of our States—including my own—legally maintained dual-school systems under explicit sanction by our highest court. This constitutional interpretation was reaffirmed many times over the years and school boards built separate school facilities under its shelter. When, after 58 years, the Supreme Court declared the legal illegal, much of these capital expenditures were thereby wasted, and more, urgent new requirements for school housing were created.

And as a result of this decision, southern communities face a task of tremendous scope. They must reorganize and unify their entire school systems—a most difficult and expensive assignment. Unquestionably, this expense and the tremendous attendant social problems, are directly the result of Federal action—the decisions of the Supreme Court. These communities should not be expected or required to implement these decisions unaided. I propose that the entire country assist in the task.

A COMPARISON PUBLIC LAW 815

Clearly these decisions of the judicial arm of our Government produce a Federal impact equal to, or greater than, the defense activities recognized by Congress when Public Law 815—our existing school-aid legislation—was passed. Is it fair or just to expect those who erected physical facilities relying in good faith on existing constitutional law to bear the burden alone of revising their physical plant to conform to the new constitutional requirements? We must agree that there is a national duty arising out of these facts. Federal aid will lift a large portion of this crushing tax burden from local communities and will strengthen the hand of those good citizens who have the courage and statesmanship to tackle the onerous task of making integration work.

Indeed, the case for Federal aid here is far stronger than under the defense-impact program, for our national-defense activities have carried with them certain long-range compensating factors—payrolls, and eventually a larger tax base—which are wholly absent in the impact of integration.

This national duty is emphasized, too, by the fact that under dual school systems many of the schools for Negro children have been markedly substandard. If we are really interested, then, in successfully implementing the Court's decisions, we should guard against any program which would result in a leveling down of our schools. It is obvious that only under a substantial Federal-aid program such as I have outlined can we ensure that the standards of the whole system will be raised, and thus protect the integrity of our educational enterprise.

Following the Public Law 815 pattern, this program would consist of outright grants without a matching requirement, and local school districts ready to carry out integration programs would apply for aid directly to Washington free from hindrance by State, or other, officials. This amendment would become title V of Public Law 815, and would thus employ the proven administrative machinery and personnel of a going program.

COOPERATION AND NOT COMPELSION

Most important, the enactment of this legislation would be warm-hearted testimony to the communities concerned that the entire country is sympathetically interested and is willing to bear a major part of the entailed financial burden. Instead of engendering bitterness by taxing southern citizens to build schools in other States, as the Powell amendment would do, the reverse principle would apply as testimony of national concern.

Those southern leaders who are driven by fear of punitive Federal action would be disarmed by such a program as this. In short, I propose that instead of self-righteous criticism, the rest of the country would hold out a helping hand. Instead of threats, we would use understanding. In place of compulsion, we would offer cooperation.

These, then, are some of the middle-way principles which form the framework of H. R. 6803.

DESEGREGATION PATTERNS: FALL OF 1955

Integration programs were voluntarily initiated last fall in school districts of nine States, and the most striking fact which emerges from a study of these successful desegregation efforts is that final decisions were invariably left to local school officials, and were frankly dealt with as problems of educational management. In all of the nine States the issue was utterly divorced from politics. In my opinion, too few words of praise have been said for the wise restraint exercised by the holders of public office in these States: they did not protest, most did not intervene in any way, they simply honored and acquiesced in the decision of our highest tribunal.

It is clear, if last fall's experience is any guide, that success will follow wherever local sovereignty is recognized and politics is kept out. It is this district-by-district approach which H. R. 6803 seeks to foster.

Lastly, in all earnestness, I should like to raise one remaining, grave question. I do not profess to know the answer to this inquiry, and I propound it only to encourage a rethinking of a central issue.

SOME UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

I should like with all respect to ask the gentleman from New York this question: Will the cause of school integration, as contemplated by the Supreme Court, be served by the passage of his amendment?

I know some advocates have argued that placing his directive in the school construction bill would break the defiance of the dissident Southern States. Perhaps so. But others argue, with equal force, that such action would inevitably breed defiance and delay action. I submit that these two points of view should be weighed with care.

Other related questions must also worry the conscientious Congressman:

First. Will the enactment of punitive legislation at this time strengthen or weaken the moderates in the communities of the South?

Second. In the months to come, will the deep-seated attitudes and emotions which lie at the root of this problem respond most readily to the human-rela-

tions approach, or the legislative approach?

Third. Is there anything which will do more to seal the ultimate defeat of the opponents of integration than quiet, orderly desegregation programs carried out in neighboring States or counties?

Fourth. Will moderate, constructive action by Congress tend to relax or intensify the growing tensions in some southern areas? It is a singular fact, I think, that the two leading middle-way spokesmen on this issue—the President and Mr. Stevenson—are criticized severely by the extremists on both sides.

CONCLUSIONS

It is my belief that what we need in our land today is a fresh uprising of that spirit of moderation which has always been the saving quality of our American way of life. This spirit partakes of patience and tolerance, and above all it seeks to understand and work with the minds and hearts of men.

In times not unlike our own, at an earlier stage of this identical controversy, an immortal American expressed this spirit in these simple words: "With malice toward none, with charity for all."

Can we recapture that spirit today? I fear we may miscalculate unless we recognize that an honorable solution of our present impasse in the days to come may rest more on the answer to this question than on edicts or laws that this body may enact.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. At the outset, I should like to say I deeply appreciate the gentleman's approach to this problem, but I want to point out also that I fear that other problems arise with the adoption of his amendment. Unless I misunderstand it, I question how the funds are going to be disbursed. Are they going to go through the department of education in a State, or are they going to go directly from the Federal Government to the school district that is co-operating?

Mr. UDALL. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. Let me clarify it, if I can. Under the Kelley bill the State educational agencies would handle the funds, as I know the gentleman is aware. Under my bill we would earmark a portion of the funds appropriated by the Kelley bill, perhaps \$25 to \$50 million annually. These funds would then be administered under Public Law 815, with which I am sure the gentleman is familiar. Application for funds would be made in accordance with the present practice, directly to the Commissioner of education, and the local school districts would deal, as they now do, directly with the Federal Government, as far as these funds were concerned.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Then in effect with the adoption of the gentleman's amendment you could override an organization set up by any State?

Mr. UDALL. It would have this effect, to use an example. The people across the river in Arlington, Va., for instance, and in Fairfax County, where I happen

to live, are apparently ready to go ahead with integration programs. However, the officials in their State appear at the moment to be heading in another direction. Those people under the Kelley bill—and if the amendment of the gentleman from New York were passed—would not be able to get any funds. Under my bill they would apply directly to the commissioner of education for assistance. So, we would treat it on a district-by-district basis instead of treating it as a State problem which, in my opinion, it is not. If we are going to solve this problem, I believe it will be solved by people sitting down together in the communities affected and producing workable programs, not by legislation that we may pass. However, the Congress can assist in some ways, and that is what this program proposes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. My whole point is that you would be bypassing the State department of education in any State.

Mr. UDALL. That is true so far as this supplemental program is concerned.

To supplement my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to append the following factual data and commentaries: A Report Card—Progress of the States Toward School Desegregation, from Time magazine of September 19, 1955; a progress report on school desegregation, from U. S. News & World Report of September 9, 1955; a column by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 18, 1956; and an editorial published in the New York Times today.

[From Time magazine of September 19, 1955]

REPORT CARD—PROGRESS OF THE STATES
TOWARD SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

As the new school year began, 17 Southern and border States had widely varying records of compliance with the Supreme Court's order to enforce desegregation with all deliberate speed. The States' report cards:

Alabama, grade F: "Not one of the school boards has made any move to try to work out anything," a top Negro attorney correctly reports. The Alabama State Legislature recently enacted a placement bill, over the veto of Gov. James ("Klissin' Jim") Folsom, empowering local school boards to place pupils in schools upon such considerations as "the psychological qualifications of the pupil for the type of teaching and associations involved . . . the possibility of breaches of peace or ill will or economic retaliation within the community."

Arkansas, grade C plus: "It is a problem that must be left to the people of the local districts to solve," said Gov. Orval E. Faubus. Four of the State's 228 interracial school districts are integrating this fall, moving 49 Negro children in, along with about 2,170 whites. Little Rock (population 102,213) will integrate its 24 percent Negro student population in the high schools in 1957, the junior high schools in 1958. The University of Arkansas held its first integrated summer session this year.

Delaware, grade C: In Wilmington (population 110,356), 13 city schools will integrate this fall; 900 Negro students will attend formerly all-white schools, while 50 whites will attend all-Negro schools. In New Castle County (Wilmington), 14 out of 20 school boards intend to integrate. But in Kent and Sussex Counties, officials of only 1 (the city of Dover) out of 27 white school districts intend to heed the Supreme Court.

Florida, grade D: State law prohibits the mixing of races in schools, but on three bases of the United States Air Force, white

and Negro pupils will integrate this fall. Negro parents have filed petitions for integration in four counties.

Georgia, grade F: No desegregation anywhere.

Kentucky, grade B plus: Gov. Lawrence Wetherby and his education officials promise to enact the Supreme Court mandate. Out of 224 school districts, including that of Lexington, 20 or 25 will integrate this fall. Louisville (pop. 369,129), where Jim Crow barriers are fast crumbling, will integrate in 1956. Segregation bars are down at all the State colleges and most private colleges and universities.

Louisiana, grade F: State schools will not be integrated this fall, or in the foreseeable future. New Orleans Catholic authorities will not integrate their parochial schools this year. The Louisiana State legislature voted \$100,000 to hire attorneys to contest integration lawsuits at every level.

Maryland, grade B minus: In Baltimore (pop. 949,708), formal integration of the city schools is 1 year old, although only about 4 percent of Negro pupils are actually in mixed schools. Statewide, 8 out of 22 counties with mixed populations plan to integrate this fall; several others will integrate next year. Maryland will also integrate its five State teachers' colleges before the end of 1955. Last week in Washington County, where the Union won the victory at Antietam that encouraged President Lincoln to publish his Emancipation Proclamation, 73 Negro children registered for all-white schools. Maryland's Eastern Shore, however, contrives to preserve segregation by devious means; e. g., two counties run school buses only along last year's routes so that Negroes have to attend their old segregated schools or walk.

Mississippi, grade F: No move to desegregate.

Missouri, grade A: State education authorities estimate that 55,000 (80 percent of Missouri's Negro children are now studying alongside 550,000 whites; there has been no friction.

North Carolina, grade C minus: Gov. Luther Hodges' idea is that whites and Negroes should combine to make what he calls "a voluntary choice of separate schools"; he threatens to close public schools rather than desegregate them. Some industrial cities—Charlotte, Greensboro, Durham—have appointed committees to study the Supreme Court decision. A Federal court ruled last week that the University of North Carolina must process the applications of three Negro undergraduates.

Oklahoma, grade B plus: "I think without question we are in advance of any other [southern] State," said a Negro newspaper editor in Oklahoma City, adding: "I am utterly surprised." At least 88 out of 1,802 school districts will integrate in Oklahoma this week, including Oklahoma City and Tulsa. All 18 of the State universities and colleges plan to integrate this fall. Much of this impetus comes from Gov. Raymond Gary, who insists that his State will not defy the Supreme Court, and from Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Oliver Hodge. Says Hodge: "Our attitude is that they're all just children." One Oklahoma problem: Most integrated classes are awarded to white teachers, throwing about 200 Negro teachers out of work.

South Carolina, grade F: South Carolina's general assembly is on record to the effect that (1) school districts permitting integration will be denied State funds, (2) races must not intermingle in public buildings. The NAACP has filed 17 petitions asking school districts to carry out the full intent of the United States Supreme Court decree.

Tennessee, grade C: On October 17, a Federal court in Memphis (population 396,000), will try an NAACP test lawsuit designed to admit 5 Negro undergraduates to Memphis State College, about 85 percent of whose

students are said to favor the move. Tennessee intends gradually to integrate all six of its State-supported colleges. Nashville has a committee studying integration; Chattanooga recently voted for integration, but not this year. Federal-run Oak Ridge (population 30,229) has the only integrated school system in the State.

Texas, grade C plus: San Antonio (population 408,442), where 2 Negro slaves survived the siege of the Alamo, opened its 94 schools to 5,995 Negro children this week. More than 60 out of the State's 2,000 school districts—including El Paso, Corpus Christi, and Austin—will begin to integrate this fall; Dallas (population 434,462), plans to integrate at an indefinite date. Houston (population 596,163), indicates an intent to comply. Every branch of the University of Texas will be open to Negroes in the fall of 1956.

Virginia, grade D plus: Gov. Thomas B. Stanley says that he will "use every legal power at my command to continue segregated schools." His State Commission on Public Education is examining legal ways of preventing integration. Prince Edward County operates white schools on a month-to-month funding basis, ready to shutdown rather than desegregate. Norfolk (population 213,513), proclaims that it intends to uphold the Supreme Court decision, but State law forbids it. Richmond recently dropped a pilot plan to integrate a few Negroes into white junior high schools.

West Virginia, grade A minus: About 35 of the State's 55 counties will begin to integrate this fall. Ten counties have no Negroes, and nine continue to run segregated all-white and all-Negro schools. Charleston (population 73,501), integrated its schools' 1st, 2d, and 7th grades last week, reported that all went well.

[From U. S. News & World Report of September 9, 1955]

Delaware: 15 of 62 school districts plan to integrate this autumn. State board of education is pressing for integration.

Maryland: Baltimore mixed schools last year. Seven Maryland counties plan partial integration this year.

West Virginia: 29 counties have integrated, in whole or part. Five others are desegregating this year. Of remaining 21 counties, 10 have no Negroes and 11 have not started integrating.

Kentucky: At least 10 counties and 4 cities are integrating this year. State policy is to mix schools elsewhere as soon as possible.

Tennessee: Only Oak Ridge, Federal town, is desegregating this year. State is leaving integration of schools up to local communities.

Missouri: 80 percent of Negro pupils are to be in integrated school districts this autumn. Integrated districts will include Kansas City and nearly all of St. Louis.

Arkansas: Four communities are mixing schools voluntarily. Problem is being left to local communities.

Oklahoma: State policy is to integrate. Eighty-eight school districts plan some degree of integration. Oklahoma City is to mix schools completely.

Texas: More than 60 districts have ordered a start toward integration. No immediate plans in east Texas, where most Negroes live.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 18, 1956]

EXPLOSIVE SCHOOL ISSUE (By Marquis Childs)

The widening breach over integration of the races in the public schools is now seen to threaten not only the proposed Federal school construction bill but many current programs under which much-needed aid goes to the States.

It can extend so far as to halt many functions of Government considered essential to the Nation's welfare.

With the growing bitterness fostered by extremists on both sides, there is talk of legislative action to prevent funds for current grant-in-aid programs going to the five Southern States refusing to comply with the Supreme Court's order. This could mean a stop to the aid to vocational education, the school lunch program and the federally supported hospital construction program.

Pushed to even further extremes, the ever increasing hostility could block Federal support for highway construction. After all, in the South segregated buses run on the highways and on construction jobs there is racial discrimination.

The gravity of what can happen should serve as a warning to politicians who would exploit this issue for their own political purposes.

The Republicans can put the Democrats on the spot but at the same time they can help to set race against race and region against region in an atmosphere that has begun to generate something like the hatreds that led to the terrible tragedy of civil war a century ago.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Gov. Averell Harriman may serve their own political ends by their recent use of the school-race issue, but they do the country a deep disservice by bringing it up at this time.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., Democrat, New York, who is pressing his amendment to the school-construction bill, which would deny funds to school districts that fail to initiate integration, suggests that it may be necessary to take similar action with current aid programs.

After all, he points out, the five Southern States that set their State rights above Federal authority on this issue, get about \$75 million a year in grants-in-aid for education and hospital construction. This is more than the estimated \$68 million a year they would get under the school-construction bill.

So while POWELL has not made a final decision, he may feel compelled to offer prohibiting amendments to appropriations for these purposes.

The political pattern of response to the Powell amendment has been set by the Republican leaders in the House. Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, and CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, declared for the amendment to the school-construction bill. Having taken this stand, they could hardly, in all logic, refuse to follow POWELL if he decides to try to stop current funds going to States practicing segregation.

That is the easy political out. The southerners, led by such violent extremists as Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, respond with a filibuster and the legislation is killed.

But a compromise solution can be found if there is any real desire to get Federal help in building desperately needed schools. A proposal has been put forward by Representative STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, Arizona, which, he says, he will reintroduce on the floor when the Powell amendment is brought up.

The Udall amendment provides that part of the money voted for school construction be earmarked for direct aid to areas where the problem of integration is especially costly and difficult because of a large Negro population and where integration has been initiated.

It recognizes that most Negro schools have been substandard and that to raise or even maintain the level of education under integration funds must be spent for new classrooms.

Under the Udall proposal, this would be done by amending Public Law 815, which has served to cushion the effect in defense-impact areas where huge Government installations

put a heavy and uninvited burden on local facilities.

This middle-ground solution contains no prohibition against Federal funds going to districts that refuse to integrate. But legal action could be taken to challenge the right of the Government to send Federal money into areas that deny the jurisdiction of the integration order. The courts then could pass on the question.

The Eisenhower administration has held that it does not have the power to withhold funds without either a ruling by the courts or a specific prohibition written into the law as is proposed under the Powell amendment.

The political battle lines in this explosive issue are clear enough. At the end of the road is a frightening kind of showdown that can only mean more hatred and violence and a reversal of the progress achieved in recent years.

What is not clear, perhaps because it has received so little consideration either in or out of Congress, is the course of a reasonable compromise which should draw the support of all men of good will.

[From the New York Times of February 21, 1956]

MR. POWELL'S AMENDMENT

The unhappy confusion between the Federal-aid-to-schools program and the Supreme Court's desegregation decision continues to block the former without advancing the latter. The two questions are separate and they ought to be treated separately. If they are not, only the children of our country will be the losers.

The board of directors of the National Education Association has just unanimously expressed its agreement with this view. While endorsing the need for Federal appropriations "to help relieve the critical school-building shortages throughout the country," the board at its Atlantic City meeting firmly opposed the Powell amendment, which would deny Federal funds to any locality that failed to integrate its schools. The practical reason is clear: If the Powell amendment is adopted in the House, as it may be, the chances for any Federal aid to education to get through the Senate are considered nil.

There are other reasons, too. As we have previously stated, we believe the Powell amendment represents the wrong approach to the integration problem. In a message in an adjoining column Mr. POWELL takes exception to our suggestion that the purpose of his amendment might be achieved through a suit in the Federal courts. He cites a 1923 Supreme Court decision rejecting the effort of a taxpayer to prevent the appropriation of Federal funds to enforce an allegedly unconstitutional law (to help the States reduce infant mortality). But the present situation is so different from that one—not to mention the fact that the Court is so different—that we cannot share Mr. POWELL's certainty that a suit in this case would be thrown out. Furthermore, there are many other ways of attacking the problem.

Representative METCALF, former justice of the Montana supreme court, suggests that it would be the duty of the administration to withhold school-aid funds from States that had clearly and unequivocally expressed their defiance of the Supreme Court; and with this would go the corollary that the officers of a State so affected could sue for its share of the funds. A different approach is that of Representative UDALL, of Arizona, who instead of barring Federal funds from segregated States would give extra and direct Federal help to those areas that are conscientiously making an effort to integrate their schools. In any case, if there is to be a Federal school-aid program at all, it ought to contain no such punitive features as are embodied in the Powell amendment.

RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, unless the Interstate Commerce Commission rules otherwise, another increase in railroad freight rates will go into effect on Saturday, February 25. That increase will injuriously affect a number of United States industries, but the impact will be greatest on our farms and in our coal mines and on the people who work in these industries.

At the start, let me explain that the so-called record level of business activity, about which we are hearing so much, has not by any means gravitated into all of our mining communities and agricultural areas. There is ample evidence, in Department of Labor statistics, of widespread unemployment in sections of our industrial States. These conditions may not be generally understood, but members of the House who represent coal-producing areas have evidence of serious economic distress that is going to persist unless Congress does something to alleviate the situation.

I have introduced H. R. 7902, a bill to provide Federal assistance to labor surplus areas and I am hopeful that action can be taken on this legislation as expeditiously as possible in order that the impoverishment to which our people in these areas are subjected will be terminated without delay. Meanwhile Congress should acquaint itself with the factors that contribute to the hold-down of industrial activity, so that we may be in a better position to make whatever recommendations are necessary. We must also be ready to enact legislation where feasible, in cases where the executive department is deficient in providing for the welfare of the people.

The case of increasing freight rates has in the past several years assumed mounting significance. The coal industry, as you know, after declining to a 20-year low in production for 1954, experienced an encouraging upturn last year. The rise in output immediately prompted most economists and fuel experts to predict that the coal industry had definitely hit bottom and would continue its upward spiral long into the future. There is no basis for challenging these prognostications as far as coal's job of supplying its share of the energy load is concerned. We who represent coal-producing States have said many times that the coal industry will move forward under its own power if inequitable competitive practices are eliminated.

For a number of years following World War II foreign residual oil began to encroach upon the Nation's coal markets to the extent that losses were eventually felt as far west as the Mississippi River. Coal which normally moved into the east coast began to back up into other marketing areas and resulted in depressed conditions throughout the top coal-producing States.

Last year Congress finally took one remedial step by incorporating into the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act a provision ordering the executive de-

partment to hold oil imports at a level in proportion to 1954 figures. While this legislation has proved to be inadequate, it nevertheless served notice on importing companies that Congress would not tolerate a continued grab of the United States fuel markets. As a consequence, coal has returned to a number of the electric utilities and heavy industrial plants that had begun to look to sources abroad for fuel supplies. It is my hope that we shall at the current session adopt an import quota that will be less vague and flexible than the proviso now in effect. Meanwhile, though production has risen, there still are 51,000 persons in my congressional district receiving Government surplus food and a greater percentage of these recipients are unemployed coal miners and their families. This is an era of presumed general prosperity. What is America going to do to enable these unemployed citizens to return to gainful employment?

I consider it extremely unfortunate that the railroads found it necessary to petition for a rate increase at this time. The new rates come within a few months of the Interstate Commerce Commission's decision to make permanent a substantial rate increase that was originally scheduled to expire on the last day of last year. Obviously, under the burden of higher delivered prices brought about by a greater tariff on coal transportation, the coal industry could lose many of the gains attained in the past 12 months. What is more, any anticipated further progress is in danger of immediate liquidation as a result of the higher price in freight traffic.

Perhaps the time has come when the Congress should draw up a directive to the Interstate Commerce Commission emphasizing our disappointment at the Commission's failure to find some means of meeting railroad demands for increased revenue other than through ever-rising assessments on the coal industry. My own feeling, after preliminary examination is that we must come to grips with that phase of railroad economics responsible for continuance of costly services that now should be classified as anachronistic. Many of the railroad people themselves agree that tradition alone has forced the roads to retain some services which produce only greater and greater deficits.

On January 20 an item in the Wall Street Journal reported that a Midwest railroad had been denied authority to halt passenger service on a 267-mile line, in intrastate traffic, which accounted for a loss of more than \$700,000 annually. Permission to stop this service has been sought by the railroad for the past 15 months, yet day after day, week after week, month after month, the road has been forced under law to continue these services so devastating to the operational budget.

The \$700,000 per annum loss must of necessity be made up elsewhere. If such were not the case, the railroad would not long be in business. The line is thus forced, in effect, to collect subsidies from other services, and on any line which penetrates a mining or farm district, coal and agricultural products necessarily become the fall guy. It is a

strange way to run a railroad, but the company presumably has no alternative so long as the State commission persists in inflicting parochial opinions on our transportation system.

While the Interstate Commerce Commission cannot be held responsible for the particular case which I have just cited, I feel that the Commission could contribute toward an alleviation of this situation if it were required by law to take cognizance of the injurious influence of the present rate structure on the coal and agricultural industries and on areas of the country dependent upon them for economic survival.

Action should be taken now by changing its order and disallowing the freight-rate increase scheduled to go into effect on February 25, 1956.

ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP CUSHING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an address by Archbishop Cushing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, here is the address by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, before the brotherhood dinner of the Lowell B'nai B'rith, Benjamin S. Pouzzner Lodge, at the Lowell Hebrew Community Center:

My dear friends, with emotion too deep for utterance, with mingled gratitude and pride, I receive this award with sincere humility.

For tonight doing me this great honor—you do yourselves greater honor; because truly all the kind things that have been said of me tonight describe me more graciously than accurately, more generously than exactly. Tonight you have been describing me not indeed just as I am, but with a moving generosity of spirit, as I wish I were, as I pray daily and try daily to be. But in thus too generously picturing me—you have portrayed yourselves as you are. This award is indeed an idealized painting of me, but of you who have made it, and whose presence here tonight approve it, it is in deepest reality as a clear mirror wherein your true selves are reflected.

For as no man can talk about another without revealing to an intelligent listener much of himself, so in describing me, you have truly revealed yourselves. Every kind and magnanimous word said here about me, said more the speaker, and of all of you whose applause endorsed and approved the generous sentiments so eloquently phrased and written. For in invisible yet indelible ink, between the lines of this tribute, is written for angels to read the bigness of heart and the broadness of mind, the dynamic and inspiring Americanism, the true Godliness, of those who voted for and prepared this award; and of all here assembled, men of all faiths, who have come here in support and approval of this Hebrew community's most gracious gesture.

VERY SAME VIRTUE

Nominating, as it has this year, a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, a priest and servant of God—naming me as its choice, as man of the year, for exemplary and outstanding good will and good service to men of all creeds—this Hebrew Brotherhood has not

nominated—but proved itself, the Hebrew community group of the year, for the very same virtues. This award you have bestowed upon me tonight, I firmly believe, God gives to each and every one of you in the Book of Eternal Life.

Surely in Heaven before the throne of your God and mine, the erudite Master of the Talmud sings your praises. He once said of the good man, as written in that inspiring book, *In Time and Eternity*, edited by Nahum Glatzer, a great Jewish scholar, and rendered into noble English by Olga Marx, another Jewish scholar of note, "Let the good man increase peace with his brothers, with his relatives, and with every man, even with the stranger in the market place, that he may be beloved above and desired below, and well received by all creatures."

In all this anxious, war-weary, confused, and care-burdened world are there any men more futile and stupid than those who clamor for world peace, and whisper for discrimination and discord in their own neighborhoods? The roads to world peace is the street where we ourselves live. The first steps to world peace are steps to the stranger in need or the sorrowful next door, be his race or religion what it may.

There is a pathetic story of an unemployed Negro wearily filling out still another application for employment. When he came to the question, What is your race?, with unconscious irony he wrote down, Human. We have all of us heard—and some of us preached hour-long sermons that said less. For there is one word in the heart of the matter. Since our beginning is in God and our end; since in love He created all men and nations—to hate any person or people or nation is to hate God their Father, and our Father.

WHAT IT MEANS

Three centuries ago Samuel Laniado, great spiritual writer of Judaism, wrote: "Love your neighbor just as you do yourself. And this means that just as a man who has hurt himself with his hand, will not hurt in return the hand that has hurt him; so it is, if a neighbor inflicts pain or the like on him, he will not seek vengeance, because he regards his neighbor as himself, as his very self. Since God created his soul and the soul of his neighbor, he knows both alike—each an infinitesimal part of God's creation."

All the antimovements that lead to discord, and strife, that have led to the mass murders we call wars, have their roots in the rejection of the commandment of Christ. "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them." He, the Son of God made man, understood how difficult it is to wipe out national, racial, and religious enmities; nevertheless He refused to appease or compromise in this. He would accept no co-existence with hatreds or discriminations, but proclaimed, "You have heard that it was said: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy.' But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you."

That is the one answer. We must learn it and soon, lest in blasting atoms the world commit suicide.

"The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart,
Still stands Thy ancient sacrifice,
A humble and a loving heart."

A humble and a loving heart—God's guided missile for the winning of peace. Men with such hearts, with God's help, will yet save the world. Paratroopers of the Lord, captains for Christ. The history of your people, my Jewish friends, and mine, of your religion and mine, is beautiful with the records, the words, and the deeds of such men. Conquerors, though defeated; for giving their enemies, they have no enemies;

but they make of the conquerors captives of God.

Thus tonight, being so kind to me, you have in essential reality been true to yourselves and your own religion—loyal at once to your Jewish tradition and to your American tradition; obedient to God Who three centuries ago inspired a Syrian rabbi, Samuel Ben Abraham Laniado to write, that the love of one's neighbor shall be considered in Heaven as if God himself had received it. Yes, and long before that, nearly 20 centuries ago, that same God Incarnate said, "Amen I say unto you—as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to Me."

And myself, one of His least brethren, the stranger to whom you have opened the door of your hearts, will never forget your kindness tonight, nor cease in my efforts to be worthy of it; to nourish and increase that awareness of brotherhood here manifest tonight, a blessed warmth and a holy light in us and upon us. Nor shall I cease while I live to oppose all movements and men who through ignorance or malice would infect us with the spiritual disease of bigotry, the contagious germs of racial hatreds. To such men who, knowingly or not, serve the enemies of God and country I would say:

"Whoever degrades another degrades Me,
And whatever is said or done against another
Returns in the end to hurt Me."

A REALIST

Though the years of my priesthood have not dimmed my ideals, they have made me a realist. That is why even now, while I speak rejoicing, a shadow falls on my happiness, as I realize that some among you may be silently thinking, "But is the archbishop unaware that Protestants and Jews may be disliked and distrusted by some of his Catholics?" To that silent question, if anyone here present be in thought asking it now, in sadness and humility I must answer, I know. Among my own people, my own children in Christ, there may be those who offend you—and their God. A splinter minority of my flock may be prejudiced and intolerant, only a comparatively few—yet if there were but 3 such, that would be 3 too many. There may be indeed intolerant Catholics; but—I beg of you please believe and remember what I tell you now—if they are bigoted it is not because of their Catholic faith, but in spite of it, in betrayal of it.

My friends, I have broken bread with you this night, and have talked with you, as a fellow American neighbor and friend. But in this matter I voice no mere personal opinion, but with the consecrated authority of my holy office as a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church and priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek, I declare to you that no Catholic can despise a fellow man and remain a true follower of his Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and an obedient son of his church. Any Catholic who reviles or wrongs a brother because of the color of his skin, because of race or religion, or who condemns any racial or religious group because of the mistakes or sins of a few individuals in that racial or religious group, ceases in that condemnation to be a Catholic and an American. He becomes a disobedient son of mother church and a disloyal citizen of these United States. The Catholic who fails to take a stand against racial or religious persecutions is at once a slacker in the army of the church militant and a deserter from the battle of Christian democracy. Turning his back to a brother of different color, race, or religion, wittingly or not, he turns his back to the flag and to the cross of Mount Calvary.

Such a man was gentle St. Francis of Assisi. Such is that great priest whose parish is the world, because he loves the world, our holy father, Pius XII. Such a man was St. Stephen the Levite, who, stoned to death, with

his last breath begged forgiveness for his murderers, and in the beautiful Scripture phrase, "fell asleep in the Lord."

CITES NORTH ADAMS MAN

Such men serve my church in many lands and are praying this hour for their Communist jailers. Nor need we go to the distant past or far lands for examples of the courage born of love. Such a man is Harry Melcher, of North Adams, Mass., of whom I read in the Boston papers of February 3, when for the second time in 25 years, mindless of self, he braved a fiery death to save the sacred scrolls of his synagogue, nobly proving again that as hatred is weakness, fear in action, courage is love in action. As St. John, the beloved disciple, proved in life and death, and in these deathless words, "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear." And thus casting out fear will bring peace to men in their hearts and their homes, in their communities and countries throughout the whole world.

For centuries now we've tried everything else; the powers of wealth, of mighty armies and navies, and combinations of nations, machinations of diplomats. All have failed. Before it's too late, and time is running out, let us turn from trust in the chain reactions of exploding atoms to faith in the chain reaction of God's love. Love—love of God and fellow men—that is God's formula for peace. Peace on earth to men of good will.

This night, here assembled, you have lit a beacon for peace, a spark which could with God's help start a fire of enthusiasm to God who alone is peace in time and eternity. This night you are doing just that. You have kindled a flame of divine fire which might, indeed, with God's help, start a chain reaction for brotherhood, a spreading conflagration of love withering to ashes all bigotries and fears, making bright the path to our loving Father in whom alone is peace in this world and the next, today and forever.

A half century ago when the British Empire was first among nations, as we are now, Kipling warned his people, and warns us now:

"Far called, our navies melt away;
On dune and headland sinks the fire;
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!

"If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Lord God of Hosts be with us yet
Lest we forget, lest we forget!"

You have not forgotten, nor will He forget you, nor I in my prayers—but one gift I would rejoice in more than your unanimous award, a prayer, though it be but a mumbled phrase—that all men may love God and love one another. Every day and frequently throughout every day, let each one say: "Oh, my God, I love you and I love my neighbor as myself." That is God's guided missile to peace.

Mr. Speaker, among others the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] attended the Brotherhood dinner to which I have referred. Later he is going to ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include a very fine address by Mr. Firestone, one of his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks following his and include the acceptance of President Eisenhower of the award given by the Brotherhood organization. It is a very fine address. I also ask that I may include the remarks of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, regarding President Eisenhower when he read the

President's acceptance. They were both very fine speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. METCALF (at the request of Mr. MAGNUSON), for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. GARMATAZ).

Mr. TUCK and to include a speech.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a speech.

Mr. HESTAND (at the request of Mr. HOSMER) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a speech.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. UTT (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER).

Mr. WILSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. UDALL).

Mr. CRAMER.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution 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; to the Committee on Rules.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 20, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 22, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1560. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 involving a net decrease of \$65,000 for several agencies, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1561. A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report showing contracts that have been negotiated for experimental, development, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, the amount of the contract, and a description of the work required to be performed thereunder for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1562. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting the monthly report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress, which amended section 211 of the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1563. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report which supplements a report dated February 9, 1956, pursuant to section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by Public Law 295, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1564. A letter from the commander in chief, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting a report of audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, and the Annual Report of Activities of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1565. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the following claim: *Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians, Plaintiff, v. United States of America, Defendant* (docket No. 11), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLISON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 372. Resolution to provide additional expenses to conduct the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 114; without amendment (Rept. No. 1776). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLISON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 373. Resolution to provide additional funds for expenses of conducting studies, investigations, and inquiries incurred by the House Committee on Banking and Currency; with amendment (Rept. No. 1777). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 64. Resolution to provide for the printing of a compilation of veterans' laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 1778). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 206. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1779). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 387. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the 1955 Annual Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities (H. Rept. No. 1648, 84th Cong. 2d sess.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1780). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 398. Resolution authorizing the printing of the 34th Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund together with the Comptroller General's Report on Audit Findings Relating to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1781). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 51. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency additional copies of hearings entitled "Stock Market Study"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1782). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 60. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on automation and technological change for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; without amendment (Rept. No. 1783). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the joint committee print entitled, "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability," for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; without amendment (Rept. No. 1784). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2423. A bill for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 1785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7062. A bill providing for pay-

ment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 578. An act for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis); with amendment (Rept. No. 1788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1242. An act for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarde and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarde and Patrick Robert Adiarde; with amendment (Rept. No. 1789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Kavar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1905. An act for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Durham; with amendment (Rept. No. 1792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Brickell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham; with amendment (Rept. No. 1794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3960. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gago Santana; with amendment (Rept. No. 1795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle F. Brock; without amendment (Rept. No. 1796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4899. A bill for the relief of Helmut Klestadt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6126. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6321. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Popwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7403. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Milton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7487. A bill for the relief of Irmgard S. King; without amendment (Rept. No. 1801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9446. A bill to provide vocational training for adult Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 9447. A bill to provide temporary disability insurance benefits for employees in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 9448. A bill to provide that public lands of the United States shall not be withdrawn or reserved for defense purposes except by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 9449. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to issue to the Joe Graham Post No. 119, American Legion, a deed to certain lands within the Ship Island Military Reservation removing certain conditions heretofore made a part of the conveyance thereof, and providing for the conveyance of a portion of such lands to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE (by request):

H. R. 9450. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 9451. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Seminole Indians and to provide that certain lands shall be designated as a reservation for Seminole Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 9452. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to convey to the County of Los Angeles, Calif., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain portions of a tract of land heretofore conditionally conveyed to such county; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9453. A bill to allow amounts paid for the institutional care and training of a mentally retarded child of a taxpayer to be deducted for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 9454. A bill to amend chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the 30-percent withholding tax with respect to the income of certain nonresident aliens and foreign corporations shall not apply in the case of rentals derived from the exhibition of motion pictures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 9455. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Mills Creek, Fla., for drainage, flood control, and navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 9456. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 9457. A bill to provide an improved farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 9458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund or credit of internal-revenue taxes and customs duties paid on distilled spirits, wines, beer, tobacco products, and cigarette papers and tubes lost, rendered unmarketable, or condemned by health authorities as a result of a fire, hurricane, flood, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 9459. A bill to amend section 77 (c) (6) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. J. Res. 552. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER (by request):

H. R. 9460. A bill for the relief of Jan M. Hoegfeldt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 9461. A bill for the relief of Hanna Rezmovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 9462. A bill for the relief of Raimundo Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 9463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hayguhi (Kedasyan) Kudis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 9464. A bill for the relief of Robert Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9465. A bill for the relief of Joseph Aboudi or Joe Abood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 9466. A bill for the relief of Antoni Klimowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 9467. A bill for the relief of Ludwik Kwasniewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9468. A bill for the relief of Jo-Soon Duk and Lee Won Duk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 9469. A bill for the relief of Francisco Carapia Gaytin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9470. A bill for the relief of Miguel Gonzales-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9471. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jadwiga Stefaniak and daughter, Christina Stefaniak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 9472. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pauline Zweimueller Barkovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

554. By Mr. BROWNSON: Petition of Mrs. Luck Burkhart and 20 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

merce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

555. Also, petition of Mr. W. A. Thomas and 40 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act so as to provide retirement at age 60 after 30 years of service or after 35 years of service regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

556. Also, petition of Mrs. Marguerite Dice, J. R. Morgan, and 54 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging early passage without change of Bricker amendment, enforcement of McCarran-Walter Act, adoption of Hoover Commission recommendations, end deficit spending, balance budget, cut taxes, withdrawal from International Labor Organization, keep out of Atlantic Union and World Government, terminate Status of Forces Treaty, advance no Federal aid to education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

557. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Mrs. L. M. Jorgensen, of the First Methodist Church, Mishawaka, Ind., and 166 other signers, protesting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

558. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition signed by Mrs. S. Miriam Crist, of Rexmont, Pa., and some 20 other residents of Lebanon County, urging the enactment of legislation prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

559. Also, petition signed by Mrs. May W. Brandreth and 39 other residents of Cornwall, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

560. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of residents of the villages of Poland, N. Y., and Cold Brook, N. Y., in support of H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

561. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the director, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging that the House of Representatives rescind the appropriation of funds for the work of the Un-American Activities Committee and direct that the committee terminate its investigations as initially proposed by the present chairman of the committee, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Upper Colorado Project Means More Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, this means all of us, now has more than \$8 billion in surplus farm products stored in warehouses around the Nation.

Storage costs alone are \$1 million a day.

These surpluses are steadily increasing.

CH—193

On the one hand, Congress is proposing to take 40 million acres of land out of production and put it in a so-called soil bank.

The Government would pay farmers \$1 billion or more a year to remove this land from production to help decrease the huge surpluses.

But, on the other hand, there is an incredible proposal before Congress called the upper Colorado River storage project to irrigate 580,000 new acres of arid mountain land in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming at a cost to the Government, this means all of us, of \$4 billion. And these lands would grow more surplus crops.

If you are confused, here is the answer: Defeat the upper Colorado project, which would create an additional \$4 billion tax burden and also add to the huge pile of farm surpluses.

Gamma Sigma Fraternity—Workshop in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago a group of students at Rutgers University organized a fraternity in which persons of all colors, creeds, and nationalities were eligible for membership. This was an experiment in social living, designed to test the principle of broad fraternity participation.

The nonsectarian fraternity, Gamma Sigma, began at the university in the fall

of 1947 when 12 undergraduates, 9 of whom were ex-service men, decided that the existing fraternities were not in keeping with the democratic traditions of our Founding Fathers. They wanted a fraternity that did not have arbitrary restrictions concerning race, creed, or color. So they organized their own fraternal group without any restrictions whatsoever, except character and the appreciation of one individual for another.

During the 1947-48 college term, when universities were bulging with veterans, national fraternities sought new chapters all over the Nation. Several sent representatives to Rutgers, where Gamma Sigma was one of three new fraternal groups in the process of organization. When the fraternity pledged two Negro boys, the national fraternity representatives immediately lost interest.

When classes began in September 1949, it was discovered that the new fraternity had achieved the highest academic average of any fraternity chapter on the campus. The following year Gamma Sigma rented from the university the yellow house in fraternity row which it now occupies. It became evident that the organization was on the campus to stay. The heterogeneous group was welded into a strong unit.

Membership is pretty evenly divided among members of the three major faiths. The evening bull sessions are often equivalent to many courses aimed at explaining the religious beliefs subscribed throughout the world. Many nationalities are in the fraternity—Chinese, a Japanese student, the son of a Cuban educator, a Greek, and a Dutch boy.

The fraternity president, Richard Cogan, a history student, feels that Gamma Sigma has shown that all sorts of people can live together.

On Saturday evening, February 11, 1956, the young men of Gamma Sigma gave a testimonial dinner at the Somerville Inn, Somerville, N. J., to Mrs. Elin Johnson, the fraternity housemother. Mrs. Johnson, who came to the United States from Sweden 32 years ago, typifies the spirit of brotherhood of the group. She has by her devotion to the principle of the brotherhood of man inspired all those around her.

On the ninth birthday of Gamma Sigma Fraternity I wish to salute them and commend them for exemplifying the American tradition of equality. It is my hope that this workshop in democracy will have many years of continued success.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD various messages, a letter from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and a newspaper editorial concerning Gamma Sigma.

The messages are as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, September 30, 1955.

DEAR MR. COGAN: May I congratulate your fraternity, Gamma Sigma, on its 9th anniversary. The objectives with which your group was organized are certainly commendable. I wish you future success.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1955.

DEAR MR. COGAN: I wish to commend the men of Gamma Sigma Fraternity for their fine efforts on behalf of the true spirit of democracy at one of our leading universities. Fraternities should be founded in the belief of the brotherhood of man. Unfortunately, on some of our college campuses, the fraternity system has been perverted by policies of discrimination and exclusion.

Gamma Sigma, by its example, upholds that most fundamental precept of our Nation that all men are equal without regard to race, religion, or national origin. My own experience while mayor of Minneapolis in working to solve these problems of human relations has convinced me that much more can be done to level the barriers of prejudice and hate than we sometimes think when confronted with them in all their ugliness. It can be done through just such forthright action as yours.

The practice of toleration and good will as exemplified by Gamma Sigma has its influence far beyond your own fraternity. As you begin your ninth year of democratic living together, I hope you will be encouraged by the knowledge that others look to your example with respect and hope. Keep up the good work, I pray you.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 30, 1955.
MR. RICHARD COGAN,
President, Gamma Sigma Fraternity,
Rutgers University,
New Brunswick, N. J.:

Would you extend my congratulations to the members of the Gamma Sigma Fraternity of Rutgers University upon the opportunities that await them during the current academic year.

It is my understanding through mutual friends that this particular fraternity came into being 9 years ago because of a need felt upon your own campus for a fraternity into which persons of all colors, creeds, and nationalities could come and share in the common life and benefits of associating one with another. You who are members of this fraternity today inherit the high purposes with which this organization was founded and the current year offers you an opportunity to add to that history.

I again congratulate you on the opportunity and wish you a challenging and eventful year.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, October 4, 1955.

DEAR MR. COGAN: I have recently heard of your experiment in democratic living which is now past the experiment stage, having reached the 8-year mark.

As Gamma Sigma enters its ninth season, I wish for it good fortune and long life.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

FEBRUARY 4, 1956.

DEAR MR. KRUGER: I am happy to send my good wishes to the Gamma Sigma Fraternity on the occasion of their annual alumni dinner. I think it is nice that you have this independent, nonsectarian fraternity and it must add greatly to the democratic way of life on your campus.

My best wishes to Mrs. Johnson for her good work with the fraternity members.

With all good wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

MESSAGE FROM CONGRESSMAN HUGH J. ADDONIZIO TO GAMMA SIGMA FRATERNITY

As Gamma Sigma gathers for its second annual alumni dinner, I wish to take this

opportunity to extend, both to its members and to Mrs. Elin Johnson, who is being especially honored on this occasion, my most sincere congratulations and best wishes.

It has been 9 years now since a group of young men at Rutgers determined to enter upon an experiment in democratic living. The fraternity they organized has lived up to the finest traditions of American life. Nonsectarian, nondiscriminatory, Gamma Sigma has been a living demonstration that democracy can thrive on a college campus. Too often college fraternities are charged, and often rightly so, with raising discriminatory barriers. Yet college years are the time when such barriers should be broken down, when students should learn to know the peoples of all nations, all creeds, all races with which we share this land and this shrinking world. What better way to do this than by sharing the experiences of everyday living, by working together, or by long talks over that last cup of coffee at dinner? The fraternal spirit can and should do much to lift the barriers of discrimination and prejudice. For this is the spirit of brotherhood in its truest sense.

It is most fitting that Mrs. Johnson should be your honored guest. Her position as housemother to your fraternity is one that requires tolerance and wisdom and discretion, as well as a firm belief in the principles for which you stand. On her depends some measure of the success of your undertaking.

It is my sincere hope that Gamma Sigma's crusade will meet with ever-increasing success, so that one day, the fraternal spirit having conquered, discrimination will have vanished.

May Gamma Sigma enjoy many long years of success.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of April 22, 1952]

If all fraternities operated on the same basis as Gamma Sigma at New Jersey's Rutgers University, there would be far less room for criticism of the fraternity system on the grounds that it produces unwholesome social byproducts in the form of snobbery, race, and religious prejudice.

In 1947, 12 Rutgers undergraduates, of whom 9 were ex-servicemen, organized Gamma Sigma without any membership restrictions whatever on race, creed, or color. The only criteria were character and individual appreciation. Its members today include a Chinese who came to the United States from Indonesia with his family, a Japanese student from Tokyo, an Albanian, a German youth who arrived here via England, and the son of a Cuban educator.

The fraternity has achieved a high scholastic average. It is permanently established in a house on the university's fraternity row. . . .

One suspects that Gamma Sigma's members have received an education from one another as valuable as anything they have been taught in the classroom. They are certainly far better equipped to live in a world in which, if it is to survive, whole nations must revise their concept of fraternity.

Russia Invokes Help of Security Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, well, anything can happen. Russia now warns that the United States and Great Britain

will have to notify them of any move we make in the Far East. They say our intended plan of liberating countries is a direct violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and that before we can make any move we shall have to get a permit from the Security Council of the United Nations. What has happened? All at once the Russians have an urge to bring the power and authority of the United Nations to the front. They did not take this attitude while stirring up their underlings to start in on aggression. We have such positive evidence of this that simply to state the situation is proof enough.

We agreed with Russia that we would pull out of Korea, with the provision that she would do likewise. We kept our promise and did pull out. Knowing the dictators of Russia as we must have known them, we never should have taken their word for anything. We got out, but the Russians, through the Red Chinese, came in and started a huge aggressive movement that would have swept the South Koreans into the seas. We intervened and went through all the expense in lives and property necessary to get back in to stop their aggression. Did Russia then think of the terms of the Charter of the United Nations that they now say we are violating? No; she did not. She carried out the principal of the manifesto of Karl Marx that any agreement with capitalistic nations is all right as long as it helps the Kremlin; but when the agreement bars the path to its further aggression, scrap it. That is what Russia did in Korea, but now when we merely talk about aiding helpless people, Russia points her finger at us and shouts, "You are violating the terms of the United Nations Charter. We will attend to peace in the Far East. That is our orbit."

For outright duplicity, deceit, perfidy, and degraded diplomacy, this is the worst history has ever recorded. The Russians know what the Charter of the United Nations is; they were instrumental in writing it. It is for them to use when they want it, when it complacently submits to the dictates of Russia, but to be in all things rejected when its terms may conflict with the program of the Kremlin for world domination.

After this recent blast of the Soviets are we going to play country dog, and with our tail between our legs streak for home? Or shall we finally make a stand so that these intriguing propagandists will have something to chew over before they take it upon themselves to run our business before we ask for it?

Since Russia now complains that we are making moves not authorized by the Security Council of the United Nations, we should ask just what authority this Council has bestowed upon them to take charge of the peace in the Far East. The Security Council has not yet spoken on this subject. Is Russia so sure of having the support of that Council that they can act with impunity, while demanding that we conform to their interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations? They may be right, for they were openly active in framing that charter, and they would not approve anything that would not accrue to their advantage.

Questionnaire to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the 4th District of California

have again shown an alert interest in their Government by responding in large numbers to the most recent of my yearly questionnaires. One out of every six voters was asked to participate. To this date, almost 20 percent have answered.

I am greatly encouraged by this response. It is an indication of the vitality of our form of government. The following tabulation may be of interest to my colleagues:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent		
1. If the Federal budget is balanced this year, would you favor some reduction in the national debt before taxes are lowered?	68	30	2
2. Do you favor increased appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enlarge the Government's program of medical research?	70	27	3
3. (a) Recognizing that United States aid to Europe is dwindling, would you favor more economic assistance to areas such as the Middle East and Asia?	43	53	4
(b) Do you believe the administration should be given authority to enter into long-range commitments for economic assistance needed in these areas?	27	65	8
4. The administration is again recommending a limited program of public housing for urban redevelopment. Do you believe some of these public housing units should be set aside for occupancy by aged citizens?	80	16	4
5. Although it is generally agreed that our Federal highway system should be modernized, a controversy has developed over the method of financing. Do you favor (a) Using the Government's credit to obtain money now and pay off the debt over a long period; or (b) increasing the fuel, tire, license and other highway-user taxes to provide the money on a pay-as-you-go basis?	(a) 39	(b) 55	5
6. In view of the continuing depressed level of farm income, several proposals have been made for assistance to farmers. Do you favor (a) Government payments to farmers for keeping part of their acreage out of production, coupled with flexible price supports; or (b) return to rigid farm price supports at 90 percent of parity?	(a) 45	(b) 27	14
7. Would you favor a Federal program to reinsure private voluntary health insurance plans to make these plans available to more people at lower rates?	64	33	3
8. Would you be willing to pay increased social-security payroll deductions in order to finance liberalization of benefits, such as raising minimum social-security payments, lowering the age at which payments can be received, etc.?	63	33	4
9. President Eisenhower has recommended "that the number of persons admitted to this country annually be based not on the 1920 census but on the 1950 census. Provision should be made to allow for greater flexibility in the use of quotas so if one country does not use its share, the vacancies may be made available for the use of qualified individuals from other countries." Do you agree?	59	38	3
10. Among those who favor a Federal program to assist in school construction, a controversy has developed. Do you favor (a) Using Federal credit to assist school districts in raising their own money; or (b) direct grants by the Federal Government?	(a) 68	(b) 23	5

¹ The difference between 100 percent and the totals in Nos. 5, 6, and 10 is attributable to those who rejected both alternatives or offered solutions of their own.

Address of United States Representative
James C. Davis, of Georgia, to Joint
Session of the General Assembly of
Georgia, January 24, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 24, 1956, our colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, a Representative in the Congress from the State of Georgia, delivered a masterful address before a joint session of the General Assembly of Georgia in the capitol at Atlanta. The invitation extended to Judge DAVIS to speak in that forum is evidence of the high esteem in which he is held by the people of Georgia. It constitutes an appropriate recognition of his integrity, character, and ability by the citizens of his own State, a compliment which he richly merits and deserves.

I have read, studied, and considered the address carefully. It is a dignified, yet forceful, and able discussion of a subject very close to the heart of every true

American. The fundamental principles upon which our country was established and which we cherish are being threatened and jeopardized by flagitious influences. At such a time as this we are fortunate to have Judge DAVIS and others like him in the public life of America. He has talent and courage. He is unafraid to express his convictions and to inveigh against these evils whether speaking to the General Assembly of Georgia or the Congress of the United States.

I am proud to have the privilege of knowing the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS. Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks, I am glad to include in the RECORD his address hereinbefore referred to. I commend it to every thoughtful American who appreciates and prizes our liberty and freedom.

The address is as follows:

Lieutenant Governor Vandiver, Speaker Moate, and members of the house and senate, I deeply appreciate the high privilege and great honor which you bestowed upon me in extending the invitation to address this honorable assembly.

This is the 10th year I have represented my district and State in Congress. There I have been duly impressed with the magnificence of our Capitol city and with the greatness of our Government. Yet I have never lost sight of the fundamental truth

that the strength of our great Government lies not in the size of its buildings, the hugeness of its appropriations, or the pomp and ceremony with which its affairs are conducted.

Rather the strength of our Government lies in the individuality of the citizenry all across this broad land of ours who maintain this Government; in our love of liberty, our devotion to freedom, our capacity for self-government and self-support, and the maintenance of strong State and local governments, the principle upon which this Nation was founded, and upon which it has become great.

In the resolution extending the invitation to my colleague, Congressman FLYNN, and to me, you have expressed your concern regarding pending legislation in the United States Congress on the subject of Federal aid to education. Your concern is justified. This is a subject which needs and deserves the prayerful thought and study, not only of the Congress, but of all the people, especially those officials who, like yourselves, administer the affairs of our State and local governments.

On the one hand we see the rapidly growing population of our country, having increased from 150½ million in 1950 to 165½ million in 1955 with an increase in children of school age during that same period of 6,158,000. This has brought to many sections overcrowded schools, and a great need for more school construction. The Federal Government has in some degree, where increased school population has resulted from operation of Federal Government agencies, contributed to the cost of school construction, and in small measure to maintenance and operation expense. In those areas with which I am familiar, however, this Federal contribution has been inadequate. Because of the smallness of these contributions no great voice in the control of our school systems has been sought by the Federal Government.

Now, however, the President has proposed the sizable contribution of \$1¼ billion for school construction and the bill reported out by the committee calls for \$1.6 billion. As the time draws near for consideration of this legislation, and its passage or rejection, threats are being made by those who traditionally have displayed hostility to our section who traditionally have sought to meddle in the conduct of our affairs, that they will attach conditions to the use of this money which we in Georgia could under no circumstances accept or tolerate. There is not a scintilla of doubt in my mind as to what will be the proper course of action if acceptance of Federal money means also acceptance of Federal control. If the only way we can obtain Federal school funds is to accept them with strings attached, then I say with no hesitation whatsoever, the answer is "No." That would be my answer and my vote in the Congress, and I am confident that would be your answer and your vote here in the Georgia Legislature upon this resolution now pending before you.

We face a very serious question in this respect: If the bill is voted, and either now or next year a condition is imposed that none of this money will be allotted to a State where segregated schools are maintained, the taxpayers of Georgia will be in the unfortunate position of having to pay our part of the taxes to raise the money, without getting a dollar of it for our own use. It would go to States willing to accept it with conditions attached, and be denied to us because we will not accept it with conditions attached, which to us are repulsive, unacceptable, and intolerable.

The conditions placed in the pending bill by the committee call for too much Federal control. Our Georgia member on the committee, Congressman PHIL LANDBUM, voted against the bill in the committee. As the bill now stands, I believe a majority of the Georgia delegation in the House will vote

against it because of too much Federal control. In approving or disapproving the State plans for spending the money, the Federal Commissioner of Education, under the bill, has almost unlimited discretion. How would that discretion be exercised?

As we seek the answer to this and other questions involved, what are the facts? What is the attitude of the Federal Government toward this question, the legislative department, the executive department, and the judicial department? We must be realistic as we answer these questions.

Our present dilemma and the threat to our public school system is not the result of Federal legislative action. The United States Congress has consistently refused to join in the unconstitutional illegal efforts which have been made to take away from the States control of our own local affairs.

But the executive department, headed by the President, and the judicial department headed by the Supreme Court, have joined hands to bypass Congress, and to bring about changes in our Constitution and laws through irregular and unconstitutional means—changes which they have not been able to induce Congress to make through regular and constitutional legislative action. The Supreme Court in the past few years has been usurping the power to make laws and to amend the Constitution. The Court does not possess either of those powers.

The United States Attorney General, of course, with the approval of the President, filed a brief in the Supreme Court, urging that segregation be declared unconstitutional.

The people and the States are being made the victims of a conspiracy of radical-thinking individuals and organizations, many of whom are subversive. The spearhead of this conspiracy is the radical organization, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, many of whose officers have had long records of association with subversive and Communist-front groups, which has been thoroughly exposed through material from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This radical group has been aided and abetted by other loud, noise-making minority pressure groups.

While the great majority of the right-thinking, right-living men and women of the United States have been carrying on the necessary daily functions of paying the taxes which support all of the governments of this Nation, cities, counties, States, and Federal, supporting our schools, growing the crops which must feed and clothe our population, operating our factories, financing our banks, and carrying on the myriad tasks necessary for our great Nation to maintain its rightful place in the world, this radical organization, conniving with other radical groups such as the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, and allied radical pressure groups have been pushing that conspiracy to bypass Congress and amend our Constitution and change our laws through fraudulent court decisions and dictatorial Executive orders from the White House.

Political blackmail is the chosen method through which these radical groups have sought and are with great success seeking to impose their will upon a protesting, unwilling people.

All over this country vigorous protests are being made by white people who intend to remain white, and to keep our white institutions free from forced intermingling with other races.

It is shameful to note the extent to which those who seek political power in this country are willing to pander and capitulate to noisy minority pressure groups, whose political influence actually has been magnified far beyond its actual strength.

It is shameful that the President of the United States for political expediency has permitted these radical pressure groups to in-

fluence him to issue orders creating a new FEPC Commission, and other similar orders to destroy and tear down wise customs and practices which are as old as civilization itself, and which in fact, do not represent the real attitude of the President himself.

In his present efforts to pander to the Negro voters of this country, he now boasts that he has eliminated the last vestige of segregation in all of the branches and departments of our Armed Forces. Yet in 1948 when he was a General in the Army, and not a candidate for any elective public office he testified before a congressional committee that he was in favor of keeping the Negro soldiers in small units of their own; that they could not compete successfully with white soldiers for promotions and that "if we attempt merely by passing a lot of laws to force someone to like someone else, we are just going to get into trouble." (P. 996, Senate UMT hearings, Apr. 2, 1948.)

The President boasts that he and the Republican Party have been instrumental in turning the vast hordes of Negro pupils in upon the white children in the classrooms of Washington, D. C., where the Negroes constitute two-thirds of the school population of that city. Yet at the very moment he makes this boast that he has imposed this radical change upon the white children of our Nation's Capital, his own grandson is carried by automobile to an Episcopal school in Alexandria, Va., where tuition must be paid for his schooling, although his son, Maj. John Eisenhower, resides upon the post at Fort Belvoir, Va., where his son is in easy walking distance of a nonsegregated school, attended by both whites and blacks, and which the Eisenhower child could also attend without the necessity of transportation, and without paying any tuition whatever.

Yet the President is using his great power as the Chief Executive of this country to force our boys and girls in the various branches of our Armed Forces to live, eat, and sleep with Negroes, and to force our children into integrated schools with them, a practice in which he does not believe, and which his own flesh and blood do not follow. There are mothers and fathers in Georgia today who know their sons are being forced to live with Negroes against their will in the armed services. There is no wonder that the armed services are having a hard time getting men to enlist and reenlist.

The apostles of integration and mongrelization, the Communist Party, the NAACP, the American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, and other radical organizations and individuals of the same stripe and odor are busy endeavoring to create the impression that segregation is being voluntarily abandoned, and that integration is being voluntarily accepted.

Nothing is further from the truth. Integration of the races is not voluntary. On the contrary segregation is voluntary. Wherever integration has taken place, it has been forced upon the people. Wherever segregation has been abolished, it has been over the vigorous protest of those affected. It is not voluntary in the Army. It was put into effect by Executive order, and men have to render at least 2 years military service. It is not voluntary in our political primaries. That came by a court order.

Time and time again where people in various States have had the opportunity to vote upon FEPC proposals, FEPC laws have been rejected.

Throughout this Nation for generations property owners have protected themselves and their communities against invasion by colored hordes through restrictive clauses in their deeds to real estate. The Supreme Court struck down those clauses. Where there have been any sizable groups of Negroes, it has been the almost unvarying custom for whites to live in white sections and Negroes to live in Negro sections. White people have maintained white schools

and white colleges and universities. White people have also maintained Negro schools and Negro colleges and universities. The contributions of Negroes to their own institutions of learning and their own public schools have been negligible. In 1950 I obtained from the records of DeKalb County the cost of operating the Negro schools in that county and the amount of taxes paid for school purposes by the Negroes of that county. The figures showed that the property-owning Negroes of DeKalb County paid a total amount of school taxes of \$1,925.35, or less than \$1 per school year for the 2,042 Negro children who attended the county public schools. Yet DeKalb County spent that year an average of \$85.33 per pupil. DeKalb County paid \$2,000 each to operate four Negro school buses to haul Negro children to the county public schools, a total school bus expense for them of \$8,000. The amount of school taxes paid by the Negroes was not enough to haul even one-fourth of their children to the schoolhouse door, and nothing for operating the schools themselves.

The white people have carried this burden, and have carried it uncomplainingly. It has been well known that the Negroes could not and would not provide educational facilities through their own efforts. Had their school opportunities and facilities been limited to such as they would have provided for themselves, it is doubtful if provision would have been made for Negro children, as a whole, to finish the first grade.

Over half the States of this Union have laws upon their statute books preventing the intermarriage of whites and blacks. In many of the States of this Union our political systems were built upon a system of white primaries, in which the white people of the States, the counties, and the cities could express their choice as white Democrats. The bar associations, the medical societies, and the professions have generally followed a policy of segregating themselves according to races. This is the custom which has been followed in schools, in politics, in residential developments, in industry, religion, and society in general. As far back as history goes, this has been the recorded pattern upon which civilization has been based. America grew to be the greatest country following this pattern. Under it our churches have grown and prospered, and we now have missionaries in practically every land on this globe which is populated by a colored race or a mongrel race trying to keep alive a spark of the Christian religion in those lands where colored and mongrel populations have demonstrated that they do not have the stamina to perpetuate and keep alive the Christian religion and it has lived through the centuries only by the efforts of the white race.

Yet these noisy advocates of integration and mongrelization have within the past 20 years successfully organized a conspiracy to thwart the will of the great majority of the people in this country through bypassing the legislative department of our Government, the Congress, and through the connivance of the executive department and the Supreme Court, have step by step, through so-called judicial decisions and Executive orders endeavored to destroy the accepted practices of our people and to force this repulsive pattern upon an unwilling people.

The people in Chicago, Ill., do not want to live among Negroes any more than the people in Atlanta, Ga., and proved it by staging a riot which lasted for more than a year when radicals behind the integration movement there arranged for a Negro to move into an all-white residential section. In Los Angeles, Calif., which boasts that it is broad-minded, a long-standing custom was broken and a few Negro firemen were moved into white firehouses. This was so repulsive and disagreeable to the white firemen, who were unwilling to sleep and eat with the Negro firemen, that the fire chief of Los Angeles reestablished the all-white firehouses, and

told the mayor and council they could fire him if they saw fit, but he would not order the Negroes back into the white firehouses.

President Eisenhower, in his efforts to make a second Harlem out of Washington, D. C., has, through his three appointed City Commissioners ordered a few Negro firemen into some of the white firehouses there. It is meeting with the same protest and resistance.

So diligent have the integrationists and mongrelizers become in Washington that an announcement has been made by officials of the Federal and city governments that the doors of all federally owned property will be closed to the boys' clubs of the Nation's Capital if they continue to operate as white boys' clubs and Negro boys' clubs. These clubs have been financed to the extent of \$330,000 principally by white people through voluntary contributions, although there are 14,000 Negroes enrolled in the boys' clubs and only 8,000 whites. The clubs have taken boys off the streets with recreational activities in winter, and camps in summer. Yet one church in Washington has already closed the doors of a meeting place formerly used by a white boys' club, and thus deprived a group of fine white children the benefit of the wholesome influences of the boys' club program because the club and its board of governors refused to have this unacceptable intermingling forced upon them. What a fine demonstration of Christianity.

In Delaware where a school board announced mixed schools would be ordered another near riot occurred and separate schools were restored. In Washington, D. C., the mixed school order is deeply resented. White people are moving out of Washington into nearby Virginia in great numbers. In June 1955, the exodus of white people from Washington had resulted in a public school system composed of 61 percent Negro pupils and 39 percent white. These figures were reported in the U. S. News & World Report of June 10. The same article reported that white people who could afford it were moving out of predominantly Negro school districts. There is still another deplorable consequence. The article also reported, and I quote verbatim from it:

"Washington educators expressed shock at learning how far the general educational level of the Capital's Negroes is below that of the whites.

"The result, many school principals say, has been that the learning pace within most of the mixed schools has been slowed down to keep step with the general run of Negro pupils."

Thus one of the immediate and obvious results of mixing the schools in Washington is that white children will be held back because the Negro children have shown they cannot keep the pace.

This exodus of white people from Washington to avoid the mixed schools reported in June last year was not a temporary flare-up. It has not only continued; it has increased. The U. S. News & World Report 6 months later, in its November 25 issue reported as follows, and I quote verbatim from the article entitled "Mixed Schools—Second Year," as follows:

"More and more white pupils leave Washington.

"Negroes are pouring into Washington, white families leaving in droves. Result: A basic change in the population in the Nation's Capital.

"In schools 64 percent of students now are Negroes. In some residential areas, Negroes take over.

"Twenty years ago, 64 percent of the pupils in the city's public schools were white, 36 percent Negroes. Today this is reversed—64 percent Negroes, 36 percent whites. These figures are disclosed by new official count.

"Washington now has a greater proportion of Negroes in the public schools than any other large United States city."

This article also pointed out what everyone familiar with Washington knows, that the rush of white people to get out of Washington has been stepping up since 1948 when the Supreme Court, as a part of its program of usurping legislative functions, changed the law to invalidate restrictive covenants in deeds to real estate. This permitted Negroes to move into white neighborhoods, making them less desirable, and running down the value of the property.

Proof that white people do not intend to mix with Negroes, and cannot be forced to do so, is the manner in which the white people of Washington treated the order of the Federal Government abolishing segregation in federally owned swimming pools. Washington is a hot city in the summertime, and prior to the issuing of this order by the Federal Government, the white swimming pools have been crowded. When the order was issued in 1949 and 1950, it did not result in whites and Negroes swimming together, it simply resulted in the previously white swimming pools becoming Negro swimming pools, as the white people abandoned them to the Negroes.

Resentment of white people manifests itself in every section of our country—North, East, and West, as well as South over these efforts to force the unnatural practice of mixing the races. In Chicago, in many sections, a determined white population has successfully resisted forcible efforts to destroy their residential segregation pattern. This has been done although Illinois has had a governor, and Chicago has had a mayor who have sought by forcible means to ram this integration policy down their unwilling throats.

In Chicago on August 11, 1953, 1,500 persons rioted in protest over a Negro family being moved into Trumbull Park Homes in the South Deering section of the city.

The police commissioner had to send 3 shifts of 250 policemen, or 750 per day to keep down the violent rioting. On one occasion 1,250 policemen were called out.

The commissioner was quoted 16 days later, on August 27 as saying that racial disturbances had required the service of 12 percent of his 6,889 man force—in other words 826 policemen spent all of their time working with racial trouble.

Under these circumstances the battle was carried on in Trumbull Park Homes for more than a year. The Negro family was finally moved out, and then brought a damage suit against the Chicago Housing Authority. In 1 year there was more racial trouble in Chicago than in the whole South put together, and it resulted from efforts to force intermingling between whites and blacks.

Thank Almighty God that we do not have that kind of governor in Georgia willing to join hands with a packed Supreme Court and an appeasement-minded Chief Executive in destroying our Constitution. I thank Him that we have in Georgia a governor who has said:

"I speak for the people of Georgia when I say that we accept this challenge. We accept it with the firm assertion that we shall not surrender to this Court the inalienable rights of our sovereign State. We shall not surrender our right to conduct and regulate our own educational institutions. The State created them. The State built them. The State finances them. The State shall run them."

I am thankful that we have a lieutenant governor who is holding up the hands of the Governor in this crisis.

I am grateful that we have in Georgia filling the high office of attorney general an official who has the intelligence and ability to recognize this fraudulent scheme for the sorry thing it is, and the energy and courage to expose it and its backers not only to our people here at home, but in areas where hotbeds of radicalism exist in other sections of

the country. I am grateful for the determined attitude of Georgia people who voted by a substantial majority to amend our Constitution so that if worst comes to worst, and the public schools in Georgia could only be operated as nonsegregated and mixed schools, this intolerable thing can be avoided by elimination of public schools entirely and the teaching of our children in private schools.

I am grateful for this legislature and its officials who are resolutely and determinedly enacting a program of legislation to keep within our own hands the conduct of our own affairs.

I am grateful for the chief justice of the Georgia Supreme Court, who wrote the opinion, and for the six associate justices who joined with him in a unanimous opinion by that court in the case of *Williams v. State of Georgia* in which the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia said to the Supreme Court of the United States:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. * * * (Constitution of the United States, 10th amendment). Even though executives and legislators, not being constitutional lawyers, might often overstep the foregoing unambiguous constitutional prohibition of Federal invasion of State jurisdiction, there can never be an acceptable excuse for judicial failure to strictly observe it. This court bows to the Supreme Court on all Federal questions of law but we will not supinely surrender sovereign powers of this State."

This was a courageous declaration by the highest court of our State warning the United States Supreme Court to stay out of our State affairs—a declaration to one and all that the State of Georgia knows her rights, and will have them. It was a stinging and merited rebuke.

This same group of sociologists on the Federal Supreme Court, of whom only 2 out of the 9 ever had judicial experience before going on the Supreme Court bench, are throwing up some trial balloons to test public opinion upon the important question of invalidating State marriage laws, as they threw up trial balloons to test public opinion upon the segregated school issue, and to acclimatize public opinion to it before the blow was finally struck.

In Virginia the law prohibits interracial marriages, which is the case in 28 of the States of this Union. The Virginia Supreme Court, pursuant to that law, declared invalid a marriage between a Chinese seaman and a white woman, and annulled the marriage. The Chinaman appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court and asked that Virginia's marriage law be declared in violation of the 14th amendment.

I do not think the Federal Supreme Court would hesitate to strike down the marriage laws of Virginia and 27 other States if these sociologist experts felt that public opinion would accept such a shocking decision. They know that public opinion will not accept it, and they want to kick the case back and forth for a while between Washington and Richmond to give the Communist Daily Worker, the so-called liberal press, the NAACP, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the other integrationists and mongrelizers some time in which to condition the public mind for a judicial decision striking down the last legal barrier which stands in the path of mongrelization. The Supreme Court entered an order vacating the judgment, and sending the case back to the State court, for further action, saying that it wanted additional evidence as to whether Virginia's courts had jurisdiction in the case.

In rejecting this further attempt of the Federal Supreme Court to meddle in affairs belonging exclusively to the State, the Supreme Court of Virginia joined the Supreme

Court of Georgia in refusing to recognize the right of the Federal tribunal to remand cases to the State courts "for further action" where no ground for reversal is shown in the record. The Virginia Supreme Court on January 18, last Wednesday notified the Federal Supreme Court that it refused to take further action.

It is a deplorable thing that the highest Court in our land, charged more than any other agency of our Government with the duty of preserving our Constitution, has so departed from its proper function that it now must be rebuked by State courts resisting its illegal efforts to guide them into wrong channels.

So repugnant are its sociological theories becoming that when a Federal court of appeals, following the Supreme Court's school opinion, ordered a United States district judge in Ohio to issue an order ending segregation in the grade schools at Hillsboro, Ohio, the district judge refused to issue the order, and demanded that he himself be given a hearing before the Supreme Court, and that the case be carried there in his own name.

It is a deplorable situation indeed when our people and our State courts must fight for the preservation of constitutional rights with the very agency of Government to whom we should be able to look with confidence as the ultimate guardian and protector of those rights.

But such is the situation.

As we survey the situation today we see that we in Georgia do not stand alone. We have led in this fight, and I believe the bold and courageous stand which we have taken in Georgia has been an inspiration to those in other States to brand this unconstitutional decision as an unwarranted invasion of the rights of States and of the people, and to take steps to effectively resist it.

We know that the Constitution is not, as some would have us believe, what the judges say it is. It has no such unstable or uncertain meaning. The Constitution, and all of its amendments, is the compact of the sovereign States who consented to its operation. It is the document under which we live—which we understand, and which the courts have understood for years and generations. Its meaning has been proclaimed again and again. It is the document which every public official is sworn to uphold, and to which the loyalty of every public official is due. And let us never lose sight of this fact—that our loyalty is to the Constitution itself—not to a perverted opinion of nine men who happen for the moment to be occupying seats in the Supreme Court, and who seek because of that fact to change the true meaning, the established and accepted meaning of our Constitution. That authority does not belong to these nine men. It belongs to two-thirds of the membership of Congress and to three-fourths of the States, joining in concurrent action.

As we assert our position in this fight for our rights, determined people of other States are standing shoulder to shoulder with us.

In May of 1954 the Louisiana Legislature adopted a resolution by a vote of 84 to 3 in the house and 32 to 1 in the senate calling the Supreme Court action an unwarranted and unprecedented abuse of power, and declaring among other things that racial integration in schools is "clearly intolerable, impractical, and in the ultimate sense of the word, unenforceable upon the free people of the sovereign State." They followed that up in July 1954 by the passage of three bills by an overwhelming vote enabling Louisiana to use its inherent police power to continue public-school segregation despite the United States Supreme Court's decision. The people of that State have just elected a governor pledged to continue segregation of schools in the State.

The Legislature of Florida in July 1955 adopted a resolution proclaiming that the

end of segregation in its schools would jeopardize the public health and safety; that it would tend to encourage the abhorrent, execrable, and revolting practice of miscegenation which is a criminal offense in Florida; that it would create a mongrel breed. The resolution asserted the aim of the Florida Legislature to provide equal facilities for maintaining the system of segregation in Florida's public schools and deplored any effort of the United States or any agency thereof to invade and usurp the rightful powers of the State of Florida by fostering integration of the two races in the public-school system.

The people of Virginia have voted 2 to 1 for the Gray Commission plan to retain segregated schools in Virginia. South Carolina and Mississippi have taken affirmative steps to join the increasing list of States determined to resist the unconstitutional usurpation of authority by the Supreme Court.

There is another matter which your honorable body may consider during the present session, and that is whether the Georgia Legislature wishes to adopt a resolution similar to the one which 34 of Virginia's 40 senators sponsored and introduced in that body last Thursday. The resolution provides that Virginia for its part asserts it has never surrendered its powers to maintain racially segregated schools. Secondly, Virginia challenges "the usurped authority that would inflict incalculable harm to the public schools," and would disrupt the education of her children. Thirdly, Virginia appeals to her sister States to join in applying to Congress to call a constitutional convention to oppose an amendment "designed to settle the issue of contested power here asserted."

The resolution further provides that until the question is settled "by clear constitutional amendment, we pledge our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably, legally, and constitutionally available to us to resist this illegal encroachment on our sovereign powers."

This is a fight in which there is no halfway ground and no middle course. Halfway measures will not win this fight. Vigorous, aggressive, and continuing action is required. There are suits pending now in Savannah asking that Negroes be admitted to white public-housing projects. Federal courts have already admitted them in other jurisdictions. Suits are pending to admit them to the university and grammar and high schools. But this school segregation issue is only a part of the problem. The ultimate aim of the NAACP and its allied radical organizations is not merely to abolish segregation in the schools of the Nation. The ultimate aim is to pressure the Supreme Court into declaring our marriage laws unconstitutional, and require all States to recognize intermarriage between the races as legal.

One of the Negroes who claims to represent the views of the NAACP stated in a magazine article as long ago as 1952 that the aim of the Negro is intermarriage with white people. It is a blind person indeed who is not now aware of that purpose. Unless we reject this school decision in toto, another Supreme Court decision holding that our marriage laws violate the 14th amendment is as certain to follow as night follows the day.

In conclusion let me say to you with all the sincerity and earnestness of which I am capable that the answer to this monstrous threat we face is organization. Too long we have permitted those who plot our downfall aided by some of our own false leaders, to deceive us and lull us to sleep with assurances that Negroes only wanted equal facilities and fair treatment. They have advised the white people against taking organized action to prevent destruction of our institutions and our way of life. Events of the past few years have shown the wrongness of that attitude. The time is here now to view the situation

with realism. The time is here now to organize—not for violence—not for lawlessness, but to organize to combine into one strong, unified, determined group to retain our State sovereignty which we have never surrendered; to unite with other States, their officials, and their people; to keep within our own hands the right to conduct our own affairs; and to resist vigorously, aggressively, and successfully this and any other attempt on the part of a perverted court to take from us these sacred rights which are ours—the right to conduct our own affairs in the manner we choose and the right to protect and preserve our own ways—rights which were given to us by our own parents and forebears, and which we are dutybound to hand to our children and our descendants.

Upper Colorado River Bill Before Congress Not Approved by Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado River storage project bill now before the House does not represent the bill approved by the administration. The bill's projects are different—the administration recommended authorization of 2 storage units, Glen Canyon and Echo Park, and 11 participating reclamation projects, at an estimated construction cost of \$930 million.

The House bill authorizes 4 storage units—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho—and 11 participating projects recommended by the Secretary. It also in section 2 provides what is tantamount to an advance commitment of the Congress to authorize 23 additional reclamation projects.

The Bureau of the Budget definitely recommended against authorization at this time of Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho. In addition, the administration recommended that the legislation provide that authorization of the 11 participating projects be conditioned on a new finding of favorable economic justification and of financial feasibility under specified financial requirements, with reports submitted to the Congress on each project; and that new studies of direct agricultural benefits be made jointly with the Department of Agriculture.

The bill contains no provision whatever for the reevaluation so specified by the administration and hence ignores this important requirement set forth as a condition precedent to administration approval.

Financial repayment features are basically contrary to those approved and recommended by the administration. The administration set up as a requirement that all reimbursable costs of the project should be repaid in 50 years, together with interest on the unamortized balance of the investments in power and municipal water supply features.

The bill departs materially from the specified repayment criteria. It would

attempt to adhere to repayment of the irrigation investment in 50 years, but would do so by the device of extending the repayment period for the power investment to not exceed 100 years, or twice the 50-year repayment period specified by the administration.

Upper Colorado Storage Scheme Cries for Additional Hearings Before Presentation to House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the proposed upper Colorado River storage scheme should have much more study by the House Interior Committee on testimony of witnesses, and upon reports from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget before it ever comes before the House.

The projects proposed to be authorized, the repayment provisions of the bill, and the economic and financial aspects thereof have never been fully reported upon by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget.

On the contrary, the reports received from those agencies recommended authorization of only 2 storage units, Glen and Echo—1 of which, Echo, has been excluded from the pending bill, H. R. 3383, although it is included for authorization in the bill, S. 500, passed by the Senate—and 11 reclamation projects. However, with respect to the 11 reclamation projects, the draft of legislation recommended by the Secretary of the Interior specified that their economic justification should be reexamined before construction should proceed. This request is ignored and omitted from H. R. 3383.

The bill proposes authorization of three storage units, Flaming Gorge, Navaho, Curecanti, which were not approved for authorization by the Secretary and the Budget Bureau.

Moreover, the Secretary and the Budget Bureau have never reported upon or approved the proposed repayment provisions of H. R. 3383, particularly the 100-year repayment period proposed for power features of the project. On the contrary, a 50-year repayment of the power investments was specified by these agencies, with interest on the unamortized investment.

In the recent report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy transmitted to the Congress by the President, it was concluded and recommended that the economic life of reclamation projects should not be considered to exceed 50 years for evaluation purposes. Of course, the proposal in the pending bill of 100 years' repayment is totally unrealistic and unsound.

There are many unresolved questions as to engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the proposed projects

which demand further study and report before Congress acts on this proposal. Even in the case of the major storage unit proposed for authorization, Glen Canyon, which is estimated to produce some 85 percent of the prospective power revenues, the evidence available indicates that there are serious questions with respect to the geologic formations of the reservoir affecting the functioning of this unit which demand further investigation before authorization. Moreover, the plans for the dam itself and its probable cost have not been adequately determined, lending uncertainty to the financial soundness of this unit which is set up to be the cash register of the upper basin development.

All these unresolved questions affecting the engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the projects proposed in H. R. 3383 should be reviewed by an impartial board of qualified engineers and experts and reported upon before Congress takes any further action. Such a board of review and procedure is recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy for all water resources projects. The proposed upper Colorado River storage project, with its intricate web of engineering and financial arrangements, cries out for such a review.

Michigan's Neglected Gem: Isle Royale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of Congress to one of the most beautiful spots in America, Michigan's Isle Royale. This national park, located 600 miles from Detroit, and 450 miles from Chicago, is the second largest island in the United States.

This island park, located within driving distance of 35 million people, should be one of the most popular spots in America and yet less than 5,000 persons visited Isle Royale in 1955. Why?

The situation is a result of inadequate accommodations for tourists on the island and lack of transportation to and from the mainland. Somewhat of a frustrating cycle exists in this instance, for until more cabins and hotels are constructed to house tourists, it will not be profitable to operate expanded boat service to Isle Royale. It is regrettable that, for want of funds, our citizens are denied access to one of Nature's finest playgrounds.

Some of the sights to be seen in this park are not to be found anywhere else in the Midwest. A herd of 300 moose roam the island; wolves and coyotes are heard after the moon comes up, and the fishing along virgin shores and inland lakes is a caster's delight.

What is needed to make Isle Royale the vacationland it should be? Living quarters, such as hotels, motels, and

shelters for campers are needed, plus docking facilities for private boats and a seaplane for summer patrol.

I hope that the Park Service, which has fared well this year at the hands of the Appropriations Committee, will not be unmindful of Isle Royale and its needs for the benefit of the lovers of the great outdoors.

Upper Colorado River Project—Weather Control Makes It a White Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there has been an important scientific development since the upper Colorado River project was conceived which makes such project, if possible, even less economic and more unfeasible than ever before.

The development is weather modification or control, commonly known as rainmaking.

The President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control has just made its report to the President. Additional precipitation of water through cloud seeding and similar weather modification methods has been proven, and acceptable methods of measurement of the degree of success of obtaining precipitation over normal have been found.

The President's Advisory Committee has studied the possibilities of additional water for the Colorado River through weather control operations in the upper Colorado watershed and has stated that if the precipitation can be brought to 20 percent above the normal—that is, what it would be for a given year without such weather control—the upper river basin runoff for dry years would be increased by approximately 3 million acre-feet; for normal years by approximately 4,500,000 acre-feet; and for wet years by approximately 5,700,000 acre-feet.

Dr. Irving Krick, meteorologist of Denver, Colo., who has carried out many such weather modification projects including studies and test work in the Upper Colorado watershed, states that a 20 percent increase in precipitation is an exceedingly conservative estimate and that the average increase of precipitation over normal in other projects has approximated 50 percent. If the 50 percent figure were used for the upper Colorado Basin, the additional runoff in dry seasons would be about 7 million acre-feet and for normal seasons would be more than 11 million acre-feet.

The upper Colorado River project now before Congress creates no additional water. It merely impounds water that is in the river anyway. It actually causes the available water to be decreased because it is admitted even by the proponents of the project that close to 1 million acre-feet would be evaporated into the air annually from the proposed reservoirs.

The water that would be brought to the Colorado River by weather control—

rain-making—in the upper Colorado River watershed is more than the needs of the upper basin area. It can be used on its way down to the main river from the snowpacks, rainfalls, and so forth, to give moisture to pasture lands. It can be impounded here and there near its sources in small reservoirs to take care of the needs of present or proposed irrigation projects in the upper basin and then it can go down to the river for use below Lees Ferry.

The cost of such small impounding dams above various points of use would be small compared with the nearly \$1 million for the project as proposed in the bill.

The cost of obtaining this added runoff would approximate—according to the President's Advisory Committee—less than 50 cents per acre-foot or about \$1 million per year. On Dr. Krick's estimate of a greater precipitation the annual cost per acre-foot would be much less than 50 cents.

This added water, as it passes into Lake Mead and through the Hoover powerplant, would be worth at least 50 cents per acre-foot for electric generation alone. But it then goes down the river where it can be used by various irrigation districts and water districts such as the Imperial and Coachella irrigation districts and the Metropolitan and San Diego water districts. The water for these purposes is worth more than \$2 per acre-foot.

Thus, on a more than self-sustaining basis from the start and with an expenditure of approximately \$1 million per year, all the nonpower objectives of the upper Colorado River project are met without the expenditure of nearly a billion dollars.

Furthermore, this increased precipitation will cause the water as it reaches points of use in the lower Colorado areas to have less salt content, whereas the evaporation of 1 million cubic feet a year resulting from the carrying through of the upper Colorado River project would admittedly cause the salt content of the water to increase materially. The water already carries about a ton of salt per acre-foot of water. Any increase of this salt content would require more water by the irrigator for leaching purposes and if the salt content increases greatly it would render such irrigator's soil worthless for purposes for which now used.

Weather modification in the upper Colorado Basin, in view of the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, should be tested for a few years before commitment is made for a billion-dollar project. The billion-dollar project will merely impound water already in the river and destroy part of its usefulness through evaporation. Weather modification at almost insignificant expense—which will be self-sustaining from the start—will create additional available water through increased precipitation and increased runoff.

The potential deficit of water in the Colorado River Basin is indicated by the President's Advisory Committee to be 9 or 10 million acre-feet per year. This cannot be produced by the project covered by the bill because no water is

created. It can be produced without such project by simple and inexpensive weather control by cloud seeding, and so forth.

Dr. Krick has indicated his willingness to undertake such weather modification at actual out-of-pocket cost estimated at not to exceed \$1 million per year and to take his fee for services on a contingent basis at the rate of a certain number of cents per acre-foot of water produced over normal for the year in question.

From the above it is clear, based on the findings of the President's Advisory Committee, that the Colorado River project cannot be justified from the standpoint of irrigation and domestic needs in either the upper or lower river basins.

Few who have considered in Congress the bill for the upper Colorado River project have known much about weather modification—rainmaking—and its possibilities in the upper Colorado Basin. What has been accomplished in this new field has been known only by a few. But the recent findings of the President's Advisory Committee change all this.

The upper Colorado River project bill should be sent back to the Interior Committee and carefully restudied in the light of this new development. It points the way to greater benefits for the areas and populations involved at far less cost.

Senator Langer Spent \$2,400 Government Funds Making Trips Back to North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the reporter who took out after Senator Langer for charging up an expense of \$2,400 for trips to North Dakota really started something. Langer is the luckiest politician I know of. He gets more publicity than anyone here, and invariably the charges against him are trivial. Several of his trips I know about, and each time he was doing a service to the people of North Dakota. His trip out in the mud to view the mistakes of the Army engineers who flooded 60,000 acres of the best land in Ramsey County unnecessarily was one trip, and all the others had to do with performing a service for the people of North Dakota. What about the other Senators and Representatives who traveled all over the known face of the earth this last summer and several summers before to view foreign countries to see what aid they could bring to people in Africa, India, Tasmania, Timbaktu, Greece, Italy, and the rest of Europe? These trips cost the Government for each Member many times Langer's bill for attending to the people of North Dakota. Probably half of the Congress made these foreign trips, and I haven't seen any statement of what it cost the people. But let a Sen-

ator spend his time at home looking after the people of this country and the newspapers have a spasm and go into a fit of apoplexy.

While we are in this frenzy over LANGER's expense account, I am going to attempt to place before the people all the bills of the Members of the Senate and House who thought it necessary to look after the people of foreign countries. If I can do this LANGER's expense account will look like a flyspeck on the map of North Dakota.

A Blank Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDGAR W. Hiestand

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. Hiestand. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement based on information contained in a minority report on the Colorado River storage project bill. The bill is scheduled for the floor during the week beginning February 27.

Total costs of this Colorado River boondoggle are unknown. Therefore the bill in its proposed form amounts to a blank check to a Government construction agency which has been treated overgenerously already in the past.

Interest charges alone for the full period allowed for repayment are estimated at between \$320 million and \$1,153 million, or from 30 percent to more than 100 percent of the original estimated construction cost. This, of course, will be subject to revision upward should more participating projects be added, and there are many being talked of. They are of dubious value, to say the least.

Extension of the repayment period to the year 2032 is a departure from precedent and means that it is entirely probable that the year will be beyond the economic life of some of the units.

Almost complete dependence for repayment of the costs of the project upon a system of high-cost hydro projects amounts, in my mind along with the minds of the minority members of the committee, to fiscal necromancy.

There is much doubt that a ready market can be found for this high-cost power—at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. Sufficient evidence to justify dependence upon this source of revenue for repayment costs has not been presented. It is indeed doubtful that consumers will pay the high rates that will be needed for the liquidation of the cost of this project. These rates would necessarily be far above established rates at other reclamation projects.

It is strange, too, to have such dependence placed on hydropower near the center of the largest coal reserves in the Nation. These reserves need only to be mined to produce steam-generated power to the full extent of any foreseeable demand. The oil-shale deposits of the Colorado Plateau are another poten-

tial source of energy to compete with this high-cost hydropower.

I submit that this blank check project amounts to no more than the wild-est of wild dreams to spend Government money for a wholly unnecessary source of power. This proposed project not only is financially unsound, but also is not reconcilable with the interests of common sense.

Export of Tanks to Saudi Arabia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in a very difficult dilemma as a result of halting and then approving the export of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia. This situation points up a need for clarification of our position in the tug of war in the Middle East.

The State Department should review its entire foreign policy with a view to reducing the cold war tensions that have been aggravating the Middle East for several years.

Far more caution would appear to be indicated. Certainly the evidence points to employment of such arms shipments in this struggle for power.

Even granting that we have made certain commitments to Saudi Arabia for assistance in return for permitting us to utilize an air base at Dhahran on Saudi Arabia's east coast, and granting that this base is of great strategic importance to the free world's maintenance of its security, it seems to me we are endangering the world's security by shipments of arms to nations which have openly demonstrated their readiness to go to war with each other.

War in any form must be avoided. Within our own lifetime we should have learned the bitter lesson that little wars grow inevitably into big wars.

Certainly there must be some other form of compensation we can make to Saudi Arabia than actual shipment of relatively modern armed tanks, these to a nation engaged in a grim struggle for power within an orbit that is patently in a powder-keg state.

In addition, the protests from Israel and other nations in the Middle East make it amply clear that concessions, such as this shipment of tanks, only place us in a position where other concessions must be made to nations adversely affected by the shipment.

The arms race between the Arab States and Israel already has resulted in armed clashes. Shipment of materials that could be converted to wartime use and outright assistance both from the Soviet Union and the United States have seemed to encourage these skirmishes.

History repeatedly has demonstrated the folly of such arms competition. In fairness, it must be admitted that we are today facing the uncomfortable fact that if we do not assist the Arab States, the

Soviet Union will. In fact, the Soviet Union is now supplying some Arab States regardless of what action we may take.

Most of us are aware that the East-West rivalry has resulted from the simple fact that 75 percent of the Free World's proven oil reserves are held by Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Qatar. Western Europe receives most of its oil supplies from this area.

The benefits to the Soviet bloc from curtailing or disrupting this flow of oil from the Middle East are all too obvious. Most of these countries, while under the complete domination of hereditary rulers, are subject from day to day to Communist pressures.

In the face of this background of great riches and unrest, the United States has on the high seas a shipment of tanks. These 18 war machines undoubtedly will make a big difference in the balance of power between Israel and the Arab States.

We must consider carefully the consequences of such shipments.

I am not trying to hold any brief for or against the quarrels that have created this situation between the Arab States and Israel.

It is my conviction that we are courting world conflict if we continue a policy of shipping arms to nations, which in fact already are fighting each other.

Nothing for the Navahos in Upper Colorado River Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado storage project bill, H. R. 3383, would not assist the Navaho Indians.

It provides for the Navaho Dam and Reservoir, but not for the present construction of the Navaho project. However, the construction of the dam would have the effect of committing Congress to constructing the irrigation project works. The cost of the dam is estimated at \$36,500,000; the irrigation project an additional \$175 million. There are some 1,100 Navaho families involved, meaning a construction cost of close to \$200,000 for each Navaho farm. This is just to bring water to the land and does not account for assistance which will undoubtedly be necessary for equipment to get the lands in production. This astounding cost should be most carefully considered before Congress acts, particularly since H. R. 3383, as recently amended, now provides that costs allocated to Indian lands which such lands cannot repay shall be nonreimbursable—section 6. This amendment was advertised as a gift to the Indians by newspapers reporting on recent upper basin conferences which led to the amending of H. R. 3383. It is a gift Congress might well inspect closely. Certainly some

more realistic and more economic method of providing for the Indians can be considered. By this gift, the upper basin shows its unwillingness to have the costs of the Navaho project paid for by the power revenues, as all the other costs are supposed to be. Instead, this money will go into the funds to be apportioned among these States, leaving the taxpayers in the rest of the country to carry the load.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me on February 16, 1956, before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at Washington, D. C.

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

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE OPENING DINNER OF THE WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 16, 1956

It is a great honor and a real inspiration for me to be here this evening. The women's patriotic organizations represented in this important conference have earned the gratitude of every loyal American.

They exemplify devotion to the ideals of our free Republic. They work for a strong America—a God-fearing, righteous America—a Republic of spiritual and cultural power, dedicated to the highest standards of honor and justice.

I am proud to salute the members of this conference and its participating organizations as loyal and courageous soldiers in the battle to defend and preserve the American system of government.

In the gracious invitation for me to address you this evening it was suggested that I discuss the Bricker amendment and the dangers that arise from what has come to be known as treaty law.

In that connection I think it is appropriate to review the nature of the American plan of government and the reasons for our greatness as a nation.

First, let me point out that we Americans are a peace loving people. It is our proud boast that we are the most powerful Nation in all history—yet we have never imposed tyranny upon any people of the earth. We have never fought a war of conquest. We have never sought territorial gain by force of arms.

Whenever we have been forced into armed conflict we have fought on the side of honor, justice, and freedom. We have made terrific sacrifices in blood and treasure to liberate oppressed and persecuted people. American heroes have suffered and died to repel aggression that would rob free people of their liberty and would enslave them under savage cruelty.

Our sole objective in war has been to uphold the integrity of free nations, to preserve the principle of individual freedom and

to protect the right of free people to live under the form of government chosen by their own free will.

For 150 years we have been able to keep our shores free from armed invaders. Of all the world's great nations we are the only one that has escaped the desolation and destruction of war.

In two world wars we gained great military victories. Our fighting men covered themselves with everlasting glory. But the peace for which they offered their lives was not achieved. Secret deals at the conference table sabotaged American power for peace and opened the way for Communist dictatorship over one-third of the world.

As we look back to the reasons for our national greatness we must turn to the foundations upon which the Founding Fathers erected the structure of American freedom.

First, and most important, we have the ideals of Americanism so eloquently expressed in the Declaration of Independence:

"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Those rights are the essence of our individual freedom. They are not granted by government. They come from God.

Government that attempts to restrict or curtail them, or to take them away, transgresses against the divine law, to which the Founding Fathers gave their firm allegiance.

Next we turn to the Constitution of the United States, the charter of our liberties, which has been described as the greatest state document ever produced by the hand and brain of man.

Under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights there was created a government that has demonstrated its capacity and fitness to serve the people for generations far into the future.

For the first time in world history it gave recognition to the individual. For the first time in world history there was brought forth a new concept of government which derived its just powers from the consent of the governed. Never before had there been a government whose powers were specifically defined as grants from the people and limited within the bounds of a written Constitution.

And it is important to remember that in adopting the Bill of Rights the Founding Fathers did not propose to establish freedom of speech, press, assembly, religion, or to protect the rights of property. They recognized these rights as God-given rights, bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the universe. They set forth in language of biblical simplicity, the areas of human dignity and individual freedom upon which government was forbidden to encroach.

Under that plan in less than 200 years, Americans, living in freedom, have built the richest, the soundest, and the strongest nation in all history.

We hold the Constitution in the greatest reverence but that great State document, within itself, provides the method by which it can be amended to conform with changing conditions. I need not stress the point that proposed amendments should be approached with utmost caution. I think every good American will agree that the test of any proposed change is whether it will strengthen the fundamental principles of free government laid down by those whose vision and wisdom gave us the Constitution.

I submit, my fellow Americans, that the Bricker amendment meets that test.

I believe it to be one of the most important pieces of legislation now before Congress. Its importance, as you know, grows out of the various interpretations that have been given regarding article 6 of the Constitution which reads, in part, as follows:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pur-

suance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

We who support the Bricker amendment regard it as most unfortunate that there is so much difference of opinion, even in the courts, regarding the meaning of this article. For that reason we believe it should be amended and spelled out in the same simple language that we find in the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights.

It should be amended so as to give added force to article 1, section 1, which provides:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Please note the words "all legislative powers herein granted." They make no exception. They confer no legislative powers upon the executive branch of government and certainly none on any foreign government.

Furthermore, in support of this exclusive grant of legislative power the 10th amendment states:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In the 2d session of the 83d Congress the Bricker amendment was debated in the Senate at great length. Every word was examined with extreme care. A great many decisions of the Supreme Court were quoted. Legal technicalities were brought forth and ably expounded with force and eloquence by proponents of the proposed amendment and by those who were opposed. Substitute proposals were offered and on the final vote the proposed amendment failed to pass by the margin of 1 vote less than the required two-thirds.

I shall not attempt to go into further detail of the legislative record. But to my mind one thing is very clear. We are confronted with one of the most fundamental principles that has to do with the stability, if not the permanence, of the American form of government. Unless legislation is limited by the Constitution we destroy one of the mightiest safeguards for the preservation of liberty. We place in danger every sacred right for which brave men have fought, suffered and died in their striving for freedom.

The Founding Fathers were strong in their determination to restrict the powers of Government. I cannot accept the conclusion that they would make a grant of unlimited power over foreign and domestic affairs.

I am opposed to the use of international treaties for making domestic laws for the people of the United States. I am opposed to overriding the Constitution without the consent of the people.

For many years of our history the dangers of treaty law did not become apparent. Treaties between the United States and foreign countries dealt with international subjects such as alliances, war and peace, boundaries, trade agreements and so forth. It never occurred to the average American that a treaty could interfere in the domestic life of our Nation. It did not seem conceivable that a treaty could in any way infringe upon our individual rights as American citizens.

The Bricker amendment is needed to safeguard the right of the American people to make their own laws within the framework of the Constitution through their elected Representatives in Congress. It is needed to protect the American people from the will of a super-government to which they have not given their consent. It is needed to preserve the system of checks and balances which have served us so well in separating the functions and powers of the three branches of our Government. It is needed to prevent the

unwarranted encroachment of executive authority upon the legislative branch of Government.

I do not question the high integrity or sincere purpose of President Eisenhower in his opposition to the Bricker amendment. I do not fear that he will lead us into national peril.

But I can look back to the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam which were conceived in secrecy and withheld from Congress and the American people. I need not remind you that by these agreements we committed our country to make tremendous concessions to Russia and helped extend the power of the Communist conspiracy.

I can look forward with apprehension to the future when unprincipled men, ambitious for power, may seek to enlarge Federal authority over the American people by means of treaties and executive agreements.

If treaty law can override the Constitution it can deprive people of the rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the sentiment expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], when he introduced his proposed amendment in the 83d Congress.

Addressing his colleagues, Senator BRICKER said, and I quote:

"The fight for the protection against treaty law has only just begun. This fight to prevent the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States from being undermined by treaties and executive agreements will be carried on in elections, in national organizations, and in Congresses until it is settled to the satisfaction of the overwhelming majority of the American people. That majority would rather live without fear under a government of constitutional restraints than live in jeopardy under a government of men."

Therefore I say to you that the responsibility for freedom rests not in Washington but in the hearts of the people.

It is a responsibility so grave that it must not be assumed without solemn rededication to freedom of the individual as the keystone of our national faith.

The fight for the Bricker amendment can be won if we can reach the hearts of the people. It can be won if organizations like yours take leadership in old fashioned patriotism.

Love of country and loyalty to its ideals are the great and indispensable virtues of American citizenship.

Just a few days ago we celebrated the birthday anniversary of one of the greatest of all Americans, Abraham Lincoln.

Let us, in his immortal words, here highly resolve "that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday marked the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence and I take this opportunity to salute American citizens of Lithuanian descent. We join with them in their wishes—that

their people, the freedom-loving people of Lithuania, will again be free. In 1918, after 138 years of Russian rule, they achieved independence. During this period of independence they experienced a rebirth of their national culture and political freedom. Yet only 27 years later they found themselves helplessly within the Soviet orbit and today they suffer the severest form of Soviet occupation.

I think that today we all realize our commitment not only to the people of Lithuania but to those people in all areas of the globe under Soviet tyranny—a commitment to keep uppermost in our minds the goal that they will again be free. Therefore, we resolve it to be our duty to see that political freedom again takes its proper place in the world scene.

California Opposes Upper Colorado Scheme Because It Tramples Her Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress seeks the construction of 11 irrigation projects in the so-called upper basin States of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. These would irrigate about 200 square miles of new land and supply supplemental water to about 400 square miles of land irrigated inadequately at present. They are known as participating projects.

According to Government experts, they would cost about \$300 million, and that amount would be repaid to the United States without interest over a 50-year period as required by reclamation law and precedent.

The participating projects would use an estimated 400,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water a year for irrigation, domestic and industrial purposes. This amount is well within what the upper basin is entitled to use and California cannot object on that score.

There is, however, a "but" to the proposal and it is a big one. It is that revenues from the sale of water from the 11 participating projects during the 50 years would bring in only about 15 percent of the money needed to repay the Government for its investment.

As a consequence the proponents of the projects had to look elsewhere for an additional source of revenue to pay the remaining 85 percent of the price tag within the time limit. They seized on the idea of building vast power dams and utilizing the revenues from the sale of power for this purpose. In the proposals before Congress, these are called storage projects to obscure their true cash register nature.

As a starter three power projects are proposed—one at Glen Canyon, one at Flaming Gorge, and one, conditionally at

Curecanti, costing respectively: \$421,270,000, \$82,942,000, and \$88,500,000. Total: \$592,712,000. Other power projects would follow later.

The power projects are unrelated in any way to the 11 participating projects, except as cash registers. The latter could function to supply water entirely without them. Yet Congress is being asked to spend about \$600 million additional for the power features for the sole purpose of paying the \$300 million participating projects' cost.

It is little wonder that alert citizens throughout the Nation, concerned over the Federal debt and high taxes, have voiced opposition to the scheme. Federal taxpayers would be better off if Congress makes an outright gift of the 11 participating projects to the Upper Basin States and forgets the power features completely.

It is with these power features that Californians have also a special concern. They would hold back, for power use, most of the 48,000,000 acre-feet of water to be stored by the project. In the storage process, another 10,000,000 acre-feet of water would disappear by evaporation. Thereafter, they would evaporate another 600,000 acre-feet of water per year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million people. The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet figure that is to be put to beneficial use by all 11 participating projects. It is 150 percent of that amount.

That is mostly water that thirsty southern Californians claim they are entitled to have flow downstream to their State and which cannot legally be withheld from them because of their prior right to it established by contract, appropriation, and the Colorado River compact.

The Colorado River compact was negotiated at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922 by the seven States bordering on the river. It is a contract between these States and authority for such interstate agreements is found in the United States Constitution. Herbert Hoover, then winding up his affairs as World War I food administrator for starving Europe, acted as chairman during the negotiations.

The compact did not attempt to divide up water in the river as such, nor did it make any specific allocations of water as such to the States involved. Rather, it proceeded by regarding the river as consisting of three parts:

First. The upper basin: Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.

Second. The lower basin: California, Arizona, and Nevada.

Third. That part of the river which crosses the international boundary and flows in the Republic of Mexico.

The dividing line between the upper and lower basins was fixed at a point called Lee Ferry in northernmost Arizona, near the Utah border.

Thereupon the negotiators proceeded to apportion "beneficial consumptive use" of the river's waters between the basins. The compact nowhere defines "beneficial consumptive use," and its meaning is one of the issues in the

pending Supreme Court suit by Arizona against California. In general, it amounts to use of water for irrigation, industrial, or domestic purposes.

That kind of "use" of water in the amount of $7\frac{1}{2}$ million acre-feet yearly was apportioned to each basin by the compact's article III (a). This totals 15 million acre-feet; and since that was not all the water the negotiators believed available, by article III (b) they permitted the lower basin to make use of an additional 1 million acre-feet of "surplus" water.

Having no authority to cut Mexico out of water to which she might legally be entitled, they wrote article III (c), saying Mexico was to have whatever might be determined by a later treaty. This again was to come out of "surplus," but, if need be, equally out of each basin's III (a) apportionment. A subsequent treaty fixed Mexico's entitlement at $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre-feet a year.

At this point the negotiators had disposed of $17\frac{1}{2}$ million acre-feet of water a year, but they thought there was even more in the river, so in article III (f) they set up machinery for "a further equitable apportionment" of remaining water at a later date. Subsequent experience with the river has shown not only that this additional water is nonexistent, but also that part of the apportioned water likewise is nonexistent. The river, in fact, averages a critical deficiency of almost $2\frac{1}{2}$ million acre-feet a year.

Unless she desires to enter into a one party "suicide pact" California must resist to the utmost the upper basin's bold attempt, by means of the upper Colorado Basin storage project as now planned, to charge almost all this deficiency against California's preexisting water rights.

Unfortunately, this is only one of many ingenious ways in which the attempted invasion of California's water rights is being conducted. There are about a dozen other provisions in the compact on which upper basin proponents are placing weird interpretations trying to deny California and the lower basin even more water. Illustrative is the dispute involving article III (d).

Since the flow of the river varies widely from year to year, lower-basin negotiators insisted on guaranties preventing the upper basin from manipulating its uses between wet and dry years to the disadvantage of the lower basin. This turned up as article III (d) prohibiting the upper basin from depleting the amount of water flowing past Lee Ferry below a total of 75 million acre-feet in any period of 10 consecutive years.

In their desperate water grab, project proponents now contend this proviso, rather than amounting to a minimum guaranty to the lower basin, amounts to the maximum amount of water they are required to turn down the river. They say they can keep everything in excess, storing it for power purposes or making any other use or nonuse they desire.

They persist in this contention even in the face of an interpretation of the compact made by Herbert Hoover at the

time it was negotiated in his words as follows:

The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above what cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes.

In the past, California has not opposed upper basin developments. Many projects in Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado have passed Congress without an objection from the Golden State. But when schemes are proposed such as this that cut deeply into the vital water supply, like a man attacked in his own home, Californians must command their every means and skill for self-preservation.

The Attack on Veterans' Medical Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, February 18, 1956.

My remarks follow:

There is a move underway to cut down medical services for veterans under the cloak of economy.

Memory and gratitude can be very short when some people see the opportunity of saving on taxes by forgetting human obligations.

The Hoover Commission has made excellent recommendations on other phases of Government operations, but on the question of reducing medical services to veterans, many of us believe that it is going too far.

The Commission advises the cancellation of all present outstanding authorizations and appropriations for construction of additional veterans' general hospitals, except for those now under construction or under contract.

And that the Veterans' Administration dispose of by sale or otherwise, any hospital which, in its judgment can no longer be operated effectively and economically.

The VA replies that this would present a question for legislative consideration, since the Congress has authorized the construction of two proposed 500-bed general medical hospitals as replacements, one at Washington, D. C., and the other at Cleveland, Ohio. In both instances, these hospitals are necessary and are located in areas of large patient demand.

Insofar as the closing of existing hospitals is concerned, the VA believes that any determinations which are made along this line should be followed by notice to the appropriate committees of the Congress well in advance of the proposed closing dates. This appears to be a proper and advisable step, in view of the fact that the acquisition and construction of hospitals operated by the VA was pursuant to congressional authority. In commenting on this proposal by the Commission, may I say that it vests too much power in government by directive. In recent years there has been a tendency for the executive branch to take over powers that properly belong to the Congress, thus upsetting the balance upon which a free and

representative government depends. Committees and administrators without any direct mandate from the people are assuming authority that was vested in duly elected Senators and Representatives. As the Federal Government becomes larger and more complex, power must be delegated but supervised. Administrators can never be a law unto themselves. The VA is correct in reminding the Hoover Commission that the Congress must have the final say in these matters. The living veterans of the Korean war number 4,346,000, and their average age is 27 years.

A PASSING THOUGHT

The Commission further recommends "that the statement of a veteran of his inability to pay for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities, should be subject to verification; and that the Veterans' Administration be authorized to collect in case such a statement is not substantiated."

For one thing, this would require changes in the existing law. The present law provides that the statement of the veteran "shall be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses." No other verification is required and the statute does not permit the conditioning of free hospitalization upon verification thereof, pursuant to investigation.

In 1953, after hearings conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, it was decided to require a veteran to state his assets on the hospital application form (VA form 10-P-10). But, irrespective of the facts reflected by the statement of assets, hospitalization may not be denied if the applicant makes the required statement under oath of his inability to defray the expenses of hospitalization. It was felt that this additional procedure would serve as a deterrent to abuses.

Since that time, out of more than one-half million applications that have been forwarded to central office up to December 1955, only 200 cases revealed that the applicant could have paid for his necessary hospital and medical care. This is only one twenty-fifth of 1 percent, a trifling percentage of the whole. It is believed that the relatively insignificant number of questionable cases which have been turned up by this procedure does not justify the apparent views of the Commission that the present system is subject to widespread abuses.

The VA seriously questions the wisdom and practicability of a verification procedure such as that contemplated by the Hoover Commission.

The second part of the recommendation to the effect that collection should be made where the statement is not substantiated is inconsistent with the first part. If the oath were subject to verification the applicant would not be admitted to the hospital in the first place. This also brings up a serious question of policy. Neither the VA, nor any other governmental agency should enter into the business of providing hospital care for pay, in competition with private, public, or charitable institutions.

Remember, there are 15,391,000 living veterans of World War II, whose average age is $36\frac{1}{2}$ years.

Another Hoover recommendation would provide, and I quote: "That the veteran should assume a liability to pay for care of his non-service-connected disability if he can do so at some reasonable time in the future. Such a debt should be without interest. Congress should pass appropriate laws for the collection of such obligations."

Hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities was authorized as far back as 1933. This basic law contemplates the furnishing of hospital care and treatment on a free basis, to veterans who are eligible under its provisions. In this respect, the program of hospitalization, both for service-connected

and non-service-connected cases, is part of the overall pattern of benefits, including compensation, pensions, and readjustment aids for veterans, which has been established for the assistance and relief of eligible veterans as a measure of the Government's obligation and therefore at the expense of the Government.

It may be mentioned also, that the proposal to pay back in the future, would be administratively expensive and unwieldy. The follow-up procedures, both with respect to determination of when the veteran might have attained an economic position enabling him to make payment and with respect to collection procedures, could be most cumbersome. It would tend to emphasize the commercial aspects of a governmental activity in behalf of a large group of persons hitherto regarded as having a special claim on the Government by reason of their service in time of war in the Armed Forces.

How about this fact? There are 68,000 living veterans of the Spanish-American War whose average age is 78½ years.

It should be noted that the Commission's comments with respect to collecting from insurance companies, are rather misleading and unrealistic. The insurance companies have very largely written their policies to exclude reimbursement for hospital care afforded at public expense. The Commission's recommendation would not affect this non-assumption of liability, and it is beyond the power of the Congress to require change of these insurance policies on this matter, or to prohibit private persons from entering into such contracts.

The Hoover Commission also recommends:

"A. That the responsibility and authority to establish and maintain medical criteria for disability, both initial and continuing, should be transferred from the Compensation and Pension Branch of the Department of Veterans' Benefits, to the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

"B. That the Department of Medicine and Surgery should also develop and maintain a mechanism for review of disability allowances based on the possibility of increase or decrease in disabilities."

The law provides that ratings shall be based, as far as practicable, upon the average impairments of earning capacity resulting from such injuries in civil occupations. Thus, the impairment of earning capacity is not that of the individual, but rather "average impairment" as related to a large class of individuals. This, therefore, does not permit the reduction of percentage rating in an individual case where the veteran has been successful in overcoming the handicap.

It may also be noted that the one example used by the Commission of an excessive disability rating in the lower brackets is described in such a way as to reflect a misunderstanding. It stated that amputation of a great toe is rated at 30 percent, for which the veteran is entitled to a minimum of \$50 per month, regardless of his other income. In fact, the uncomplicated amputation of the great toe entitles to a rating of only 10 percent. When it is associated with removal of the metatarsal head, and consequently with the loss of muscle tone of both arches of the foot, it entitles to 30 percent. This is not high in relation to 10 percent for the simple loss of the toe, or 40 percent for the loss of the foot. The question of whether such a rating is realistic can be determined only by a survey of the resultant average impairment in earning capacity, and not solely on the basis of medical opinion, no matter how well informed.

As to section B of the recommendation, the Hoover Commission states that there is a tendency to regard disabilities as continuing and progressive, and to avoid reexaminations.

The fact is, that unless examinations by medical personnel of the Department of

Medicine and Surgery indicates that the disability is static, reexaminations are required until the disability has remained at the same level as shown by examination over a period of 5 years.

In my opinion, the Veterans' Administration has effectively answered these implied criticisms by the Hoover Commission.

It appears that the Commission is probing for an opening in the defenses we have established to protect the rights of veterans.

Under the guise of saving money, the economy skirmishers would undermine the whole program of veterans' benefits.

By emphasizing the few abuses, they would try to void the Nation's obligations to the men and women whose health was impaired in service to our country.

Behind the quiet words and the dull legalism is the intent to reduce veterans' benefits to the minimum.

Educational, and on-the-job-training programs for the veterans of World War II have already expired, insofar as beginning such courses is concerned.

The men of World War I never had such opportunities.

Now we must concentrate on maintaining suitable programs for the sick and aging veterans.

This is no time to economize at their expense.

I hope that the American public will insist on continuing medical care for all deserving veterans.

Remember this fact, there are 3,105,000 living veterans of World War I, whose average age is 62 years.

Speech Prepared for Delivery by Hon. J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland, Before a Lincoln Day Dinner of Pinellas County Republicans in Clearwater, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech prepared for delivery by Senator J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland, before a Lincoln Day dinner of Pinellas County Republicans in Clearwater, Fla.

The speech follows:

Abraham Lincoln died 91 years too soon.

Unfortunately, he never had the opportunity to see how effective and able the women of this great Nation can be when they take a direct part in politics.

Men have always suspected, of course, that women would be a wonderful adornment to the political scene. But now they have found that you women are much more than that. You women have shown without question that your active participation in politics is essential to good government. And we men need you.

We need you as loyal and understanding wives, and that is especially true on those many occasions when dinner gets cold while we are out politicking.

We need some of you as candidates, for a government without a direct voice from women can get to be like a symphony orchestra without a violin section.

And finally, we need millions of you as volunteer workers, for there is always that very practical matter of winning elections.

As you probably realize, there is one major, and all-important point which we have in our favor in this business of winning elections.

We have popular opinion on our side.

I realize the limitations of statistics, but I'd like to quote some fairly overwhelming figures which, I think, show just how strong we really are.

These results were announced by the American Institute of Public Opinion (which is better known as the Gallup Poll) several months ago.

First of all, citizens of this country were asked point blank: "Do you approve or disapprove of the way Eisenhower is handling his job as President?"

A tremendous 73 percent of the people said "Approve."

Only 14 percent said that they disapprove.

The other 13 percent indicated they had no opinion on the matter.

Now let's take a look at a breakdown of those figures in regard to the South.

When the poll takers reported their findings on a regional basis we found that in the South, 68 percent of the people said they approve of the way Mr. Eisenhower is doing his work;

A mere 18 percent disapproved, and 14 percent said they had no opinion.

Here's another point which I found extremely interesting.

The question this time was: "If the President's doctors say it is all right, and if he decides he wants to run in 1956, would you vote for him?"

The answers were: 56 percent, "Yes;" 31 percent, "No;" and 13 percent undecided.

Comparing that survey with another one which was taken prior to the President's attack, the Gallup men discovered that the drop in the ranks of those who said they would cast their ballots for reelection was only 5 percent.

As I said, we definitely do have popular opinion on our side.

Here are some of the reasons why that is true.

At the national level of government, officials of the Eisenhower administration have faced up to the grave issues and the problems of these years with faith and with courage—and success has attended our labors.

We can also point with equal pride to many men and women of the administration who serve the public in official capacities in various localities of our Nation.

Since the glorious birth of this Nation, many fine men of outstanding character, unusual wisdom and unquestioned devotion to the great principles of our heritage, have served in the highest office that our free people can bestow, the Presidency of the United States.

But until the present time two have towered above the others on heights rarely reached by others in the entire history of the world.

George Washington strode with giant steps to the stage of great events in the crisis of the colonial rebellion against the tyranny of a distant monarch.

With ragged volunteers from the 13 colonies he welded together an Army which helped forge the greatest Nation on earth.

The other was Abraham Lincoln, whose memory we honor this weekend.

Although many persons were in honest disagreement with the policies of Lincoln, they never had the slightest thought that his actions were ever marred by cowardice or greed or pettiness.

Now, at last, another man has attained the stature of those other forthright Americans.

As history brings these troubled and dangerous times into the perspective of the whole, literate people in all of the civilized world will associate with Washington and

Lincoln, as representatives of all the time-less greatness of America, the name of their new, great partner, the incumbent leader of the people, the President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Yes, Dwight Eisenhower, born to our magnificent traditions of freedom and human dignity, trained in love and respect for God and for his fellow men, and tested in the terrible trials of massive war, was drawn to the full height of his great stature, like Washington and Lincoln, in time of crisis—crisis for this Nation and for the world.

He came to the Presidency in the midst of a stalemate in a cruel and costly war, a stalemate which his opponents said could not be broken—a war which they said could not be ended.

He moved with dispatch.

He acted with decision.

He brought into play the skills of the great soldier that he is, and the intellect of the great statesman that he is.

The stalemate was ended at the conference table.

The shouting, suffering, and slaughter were stopped in the hills and across the plains of Korea.

Dwight Eisenhower moved into the White House while the tyrants, the would-be conquerors of the world, were rattling their sabers with new vigor, when the initiative was all on their side, when confidence was lacking among our allies and those who should be our allies in the event of war.

Under the wise leadership of Dwight Eisenhower, our Nation has taken the initiative, not the boastful, blustering initiative of warmongers, not the threatening initiative of those who would enrich themselves through the conquest of the lands and goods of others, but the calm, courageous, directional initiative of enlightened, civilized people who are as proud in their pursuit of a permanent peace as they were courageous in conflict.

Our policies and our purposes have been stated clearly by President Eisenhower.

The mist of doubt has been removed.

The confidence of allies has been strengthened, and the power of our defenses and of our weapons of offense, if necessary, has grown in mighty steps.

Our internal economy never was basically better.

The calm that has replaced near-hysteria within the Government has been transmitted to the people.

The fear that seemed normal prior to the Eisenhower administration has disappeared.

The economic recession which men of little faith had called inevitable never developed.

Make no mistake . . . the troubles and the dangers of the world have not yet been brought to an end.

They never could have been brought to an end under the directionless course we have known in the recent past.

They can, and I am confident will, be brought to an end with the leadership of Dwight Eisenhower.

"To protect our nations and our people from the catastrophe of nuclear holocaust," said this great President of ours, "free nations must maintain countervailing military power to persuade the Communists of the futility of seeking to advance their ends through aggression."

"If Communist rulers understand that never shall we buy peace at the expense of honor or faith, they will be powerfully deterred."

Yes; these are the words of Dwight Eisenhower, and the Communists have been powerfully deterred.

But the grand results—the final victory of peace—cannot be accomplished overnight, or even in the short period of 4 years.

We have found in Dwight Eisenhower, I believe with all my heart, the master of the crisis in the world.

We must, in the name of humanity, in the cause of decency, for the generations of today and for the sake of the generations to come keep Dwight David Eisenhower in his great job through a second term if he chooses to run.

I can understand his yearning for the quiet of his home in Gettysburg.

I can sympathize with him, too.

But I know his great love for his country and for humanity.

I know of his great faith in God and of his conviction that the search for a just and lasting peace is far from hopeless.

I feel that if he is convinced that he is needed, he will yield to the wishes of the people.

If the prayers of the people are answered, and Dwight Eisenhower heeds their rising call for him to continue his great crusade for peace and justice, he cannot be defeated.

Let the disciples of doubt raise their cries of fear and confusion.

When the chips are down and the sovereignty of the citizens is exercised again at the voting machines and ballot boxes across the land, the decision again will be, more overwhelming than before, that Dwight D. Eisenhower continue as President of the United States.

It could not be otherwise, because no other man since Washington and Lincoln has earned so well and kept so completely the confidence and faith of his fellow citizens.

I've been dwelling at length on the President himself.

Now let's consider the administration in general.

It has gained its strength, not only from the regular members of the GOP, but also from the many thousands of Americans who have become disgusted with Trumanism and its heir, Stevensonism.

Take my own Free State of Maryland, for instance.

In Maryland, as in Florida, the members of the President's party are in the minority.

Yet, today, because of the profound beliefs of the people of Maryland in individual liberty and the principles of the Eisenhower administration, Maryland has a Republican Governor, Theodore R. McKeldin, who had the honor of placing President Eisenhower's name in nomination at our national convention in 1952.

Maryland is also represented by two Republican Senators of which I have the honor to be one, together with Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER.

In addition, Maryland is represented by 3 GOP Representatives out of 7 for the State.

How is this possible? Because the people of Maryland have voted their convictions that they are better represented by the ideals and principles of this administration.

These convictions were not lightly arrived at, just as they were not in the case of the voters of Florida.

But knowing that when the philosophies of the two parties are brought home to the people they will vote for truly liberal government, I look forward to even greater gains in Florida this fall.

You have already gained national recognition by electing such a worthy Representative as BILL CRAMER, and now you will be expected to live up to the great promise you have shown.

I've done quite a bit of talking about BILL CRAMER since I arrived in your State, and I'm going to keep it up.

In the first place, BILL CRAMER has the bigwigs of the opposition plenty worried.

Personally, I don't blame them.

I'm just very glad that he's on our side.

On Capitol Hill, BILL CRAMER has made a reputation for fighting for what he wants.

Furthermore, he gets what he wants—and that is a real trick.

Just look at the \$11 million harbor project he got for the Tampa area, and the appropri-

tions he has gotten for your post offices, sponge industry, fish business and other activities.

It isn't easy getting things like that in Washington—I know.

I was in the House of Representatives for 10 years myself, but perhaps I could still take lessons from BILL CRAMER.

If anybody ever wants to know about a two-party system in the South, just point to Bill.

Florida can be proud of him, as we all are.

One of Bill's biggest jobs as part of the Eisenhower administration is to give the United States a liberal representative government.

Liberalism is a word that is being lightly tossed around these days.

The New Deal-Fair Deal Party and its supporters have claimed to be liberals.

But what is the true meaning of liberalism?

Does it mean excessive taxation, a flagrant spending of the resources of the American people for brazen political purposes—the placing of more and more controls and restrictions on the lives and economy of the Nation?

If that is true liberalism, then the New Deal-Fair Deal Party has been liberal.

But that is not true liberalism. It is liberality, liberality with the American people's money, freedom, initiative, and heritage.

The Eisenhower administration does not confuse liberalism with liberality.

Our true liberalism has respect for tradition, and it has vision of the progress in the future.

Our liberalism is based on the principle of individual freedom and liberty which permits each man and woman to be the maker of his or her own destiny.

It is a liberalism which stands by to aid in times of distress but exacts no tribute in the form of control over the people's economy or pocketbooks.

President Eisenhower himself has said, "This administration is committed to a program of progressive moderation, liberal in its human concerns, conservative in its economic proposals, constructively dynamic and optimistic in its appraisal of the future."

"This program, I firmly believe, merits the endorsement and support of thinking, confident, forward-looking Americans."

"For our national economy, we seek a dependable stability in our present assets, a vigorous expansion in our future growth."

"These can be best achieved, we believe, by giving the private citizen the greatest possible opportunity—consistent with the rights of others—to contribute to the development of the economy and to share in its abundance."

Since this present administration has been in power, we have made the following key policy changes:

1. In place of a stalemate war in Korea—a truce.
2. In place of reaction in foreign affairs—action.
3. In place of peak target dates in defense—the long pull.
4. In place of softness toward communism—firmness.
5. In place of planned deficits in finance—a balanced budget.
6. In place of increases in taxation—reductions.
7. In place of a shrinking buying power of the dollar—stability.
8. In place of unchangeability in agriculture—flexibility and adaptability.
9. In place of misguided favoritism in labor—fairness.
10. In place of antagonism to business—encouragement.
11. In place of Government paternalism in natural resources—partnership.
12. In place of promises on housing—better housing.
13. In place of wardships in social security—a cushion against shock.

14. In place of socializing medicine—improving private care.

15. In place of corruption—integrity.

16. In place of monopoly in atomic development—sharing.

Today there are more than 65 million persons at work at the highest wages in history. Construction has set a record at \$42 billion in 1955.

American businessmen sold \$14 billion worth of goods abroad.

Inflation has been halted.

Government spending has been reduced, taxes cut, and we are approaching a balanced budget.

These accomplishments are but a prelude of those to come in the dynamic program which the Eisenhower administration has presented to the American people.

Confident of the integrity, the honesty, and the belief in the American people and constitutional government, which this administration represents, the Nation can go forward to even greater heights in the future.

For the first time after two decades of New Deal-Fair Deal administrations, the American people now have the Federal Government back in their own hands—a Government which represents them—not a Government of a chosen few who would direct and regiment this American Nation.

Don't forget how long it has been that the South has had to fight against becoming stagnant under one-party rule.

It reminds me of the story of the young wife who nagged her husband with the following:

"What's the matter with you?" she asked.

"Monday you liked baloney.

"Tuesday you liked baloney.

"Wednesday you liked baloney.

"Now, Thursday, all of a sudden, you don't like baloney."

Well, now, all of a sudden, the South is fed up with baloney, too.

I'm sure you will keep doing something about it.

Thank you.

Government Bodies and Organizations Officially Opposed to Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the following list of governmental bodies and organizations which officially have recorded their opposition to the proposed upper Colorado River storage proposal. It undoubtedly is an incomplete list, but even as such, the imposing number of important groups included should give serious pause to anyone inclined to favor the project:

1. Engineers Joint Council.
2. American Society of Civil Engineers.
3. American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.
4. The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
5. The American Water Works Association.
6. American Institute of Electrical Engineers.
7. The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.
8. American Society for Engineering Education.
9. American Institute of Chemical Engineers.

10. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers.

11. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

12. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.

13. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

14. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.

15. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.

16. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

17. Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

18. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

19. Sheet Metal Workers International Association.

20. Railway Employees Department, AFL.

21. American Public Power Association.

22. Colorado River Board of California.

23. Imperial Irrigation District.

24. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

25. Los Angeles City Council.

26. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles.

27. Anaheim City Council.

28. Anaheim Chamber of Commerce.

29. Calexico City Council.

30. Calexico Chamber of Commerce.

31. El Centro City Council.

32. El Centro Chamber of Commerce.

33. Holtville City Council.

34. Holtville Chamber of Commerce.

35. Imperial City Council.

36. Imperial County Board of Supervisors.

37. Imperial County Farmer Bureau.

38. American Legion, District 22, San Diego and Imperial Counties.

39. Burbank City Council.

40. Los Angeles Clearing House Association.

41. Chula Vista City Council.

42. Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce.

43. Otay Municipal Water District.

44. San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce.

45. Property Owners Association of California.

46. California State Grange.

47. Glendale City Council.

48. Hemet City Council.

49. Hemet Chamber of Commerce.

50. Los Angeles City Council.

51. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

52. Los Angeles Central Labor Council.

53. Orange County Board of Supervisors.

54. Pasadena Board of Directors.

55. Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

56. Santa Ana City Council.

57. San Diego County Board of Supervisors.

58. San Diego City Council.

59. San Diego County Water Authority.

60. Rainbow Municipal Water District, San Diego County.

61. San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors.

62. San Marino City Council.

63. Agricultural Council of California.

64. Calavo Growers of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

65. Calcot, Ltd., Bakersfield, Calif.

66. California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.

67. California Asparagus Growers Association, Stockton, Calif.

68. California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., Stockton, Calif.

69. California Canning Peach Association, San Francisco, Calif.

70. California Cattle Feeder's Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

71. California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif.

72. California Date Growers Association, Indio, Calif.

73. California Flg Institute, Fresno, Calif.

74. California Fruit Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.

75. California Lima Bean Growers Association, Oxnard, Calif.

76. California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, Bakersfield, Calif.

77. California Prune and Apricot Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.

78. California Turkey Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.

79. California Vegetable Growers, Santa Barbara, Calif.

80. California Wool Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.

81. Central California Berry Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.

82. Challenge Cream & Butter Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

83. Consolidated Milk Producers for San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.

84. Farmers Cooperative Exchange, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif.

85. Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative, San Francisco, Calif.

86. Fontana Producers Egg and Supply Co., Fontana, Calif.

87. Hayward Poultry Producers Association, Hayward, Calif.

88. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc., Brawley, Calif.

89. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc., Brawley, Calif.

90. Milk Producers Association of Central California, Modesto, Calif.

91. Poultrymen's Cooperative Association of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

92. Poultry Producers of Central California, San Francisco, Calif.

93. Qualitee Dairy Products Association, San Diego, Calif.

94. Ranchers Cotton Oil, Fresno, Calif.

95. Rice Growers Association of California, Sacramento, Calif.

96. San Diego Cooperative Poultry Association, San Diego, Calif.

97. San Joaquin Valley Poultry Producers Association, Fresno, Calif.

98. Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union, Sebastopol, Calif.

99. Sunkist Growers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

100. Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California, Fresno, Calif.

101. Tri-Valley Packing Association, San Francisco, Calif.

102. Turlock Cooperative Growers, Modesto, Calif.

103. Coachella Valley County Water District.

104. California State Chamber of Commerce.

105. Brawley City Council.

106. Brawley Chamber of Commerce.

107. City of Calipatria.

108. Calipatria Chamber of Commerce.

109. City of Beverly Hills.

110. Westmorland City Council.

111. San Jacinto City Council.

112. Torrance City Council.

113. Costa Mesa City Council.

114. Laguna Beach City Council.

115. City of Chino.

116. City of Compton.

117. Newport Beach City Council.

118. County Supervisors Association of California.

119. City of Fontana.

120. City of Fullerton.

121. City of Long Beach.

122. City of Ontario.

123. Perris City Council.

124. City of Pomona.

125. Santa Monica City Council.

126. Upland City Council.

127. California Academy of Sciences.

128. Citizens Public Expenditures Survey, Inc., Albany, N. Y.

129. Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council.

130. Whittier City Council.

131. City of Gardena, Calif.

132. City of Lakewood, Calif.

133. City Council of the City of El Segundo, Calif.

134. Seal Beach City Council, California.

135. City of La Habra, Calif.

136. National Avenue Business Men's Association, Chula Vista, Calif.

137. South Bay Irrigation District, Chula Vista, Calif.
138. City Council of Oceanside, Calif.
139. City Council of City of Escondido, Calif.
140. Escondido Chamber of Commerce.
141. City Council of the City of National City, Calif.
142. National City Chamber of Commerce.
143. La Mesa Chamber of Commerce.
144. City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach.
145. City Council of the City of Lynwood.
146. Fullerton Chamber of Commerce.
147. City Council of the City of El Cajon.
148. El Cajon Valley Chamber of Commerce.
149. Santee Chamber of Commerce.
150. California Taxpayers Association.

The World Health Organization and Nursing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the outstanding organizations working throughout the globe is the World Health Organization.

When the history of this era is written, when the substantial developments have been separated from the trivial items of our times, when the wheat has been separated from the chaff, it will be found that the World Health Organization has written one of the finest chapters of this era.

For the first time in the history of mankind, the human community, acting on the basis of its collective conscience, and its humanitarian instinct for its fellow human beings, has conducted a global assault against mankind's age-old scourges.

I send to the desk a further statement which I have prepared on this subject, along with supplementary material regarding the "heroines in white"—the nurses of the world—who are helping to spearhead this effort. I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

In the February 1956 issue of the World Health Organization Newsletter there is a great amount of inspiring information concerning the fight by organized medicine under the banner of the United Nations and, in particular, the WHO, to improve mankind's health.

The overall report of the issue concerns WHO activities in the Western Pacific region in 1954-55.

There is an article concerning the battle against malaria on Taiwan. It reports, for example, how 5½ million people in Taiwan's malarious areas have been protected by DDT spraying.

There is a review of a new book, *Mankind Against Killers*, by James Hemmings, published by Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. As Dr. Brock Christolm, former Director-General of

WHO states, "It is the first time, to my belief, that a book dealing with health on a world scale has been attempted with the aim of interesting young people."

Continuing with the battle against disease in the Western Pacific, there is a report, on the efforts for maternal and child health, for environmental sanitation, against communicable diseases, against tuberculosis, yaws, and for education and training.

One of the phases which inevitably comes up is the matter of necessarily expanding the reservoir of nurses in the area. Indeed, almost any discussion of the improvement of mankind's health brings up the question of increasing the availability of the heroines in white, the tireless women who devote years of their lives, indeed often their entire lives, to the healing of men, women, and children.

ARTICLE ON MEETING AT TEACHERS COLLEGE

Coincidentally enough, I noted in last Sunday's New York Times a report concerning a veritable international meeting at the spring session of the Division of Nursing Education of Teachers College, Columbia University. It brought out clearly the continued serious shortage of nurses throughout the world, a shortage which our own Government and our own private nursing schools have been diligently trying to help relieve.

The need is acute. Thus, for example, it was noted that in our sister Republic of Brazil, a great and promising land, there are unfortunately fewer than 5,000 nurses, for the country's vast and increasing population of 60 million. In our sister Republic of Haiti, which has been making laudable progress in many fields, it was reported that nurses unfortunately still are so scarce that a new hospital, built by American philanthropy, could not be opened because it lacked qualified nurses to staff it.

Other instances of shortages, especially in what has come to be known as underdeveloped areas, could be cited. But these should not prove discouraging to us. On the contrary, we have a right to be proud of the wonderful progress which has been made toward relieving the shortages. Thus, the republics of Latin America have become increasingly aware of this problem. Despite often meager financial resources, they are exerting ever larger efforts to meet the problem, by attracting their finest young womanpower into this magnificent profession and training them in modern scientific ways.

Lest we ourselves in North America take too superior an attitude, let us realize that even in our own country, with its great wealth and resources, we have faced a shortage of nurses. This situation has given deep concern to our medical profession, to Members of Congress, like the ever active Congressman FRANCES BOLTON, as well as to many laymen throughout the land. Of course, with our tremendously high American standard of living, we have come to expect and to receive the finest and most abundant medical and nursing care in the world.

But we know that to reach the still higher standards which we desire for ourselves, we must have still more nursing schools, more modern facilities for them, higher enrollments, more financial assistance and more inducements to our women to enter and remain in this esteemed career, particularly specialized phases of it, where shortages are especially severe, as in the instance of psychiatric nursing.

Of course, by comparison, the shortage elsewhere in the world is infinitely more serious, because there, the fight is to reach not top standards but the most minimal health standards with at least a minimal number of qualified nurses.

And so, I wish the best of good luck to the World Health Organization and to all the

individuals and groups associated with it, including of course UNICEF, in the fight to make available the blessing of nursing and medical care to ill peoples throughout the world.

THE WORLD NEEDS MORE NURSES

Fifty-one nurses from 20 different countries and territories of the western Pacific attended the second nursing education seminar of WHO held in Suva, Fiji Islands. They had come to study and discuss the many problems connected with the training and education of nurses for whose services there exists still a desperate need in many parts of the world.

For instance, it has been estimated that while in New Zealand there is 1 professionally trained nurse to 400 of the population and in Japan 4 to 530, the figure for the Philippines is 1 to 5,400, while for India it is 1 to 55,000.

Commenting on the seminar, Miss Alice Reid, regional nursing adviser to the WHO Western Pacific Regional Office writes:

"Living and working together in close proximity and sharing opportunities for leisure time enjoyment made it possible for nurses from many different countries to come to know one another really well, to realize that people in any country are very much alike and that the nurses everywhere have similar jobs to do and similar problems to resolve."

"The task of problem solving went on, not only in organized study groups, but in informal and earnest groups of people sitting on mats, on bedroom floors, or gathered in corners of the recreation room."

"In the beginning, differences in terminology and methods were a source of irritation; later they became a subject of good-natured banter and finally, with the development of greater understanding, were replaced by feelings of real respect and a desire to learn from one another."

"A Filipino nurse wrote in her report, 'Truly, there is much to learn from the British system of nursing,' and at least two British nurses expressed their intention of studying in the United States."

During the seminar the real problems faced in carrying on the training of nurses and staffing of medical and health services were brought out of the experience of the participants. Groups then took up specific areas to study and to plan for ways to develop methods of solving these problems.

Group 1 worked together on the training of the community nurse, including her services to the public as a health worker and midwife.

Group 2 worked on the problems of carrying on general public health education, infant welfare, and teaching better ways of nutrition by using local materials and local foods.

Group 3 had the large field of the basic-nursing curriculum and set up 3 smaller groups to study clinical teaching, the need of helping to prepare nurses in the art of teaching, and the teaching of public health throughout the student nurses learning experience.

Group 4 studied problems of postgraduate nursing education and gave particular attention to programs for international students.

The notes on this page, contributed by some of those attending the seminar, give a picture of nursing life and conditions in various countries of the western Pacific region.

(By Mrs. Felicidad D. Elegado, principal, School of Nursing, North General Hospital, Manila, P. I.)

The Philippines has an area of 114,000 square miles with a population of about 22 million. A study of nursing resources done by Filipino Nurses' Association, Department of Health, and other agencies, revealed that

there are 8,857 people able to do nursing, but how many are actually in practice we do not know, for there is as yet no effective system of registration.

Every province has graduate nurses, but many provinces do not have enough to meet the health needs of the people.

Nursing is actually rendered in hospitals, health departments, and homes by the graduate nurses, licensed midwives, and attendants, with little distinction between them.

There is a marked difference in preparation of these workers. Some have no training, some have several years of nursing education, yet all these persons give general bedside nursing care.

One of the serious problems facing nursing education in the Philippines is the increasing number of students who finished 1 year liberal arts courses (being a requirement for entrance to a school or college of nursing) who seek accommodation in schools and colleges of nursing that have no room for them.

Because of lack of faculty, clinical and physical facilities, many hundreds of young girls cannot be accommodated even after spending money and time in college.

In this seminar we have exchanged ideas and experiences and our minds have been opened to various possible solutions of our nursing problems.

(By Mrs. Laura Yergan, nursing education consultant for Vietnam, U. S. International Cooperation Administration)

My job, as one of the American nursing education consultants for Vietnam, is carried out in Saigon at the main branch of the National School of Nursing.

Before the division of Vietnam my work was chiefly at Hanoi, where the North Vietnam branch of the school was situated. After July 1953, however, all American technical assistance had to be withdrawn from that area.

When I left North Vietnam some of the nursing students also evacuated to South Vietnam and continued their studies at the Saigon School, so we had the consolation that all of our previous work was not entirely lost.

In Saigon the nursing education consultants all have Vietnamese counterparts who are being trained to take over the teaching positions as soon as they are qualified.

Since there are no schools in Vietnam for university-level study to prepare nurses for positions as educators and administrators, the United States Operations Mission to Vietnam, for whom we work, gives scholarships to Vietnamese nurses of outstanding ability for training outside Vietnam, usually in America.

One such nurse has just completed her studies at Syracuse University in New York and is returning as nursing director of the National School of Nursing. In 1956 we hope to send 3 or 4 more nurses who are now teaching under my supervision for advanced study abroad.

It is my belief that the standards of nursing education, professional nursing and health service to the people of Vietnam will eventually achieve a level of which any country might well be proud.

(By Miss Doris Cowell, acting matron, General Hospital, Singapore)

Singapore is a rapidly expanding colony heading toward self-government. Expansion in the medical services program is taking place to meet the ever-increasing demands of the population of Singapore, which now has 1,165,000 people over an area of 217 square miles.

To serve this population there is only 1 general hospital of 900 beds. There is a maternity hospital of 240 beds, with an average of 60 births a day, and there are also

tuberculosis, mental, leprosy, infectious diseases, and children's hospitals.

As regards nurse training, we have 464 student nurses, of whom 43 are men, 110 student assistant nurses, and 72 student midwives.

The 10-year medical plan which was devised in 1950 has gone ahead with great success. This year has seen the opening of a surgical block consisting of 10 theaters and 50 postoperative beds. Also nearing completion is a pediatric unit of 200 cots.

The next stage of the building program includes the building of a new 1,000-bed general hospital, district hospitals, health clinics, accommodation for staff, and a nursing school.

(By Miss M. H. Paton, principal, Central Nursing School, Tamavua, Suva, Fiji)

There are two nursing schools in Fiji, 1 at Tamavua and 1 at Lautoka. At the end of the preliminary period of a month's training time, 8 nurses are sent to Labasa Hospital from the Central Nursing School for 1 year.

I am stationed at the Central Nursing School, Tamavua, but my duties include supervision of the Lautoka School and regular visits to Labasa Hospital, at which places discussions on education and student supervision take place.

At present there are 207 student nurses in the schools, both Fijian and Indian, and a comprehensive curriculum is presented.

At the completion of 3 years and 3 months training students sit for the qualifying examination under the Nurses' and Midwives' Board of Fiji.

After registration, an endeavor is made to keep qualified nurses in the hospitals for 1 year's postbasic experience before being transferred as district health nurses, or to staff rural hospitals.

At regular intervals I visit schools in the Suva area to aid recruitment, also in the Lautoka area, where I am assisted by the Lautoka tutor sister.

(By John Waterer, WHO nurse educator, Penang, Malaya)

I am a male nurse, a nurse-educator in the ranks of the nurses of the World Health Organization. I trained in England just before the last war. I served in the war in the ranks, and as an officer of the Royal Army Medical Corps.

After the war, I attended the University of Manchester and obtained a diploma qualifying me as a nurse tutor. After a period of service in that capacity in London, I entered the service of the World Health Organization as their first male nurse-educator.

The program in which I am working is in Penang, Malaya. At the end of hostilities the Government of Malaya established schools of nursing and young Malayan men and women are admitted for a period of 3 years and 4 months nurse training.

These young Malaysians are anxious to serve their people in the true spirit of service.

Today the Malayan hospital and health services are expanding with the ever-increasing number of available trained workers. The World Health Organization has been assisting in this education program since 1950.

At the moment, in Penang, we have a team leader who specializes in postgraduate training and comes from Canada, an educator specializing in Public Health nursing who comes from New Zealand, and myself.

I assist the Government's education staff lecturing and demonstrating to both male and female nurses. In addition, I, of course, take an especial interest in the male nurses and their training.

The nurses represent all the peoples of Malaya: Malay, Indian, Chinese and Eurasian. It is a wonderful experience to work with these enthusiastic young people and alongside trained nurses from different parts of the world.

(By Miss Wilhelmina Visscher, WHO nursing education consultant in Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos)

In December 1951, two nurses of the World Health Organization went to Cambodia as the first members of a nursing education team to help the Government establish modern nursing and midwifery educational programs.

Cambodia is situated between Thailand and Vietnam and has a population of 4 million people of whom 600,000 live in Phnom-Penh, the capital.

Life is peaceful for the Cambodians and nature is good to them. The normal temperature varies from 30° to 33° centigrade and the provision of clothing for children is not a problem. Rice is a staple food and the Mekong River provides enough fish.

Most of the education in the past has been given by the bonzes, who are the Buddhist priests, and formerly only boys were allowed to attend classes. Education for girls was not thought to be very necessary. Some changes have taken place: Girls are now attending the public schools and, under the leadership of a few educated ones, women have begun to take part in a very small measure in community affairs.

The infant mortality rate is very high and it is not unusual to have a mother tell you that from the 10 or 12 children she has had, only a few are alive.

Two Cambodian nurses, 1 man and 1 woman, were assigned as national counterparts to the World Health Organization nurses. We started to work with them in an informal way and slowly introduced them to the concept of modern nursing. A health center called a dispensaire, which gives outpatient service, was made available by the Government to be used as a demonstration center for all public-health activities.

Well-baby and prenatal clinics were started. The nurses were given a special course in public health and home visits were started.

The giving away and adoption of babies are common practices and are treated very casually by all concerned. A mother will tell us that the baby is not growing too well. After we have heard that she does not nurse her baby, the value of breast feeding is explained. She listens very patiently.

After the explanation has gone on for 10 minutes, we then discover that the baby is not her own baby but has been adopted from one of her neighbors.

In the hospital we helped with the opening of a children's ward and the nurses had to be trained to care for the babies.

Nursing as it is known in most countries has been unknown in Cambodia in the past. Treatment as prescribed by the doctor would be given, but the actual bedside nursing care was left to the relatives.

The patient was taken to the hospital as a last resort. Many "cures," such as drinks compounded of different herbs, were first given, so that by the time the patient was admitted he was often in a critical condition.

Slowly the people have begun to realize that the hospital is there to help them get better.

The nurses have been taught how to care for babies, how to bathe them, how to prepare the feeds and how to feed them. They have learned that milk should be given to a baby after being heated, and that a hot water bottle should be placed next to the premature baby rather than on top of the child. The mothers have been encouraged to stay with the babies they have brought to the hospital and this has helped to increase their confidence in the hospital staff. It has also given excellent opportunities for them to learn how better to care for their babies.

The World Health Organization nursing team has grown and now consists of four nursing and midwifery educators. Each of us has a national counterpart working with

us, who will gradually take over more and more responsibility for the program.

At present prefabricated buildings are serving as school buildings and a basic nursing course is being given to 13 selected students.

With the help of American funds, a nursing school is being built. Teaching materials have already arrived. We hope that the status of nursing in Cambodia will be raised and that better-educated girls and boys will be attracted to take up nursing.

(By Miss Aya Maeda, professor, St. Luke's Junior College of Nursing, Tokyo, Japan)

I completed my basic training and post-graduate course in the College of Nursing in Tokyo, and took advanced study at the Teachers' College, Columbia University and at the University of Toronto in Canada. I have worked as a public health nurse for many years.

After World War II, with the help of the American nurses, the status of the Japanese nurse improved remarkably. Nursing education has also improved a great deal.

Our problem at present is that there are not enough qualified people to take teaching positions. There are 160 schools of nursing in Japan where candidates must be high-school graduates. There is only one school of nursing which has a women nurse director.

The Japanese Nursing Association is one of the strongest women's groups in Japan. It has about 50,000 members including midwives, clinical nurses, and public health nurses.

The Spirit of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1956, Mr. Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., acting in the capacity as national chairman for Brotherhood Week, addressed the National Conference of Christians and Jews held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D. C.

I believe you will agree with me after reading Mr. Firestone's speech that he has grasped the true meaning of brotherhood.

The gold medal brotherhood award was to be presented to President Eisenhower. Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, received the award on behalf of the President, and read his remarks.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, our colleague, attended the brotherhood dinner and has included her observations in today's RECORD:

THE SPIRIT OF BROTHERHOOD—TALK BY HARVEY S. FIRESTONE, JR.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great pleasure for me to be with you this evening and to talk with you about brotherhood in our Nation's Capital which possesses a rich heritage of our country's past and people whose leadership encompasses the high hopes for the future of the free world. In a world where disarmament is a dream of the future, and frightening weapons are the realities of the moment, it is comforting to know that there are enough men of good will to sustain and to develop continuously the idea of brotherhood.

For without brotherhood among men, both in word and in deed, our way of life loses much of its substance and much of its strength. Brotherhood is the firm foundation of the personal liberty we so strongly cherish.

If there is one seed from which our way of life may be said to have grown, it is the seed of personal liberty. And at the root of this liberty is a profound respect for the rights of others, as individuals, without regard to their race, their color, or their creed.

Brotherhood does not mean that every man is the captain of the team. But it does mean that there is a team, and that every man, if properly qualified, has a right to be its captain.

The concept of teamwork is fundamental in the development of America's greatness. We have discovered that one secret of success is working together as a team in running our businesses, in conducting our civic endeavors, in participating in our government and in giving our leadership to the world. We, of course, are well aware that teamwork does not mean complete uniformity of opinion. That's the kind of so-called teamwork found behind the Iron Curtain.

Our kind of teamwork is based on the recognition of the right of men to choose freely to work together for the accomplishment of a common aim. Each individual is not forced to join with others. But when he does, he helps accomplish the objective by working for it with other individuals. In other words, our kind of teamwork carries with it explicitly the roots of personal and individual freedom.

Every freedom brings with it a duty and an obligation. If we want to be free, we must see to it that others are free. If we want our rights respected, we must see to it that the rights of others are respected. In the last analysis, we can defend our own rights and freedoms best by defending the rights and freedoms of others. That concept, of course, is a fundamental one of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Although the National Conference of Christians and Jews was founded only 72 years ago, its objectives are centuries old. They are woven into the very fabric of American tradition. Indeed, the spirit of brotherhood is the spirit of our American way of life, just as the concept of free private enterprise is its body. To recognize the truth of that statement, we have only to recall the motives which impelled people to come to this country.

Among the first settlers in America were the Pilgrims who landed on historic Plymouth Rock 335 years ago. This small group of courageous pioneers left their homes across the sea to escape religious persecution. Rather than sacrifice the principles in which they so deeply believed, they risked their lives and their fortunes in a frail ship buffeted by winter winds and waves. They faced the danger of savage enemies to carve out with gun and sword, and scythe and plow, a new home in the New World.

As the years went by, they were followed by many other groups who sought over here the freedom which they were denied at home. And, ever since, America has been the refuge of all who thirst for liberty and justice, whether they be Protestants, Catholics or Jews.

In 1776, when the Liberty Bell pealed forth its message of freedom, men of all faiths became united, as never before, in the common cause of independence. They fought side by side in bloody defeat and in glorious victory.

In later years, during both World Wars, in Korea and other places where Americans have had to fight, they have fought together, not as Protestants, Catholics, or Jews, but as brothers all in a crusade for freedom.

The cold war in the tense world today is fundamentally a war of ideas that is being

waged in the minds and hearts of men everywhere. There is only one way to defeat a bad idea, and that is with a good idea.

Fortunately, in this country we have that good idea. Freedom will always be more attractive than bondage. But we must be sure that our own house is in order. We must stand together on behalf of human rights. By so doing, we can strengthen the spiritual foundation upon which our society is based. We can defend the dignity of man as an individual and thereby take from our enemy one of his important weapons, which is the exploitation he makes of every crisis in human relations and of every denial of human rights.

America stands before the world today as a living example of the power of freedom. Never before has there been such an opportunity for us to demonstrate what freedom means and how vital it is to the peace and security of the world. And there is one thing we know: We must do more than merely preach freedom. We must practice it.

Freedom is priceless because it endows each individual with personal rights and privileges. Brotherhood is equally important because it is opposed to any violation of these personal prerogatives.

Naturally, most Americans are aware that America was settled by people who fled from religious persecution. They recall that this issue was so important that generations later, when the United States became an independent nation, freedom of religion was incorporated into the Constitution and became a basic law of the land. They recognize that no man should be judged by the color of his skin, the land of his origin, or the precepts of his faith. They realize it is the individual, the man himself, who counts.

They know that only by working in harmony in the bonds of brotherhood have generations of Americans been able to make the United States the most powerful, the most prosperous, and the most successful nation on earth. They know that the spirit of brotherhood has been the irresistible force which has made it possible for our country to grow, in the relatively short space of 180 years, from a small, impoverished group of independent colonies to the position of world leadership which it occupies today.

And yet, there are some people with prejudices so deeply rooted in their minds and hearts that they deny the reality of these facts. By word and by deed they practice persecution here in the land which owes its very existence to those who fled from persecution. There are others who are merely thoughtless. Unintentionally, they say and do things which wound and offend.

The real danger in both prejudice and thoughtlessness lies not only in the resentment which they create, but also in the grist which they feed the mills of our enemies. For example, Communists and their fellow travelers pick up cases of religious prejudice, magnify them all out of their true proportion, and shout them from the house-tops. They fan the sparks of resentment into the flames of vengeance. Then, with lying tongues, they paint a picture of life under communism in which they claim that no such discriminations exist.

Many forget that conditions in countries behind the Iron Curtain belie this claim. They do not remember that in Russia, and in her satellite countries, religion is condemned and that those who try to practice it are shipped off to labor camps, persecuted, starved, tortured and murdered. Under communism there can be no freedom of religion, no freedom of thought, no freedom of speech. Any departure from the party line is punishable as treason. Yet these wily subversives have the bold effrontery to criticize our way of life and our treatment of our fellow men.

Therefore, it is important that we strive to eliminate baseless prejudice and thoughtless criticism not only because of the individual resentment which they cause, but also because of the individual resentment which they cause, but also because they add fuel to the fire with which our enemies are trying to destroy the American way of life.

You are all aware, I am sure, of the ways in which the National Conference of Christians and Jews carries on its positive program. But perhaps it will bear some brief repetition just to show how complete and how realistic it is.

The basic concept of the conference program is participation of people of all religious and racial groups. It calls upon educators to work with it through the schools and colleges of which they are a part. It seeks the cooperation of religious leaders to work in their churches and synagogues to make brotherhood a living reality. It asks leaders of all civic organizations to take its methods and materials into every civic organization in the community. It calls for the help of labor and management to put across its program in industry. And it asks the professionals of radio, theater, press and advertising to make the brotherhood concept a part of their every-day work.

Many thousands of Americans take part in conference programs as leaders, reaching millions of their fellow citizens seven days a week 52 weeks in the year, with a message of good will, harmony and understanding among men, a message of brotherhood that is realistic, down-to-earth and of immense importance to the survival of freedom in the world.

To my mind, a word which is often overrated is the word "tolerance." To me, it implies a mental reservation. It is negative. It connotes a grudging acceptance of a person who is not really regarded as an equal.

Brotherhood, on the other hand, implies no limitations. It is positive in every respect. It connotes recognition of every man as the brother of every other man and, therefore, an equal.

Let us realize the simple fact that Christians and Jews alike acknowledge God to be their Heavenly Father. Obviously, therefore, they must all be brothers. How, then, can any thinking person whose fundamental faith includes the Fatherhood of God ignore the brotherhood of man?

When a child first comes into the world, he arrives completely free from conscious dislikes of people. It is only in the days and years of growing up that he may come down with the disease of prejudice, and the principal carriers of the germ are apt to be the adults who mold his life.

Contemplating the innocence of a baby, we can realize the awesome power that parents, teachers, and adults in general have in shaping the world of tomorrow through the children of today.

Because children are naturally without prejudice, we should make a conscious effort to instill in their hearts the positive worth of brotherhood as a way of life. Brotherhood is not a cure-all for the ills and disturbances of a grownup world, but it is a medicine that can do nothing but good provided it is prescribed early enough and taken consistently.

The idea of brotherhood suggests to former children the better world this might have been if we had been able to hold on tightly and completely to the mutual kindness and love for each other that is our birthright and our natural heritage as children of the one God.

Brotherhood does not mean we have to open our hearts and our homes to everyone we meet. We have the right to select our friends because we like them or our associates because we have interests in common. Nobody wants to spend his time with a bore or open his home to a thief. Brotherhood

does not say that we should or we must. It asks only that we look upon others on the basis of their individual worth rather than on the basis of the accidental factors of their race, their color, or their creed. In short, it asks that we observe the Golden Rule: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

The cornerstone of brotherhood is the individual. By its very nature it must be personal. Like charity, it begins at home. It begins with you and with me. Unless we recognize that personal level of brotherhood, we shall weaken and dilute the effectiveness of our efforts.

While brotherhood is personal, it can have a profound effect on the international, interracial, and interreligious misunderstandings which exist in the world today. Brotherhood is like ripples in a lake, starting at one place but spreading gradually to the far edges of the water. We never know how widespread are the effects of a good act.

Brotherhood Week gives to us as Americans an opportunity to reaffirm our belief in the individual freedom of our fellow men. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that Brotherhood Week is only 1 week out of 52. It is important as a symbol, as a spotlight to focus attention on the day-to-day year-round operations of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Brotherhood Week does not mean that we start loving our fellow men with great intensity on 1 day in February, keep it up for 7 days straight, and then stop.

No; Brotherhood Week simply is a means of rising to a peak and obtaining widespread public rededication to the week-in and week-out work with which we are all concerned. The year-round work is what counts.

If the freedom we cherish is to survive in the world, we must find ways to eliminate the frictions, the tensions and the distrusts that turn man against man and nation against nation. We must first eliminate these irritations at home if we are to have hope of eliminating them throughout the world.

As a nation, we owe our position of leadership in the world today to the achievements of people of many racial and religious backgrounds who believe in brotherhood. Brotherhood is the belief of men and women who are confident of our country's continuing greatness. It is the belief of those who face the future with fearless hearts and abiding faith.

In Brotherhood we have an atomic idea whose chain reaction can spread to the hearts and minds of people everywhere. Let us use this powerful force widely and wisely. Let us believe in it. Let us live it. Let us support it.

By so doing, we can bring greater personal happiness to ourselves and our loved ones and help to achieve the goal of all men of good will: The brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God.

And now it is a very great honor and a real pleasure for me to present a well-deserved award to an outstanding American.

He believes there is "no alternative to peace" and has dedicated himself to that belief before the world. He has exercised the great moral force of his leadership to bring about notable progress in human relations and increased personal dignity for all men throughout our land. His leadership has served as an inspiration to those dedicated to the cause of greater understanding among people who differ in race, in color or in creed.

He has translated the words of his beliefs into the deeds of his leadership. In his personal and in his public life, he has truly enlarged the areas of our human understanding of each other.

This 1956 Gold Medal Brotherhood Award, the highest honor given by the National Con-

ference of Christians and Jews, is being bestowed upon President EISENHOWER for his outstanding contributions to better understanding; to the improvement of human relations internationally, nationally and in the Nation's Capital; and for advancing the objectives of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, namely, the promotion of justice, amity, understanding and cooperation in all human relationships.

I would like to read to you the text of the citation accompanying this award:

"The National Conference of Christians and Jews World Brotherhood. The National Conference of Christians and Jews acclaims for his devotion to increased human understanding and his service to human need, Dwight D. Eisenhower. He has been ever ready to render that service be it at the call of the Government of the United States, the world community, or its humblest citizen. His sympathetic understanding of the spiritual as well as the economic needs of his fellow man is making an outstanding contribution to the survival of freedom.

"EVERETT R. CLINCHY,

"President.

"BENJAMIN F. FAIRLESS,

"National Cochairman.

"ROGER W. STRAUS,

"National Cochairman.

"JAMES F. TWOHY,

"National Cochairman.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., February 20, 1956."

It is my privilege to present to you this gold medal brotherhood award on which is inscribed: "To Dwight D. Eisenhower, February 20, 1956. For outstanding contributions to the cause of brotherhood."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

To the Brotherhood Dinner, the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The gold medal brotherhood award which you have given to me is a high honor indeed. The medal symbolizes a most noble purpose, a rewarding peace among men through a common understanding of their common aspirations. I am deeply touched by your choice of me for this distinction. Most sincerely, I thank you.

The principles on which the Republic is founded, that all men are created equal in dignity and in inalienable rights, underscore the brotherhood of man.

Our faith that we can achieve among all peoples a mutual understanding and a mutual recognition of our common brotherhood, is fortified by the progress we have made at home by the practice of those principles in the last few generations—a brief span of time compared to the ages in which prejudice and misunderstanding have accumulated.

As we look forward now to the challenges of the atomic age in a world made small by rapid transportation and communication, we must with our fullest effort put brotherhood into practice by giving to others the rights and respect we want for ourselves.

In our efforts, we must maintain a sense of balance, a sense of perspective, and a capacity to listen as well as to speak. We must work for freedom and equality. In the words of President Washington, we must give "to bigotry no sanction—to persecution no assistance," and in the words of President Lincoln, we must act "with malice toward none, with justice toward all."

I congratulate the National Conference of Christians and Jews for its continued educational efforts toward better understanding in all human relationships and again express my deep appreciation for the brotherhood award.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

FEBRUARY 15, 1956.

The Spirit of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Permission was granted to extend my remarks immediately after the remarks from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. I was greatly privileged to attend the brotherhood dinner and to hear the very fine speech of Mr. Firestone and the splendid statement of the President of the United States, and Secretary Wilson's moving remarks.

The President's statement and the remarks of Hon. Charles E. Wilson follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

To the Brotherhood Dinner, the National Conference of Christians and Jews:

The gold medal brotherhood award which you have given to me is a high honor, indeed. The medal symbolizes a most noble purpose, a rewarding peace among men through a common understanding of their common aspirations. I am deeply touched by your choice of me for this distinction. Most sincerely, I thank you.

The principles on which the Republic is founded, that all men are created equal in dignity and inalienable rights, underscore the brotherhood of man.

Our faith that we can achieve among all peoples a mutual understanding and a mutual recognition of our common brotherhood is fortified by the progress we have made at home by the practice of those principles in the last few generations—a brief span of time compared to the ages in which prejudice and misunderstanding have accumulated.

As we look forward now to the challenges of the atomic age in a world made small by rapid transportation and communication,

we must with our fullest effort put brotherhood into practice by giving to others the rights and respect we want for ourselves.

In our efforts, we must maintain a sense of balance, a sense of perspective and a capacity to listen as well as to speak. We must work for freedom and equality. In the words of President Washington, we must give, "to bigotry, no sanction, to persecution, no assistance," and in the words of President Lincoln, we must act "with malice toward none, with justice toward all."

I congratulate the National Conference of Christians and Jews for its continued educational efforts toward better understanding in all human relationships and again I express my deep appreciation for the brotherhood award.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES E. WILSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, AT BROTHERHOOD DINNER, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

Mr. Riley, Mr. Firestone, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be here this evening and have a part in your program in celebration of Brotherhood Week. I am doubly honored to represent our President and accept for him the gold medal brotherhood award. I know he regrets that he could not be here this evening and bring a personal message to you under the inspiration of the occasion and of this wonderful audience.

I did not have in mind to say anything myself but I have a few things in my heart and on my mind that perhaps would be in order for me to say. President Eisenhower is a living example—a symbol of good will and brotherhood. Not only is that recognized in our country but it is recognized throughout the world.

I thought I might tell you about a little incident that happened when he first started to improve on the road to health.

Admiral Radford and I went to Denver to see him for just a few minutes. He had been out on the sun porch. They brought him back in and he was reclining there in bed. The only thing he had on his mind that he wanted to talk about was whether

he was going to recover to the degree that he could carry out the responsibility that he feels he has, not only to our country but in the whole world—perhaps a unique opportunity to personally contribute to peace and good will in the world and all he wanted to talk about was that and whether even if he didn't recover to the point of where he could carry on his duties as President, that he would at least recover to a point where, in some other capacity, he could still fulfill that opportunity, and I'm frank to confess to you, ladies and gentlemen, that had I been a woman I would have broken out in tears and cried.

Of course, I don't know any more than the rest of you do—whether he's going to run again or not. We have an express in the military business of "need to know" and I don't quite "need to know" up to now, but the time is getting a little short.

My particular assignment as Secretary of Defense is to make certain that our country is strong in a military sense and I would like to say that there is a fine group of dedicated men—military and civilian—in what is commonly called the Pentagon that are working diligently at that. We call it the defense team and in spite of what you may read in your papers from time to time we're making some progress with the job.

The purpose of our country in maintaining great military strength is in the hope that thus we will maintain peace in the world. Our military strength is not for aggression. Science, technology, and the mechanical production has been so phenomenally successful in the last few decades that science now has the clear promise of being able to raise the standard of living and the well-being of all the peoples in the world.

The progress in this area has been phenomenal and we all hope and pray that through strength we can maintain peace in the world until men and women of good will—men and women who recognize the responsibility of brotherhood have time to catch up in the sense of establishing better understanding among all human beings throughout the world so that the world will avoid another great catastrophe of war and that's why I'm so pleased and honored to be here this evening and accept for the President this award.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1956

Rev. Howard F. Newman, Th. D., minister of the Lewinsville Presbyterian Church, of McLean, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, on this significant anniversary we would pause to pray for the perspective of history, the spiritual power of Valley Forge, and the persistence to carry through the vision and faith of our Founding Fathers. Balance our gratitude for the heritage of the past with our contribution to the welfare of the future.

May the mounting pressures of the present never push us loose from our ideals. Give to us a clarity of vision and a consecration of purpose that will enable us to rise above the evils of blackness and the temptations of grayness to serve with devotion and honor.

May the benediction of Thy providence guide each decision this day to the good of the Nation and to the glory of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 21, 1956, was dispensed with.

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.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, prior to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I think a quorum should be present, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Farewell Address of George Washington will now be read by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has been heretofore designated to perform that duty.

Mr. HUMPHREY advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the