SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 11, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

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

God, of all grace and glory, in these vernal days, thrilling and throbbing with the loveliness of June, we thank Thee for every sacrament of beauty of which our enraptured senses drink as we bend in wonder to the petaled cups held up by bushes aflame with Thee. May the glory of the earth be but a parable of the things that are excellent blooming in our risen lives. As in these days of destiny, as we mass our might against the insidious assault of ruthless forces from without—foes that have not Thee in awe—give us to see that to be saved from the plots of savage enemies without will be futile unless Thou dost save us from ourselves. We confess our indifference and hardness of heart, our vanity of soul and pettiness of mind which refuse to put first Thy Kingdom and Thy righteousness. May our personal devotion to the things that matter most be a contribution to the coming of Thy new day when in a better order of human society, pity and laughter shall return to the common ways of man and peace—even Thy peace—breathe its benediction upon our war-weary world. We pray in Thy holy 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, June 11, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen;

S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tibor Horvath; and

S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1739) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2984) for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 1840. An act to reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields;

H. R. 4037. An act for the relief of Truck and Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4993. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to business property situated in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5041. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Dows Thyberg;

H. R. 5868. An act for the relief of the estate of Gertrude I. Keep;

H. R. 7400. An act for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge;

H. R. 7515. An act for the relief of James E. Driscoll;

H. R. 7868. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, island of Kauai, to certain claimants;

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 8005. An act to provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post, No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of members of the Armed Forces killed in battle;

H. R. 8149. An act to amend the first sentence of paragraph (a) of section 756 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition (par. (a) of sec. 5 of the act of April 1, 1942, ch. 207, 56 Stat. 193), relating to the transfer of actions from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8452. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hersey;

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty;

H. R. 10010. An act for the relief of Roy Click;

H. R. 10011. An act for the relief of Jess Gary;

H. R. 10199. An act for the relief of A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen;

H. R. 10670. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia;

H. R. 11320. An act to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11487. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended;

H. R. 11488. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended;

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 616. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 621. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes;

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace";

H. R. 1402. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzales Trigo;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

H. R. 4873. An act for the relief o. Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

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

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

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

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

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

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

H. R. 1840. An act to reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discrimination is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields;

H. R. 4037. An act for the relief of Truck and Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 5041. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Dows Thyberg;

H. R. 5868. An act for the relief of the estate of Gertrude I. Keep;

H. R. 7400. An act for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge;

H. R. 7515. An act for the relief of James E. Driscoll;

H. R. 10010. An act for the relief of Roy Click;

H. R. 10011. An act for the relief of Jess Gary;

H. R. 10199. An act for the relief of A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 616. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 621. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigraiton and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4993. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to business property situated in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8149. An act to amend the first sentence of paragraph (a) of section 756 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition (par. (a) of sec. 5 of the act of April 1, 1942, ch. 207, 56 Stat. 193), relating to the transfer of actions from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10670. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia;

H. R. 11320. An act to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11487. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended;

H. R. 11488. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; and

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7888. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, island of Kauai, to certain claimants;

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 8005. An act to provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post, No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of members of the Armed Forces killed in battle; and

H. R. 8452. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hersey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] be granted leave of the Senate beginning today and through Monday next, for the purpose of enabling him to attend the wedding of his daughter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is so granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEHMAN was excused from attendance on today's session of the Senater after 12:15 p. m.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary;

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary; and

The Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT, 1956—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate, Executive I, 84th Congress, 2d session, the International Wheat Agreement, 1956, in the English, French, and Spanish languages, which was formulated at the United Nations Wheat Conference which concluded on April 25, 1956, and open for signature in Washington until and including May 18, 1956. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the agreement, and the agreement, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, if the Senate approve thereof, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the International Wheat Agreement, 1956, in the English, French, and Spanish languages, which was formulated at the United Nations Wheat Conference which concluded on April 25, 1956, and open for signature in Washington until and including May 18, 1956. It was signed on behalf of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 39 other countries.

The purposes and provisions of the agreement are set forth in greater detail in the enclosed report of the Secretary of State and in the summary enclosed therewith.

Attention is invited particularly to the final paragraph of the report of the Secretary of State. It is my hope that the Senate will find it possible to give early consideration to the agreement so that, if the agreement be approved, ratification by the United States can be effected and an instrument of acceptance deposited by July 16.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 12, 1956.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State, with enclosed summary of principal provisions. 2. International Wheat Agreement, 1956.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Edward Page, Jr., and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the foreign and diplomatic service.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert W. Knox, to be Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the rank of rear admiral;

Arthur Kline, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, vice Claude L. Draper; and

Donald L. Campbell, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick O. Mercer, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick Van Pelt Bryan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation 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:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY TO GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the government of American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MCMILLAN DELTA PROJECT, PECOS RIVER BASIN, N. MEX.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the McMillan Delta Project, Pecos River Basin, New Mexico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON AWARD OF THE YOUNG AMERICAN MEDAL FOR BRAVERY

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, that for the calendar year 1954, the Young American Medal for Bravery was awarded to Miss Patricia Ann Strickland, of Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESCISSIONS OF ADJUSTMENTS OF STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in cases relative to the rescissions of adjustments of status granted certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Victor Wen-Hwa Chu from a report transmitted to the Senate on May 18, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

J. A. ZACHARIASSEN & CO. *v.* UNITED STATES

A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 34, 82d Congress, 1st session, the opinion of that Court in the case of *J. A. Zachariassen & Co.* v. *The United States* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE COMMITTEES ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage and assist the States in the establistment of State Committees on Education Beyond the High School (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petitions of Mr. and Mrs. John Fischer, and Mr. and Mrs. Fletcher C. Rice, of Lexington, Ill., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 923) to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Central Region, North American Gasoline Tax Conference, at its annual meeting, Delavan, Wis., relating to the tax on nonhighway use of gasoline; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York, N. Y., relating to civil rights, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, relating to employment policies and practices of the field postal service.

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

RESOLUTION PROTESTING EMPLOYMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF THE FIELD POSTAL SERVICE ADOPTED BY THE SPECIAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 14, 1956

Whereas the present policies of the Post Office Department involve the elimination of seniority as a major factor in promotions; and

Whereas the installation of the works performance standards program has resulted in the establishment of a vicious speed-up system which places men in competition with each other in an effort to reach impossible goals; and

Whereas other working conditions with particular reference to hours and tours of duty, assignments, compensatory time and substitute employment to name only a few are steadily deteriorating; and

Whereas interpretations of Public Law 68, 84th Congress, by the Post Office Department are designed to circumvent and nullify the provisions of section 606 (b) of that act by authorizing or purporting to authorize the employment of substitutes for less than 2 hours on a voluntary basis is direct violation of law; and

Whereas the interpretation by the Post Office Department of section 403 (1) deprives employees of their legal rights to promotions on specified dates, contrary to the stated language of the act; and

Whereas regional and district officers are issuing orders and directives, and post office inspectors are frequently instrumental in the promulgation of such orders and directives with respect to seniority, annual leave, filling of vacancies and increases in complement which are directly contrary to what we have been assured is the policy of the Post Office Department; and

Whereas employees who have the misfortune to be taken ill are discouraged and coerced in an attempt to prevent them using the sick leave provided by law when their physical condition makes it necessary for them to remain away from work, and by means of investigations covering sick leave used in prior years, employees are further intimidated from the use of sick leave when and where necessary; and

Whereas as a result of these developments and others too numerous to mention there is a steady and noticeable decline in morale among employees; and

Whereas these conditions have all been brought about by unilateral actions on the part of the Post Office Department without previous consultation with employee representatives on either a local or national scale; and

Whereas employees are restrained, under part 743.222 of the Postal Manual, from advising with each other—by means of bulletin boards located in locker and swing rooms not accessible to the public—concerning matters which may be held to be controversial by a postmaster who is, in many cases, directly and solely responsible for whatever controversy exists; and

Whereas by means of recent changes in the Postal Manual, part 744.442, a studied and calculated attempt has been made to silence and "gag" employees of the field postal service to prevent them from expressing their dissatisfaction with existing conditions; and

Whereas this action is in direct violation of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, better known as the Lloyd-LaFollette anti-gag law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, in special conference assembled, at Washington, D. C., May 14, 1956, does hereby condemn these actions of the Post Office Department as oppressive, unwise, and illegal and destructive of a sound modern personnel-management relationship, and calls upon the 84th Congress and each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives thereof to support an immediate congressional investigation of the aforementioned conditions, and to enact legislation which will absolutely require the heads of each department and agency of our Federal Government to cease and desist from practices which in the case of an employer under the National Labor Relations Act would be branded as unfair labor practices, and be it further

Resolved, That we endorse the Rhodes-Johnston bills H. R. 10237 and S. 3593 for this purpose and urge each Member of Congress who believes in human dignity and fair play to support this legislation and work for its enactment at the current session of the 84th Congress.

LEO E. GEORGE,
President.
E. C. HALLBECK,
Legislative Director.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 3132. A bill to provide for purchase of lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, to promote prevention of floods and minimization of soil erosion, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2207).

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

S. 3180. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of two United States commissioners for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park (Rept. No. 2208).

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2691. A bill for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun (Rept. No. 2209);

S. 2804. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shan Yah Gin (Rept. No. 2218);

S. 2839. A bill for the relief of Rosetta Ittner (Rept. No. 2219);

S. 3232. A bill for the relief of Josef Kranz (Rept. No. 2220);

S. 3292. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria (Schandl) Cote (Rept. No. 2221);

S. 3380. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Sobota (Rept. No. 2222);

S. 3522. A bill for the relief of Theresia Schneider (Rept. No. 2223);

S. 3945. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson (Rept. No. 2210);

H. R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Scano (Rept. No. 2224);

H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil (Rept. No. 2211);

H. R. 7373. A bill for the relief of Eugene G. Aretz (Rept. No. 2213); and

H. R. 8041. A bill for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens (Rept. No. 2214).

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips (Rept. No. 2217).

H. R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zella K. Thissell (Rept. No. 2212);

H. R. 6888. A bill to amend the act of September 3, 1954 (Rept. No. 2226); and

H. J. Res. 592. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2225).

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3150. A bill for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman (Rept. No. 2215);

H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska (Rept. No. 2216); and

H. J. Res. 605. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2227).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 4035. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 4036. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; and

S. 4037. A bill for the relief of Aron Schatten (Soten); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 4038. A bill to change the designation of the Petrified Forest National Monument, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 4039. A bill to encourage the discovery, development and production of manganese bearing-ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 4040. A bill for the relief of John Dracos (Ioannis Dracos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 4041. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 4042. A bill for the relief of Jackson School Township, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 4043. A bill for the relief of Agapito Jorolan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 4044. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4045. A bill creating the city of St. Francisville Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 4046. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to provide for allowance of certain claims by successor organizations to heirless or unclaimed property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 4047. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 4048. A bill relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 4049. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Boss Hogan of Curry County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 4050. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1950, to clarify the intention of the Congress with respect to its application to nonsensitive positions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 4051. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1950, to reaffirm the discretion conferred thereby upon the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 4052. A bill to permit the United States to be named a party defendant in certain suits to quiet title if the United States is a necessary party thereto by reason of its right, title, or interest in or to real property acquired from the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4053. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of,

disability pension awards; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 4054. A bill to authorize the further extension of certain noncompetitive oil or gas leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Arthur H. Compton as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps to be known as the National Liberation Stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 82), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the purpose of this concurrent resolution to insure the soundness and maximum effectiveness of any foreign-aid program in which the United States may hereafter be engaged by providing, on the basis of a detailed study and evaluation of the policies and operations of our foreign-aid programs in the past and present, a means for—

(1) Clarifying the objectives which should be attained by any foreign-aid program of the United States and the considerations which should govern the selection of methods and policies for attaining those objectives;

(2) Determining specific organizational standards, procedures, and practices to promote improved administration of any such program at the operational level; and

(3) Developing a policy on foreign aid which will most effectively secure the implementation of such objectives while maintaining maximum economy and efficiency in all parts of the program at all levels of operation.

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purpose of this concurrent resolution there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Foreign Aid (referred to in this concurrent resolution as the "committee"), to be composed of 6 Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate (not more than 3 of whom shall be appointed from the same political party) and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (not more than 3 of whom shall be appointed from the same political party).

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(c) The committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct a thorough fact-finding study and investigation of the operation of the foreign-aid programs of the United States in the past and present, in order to provide a body of information on the basis of which an intelligent evaluation of such programs can be made, giving particular attention to the accomplishments and failures of such programs, the actual cost of such programs, the specific purposes for which such costs were incurred, and the relation of such costs to the benefits resulting to (and other effects upon) both the United States and the countries receiving aid under such programs. Such study and investigation shall cover all matters involved in the furnishing of foreign aid (including the furnishing of military assistance, defense support, direct forces support, economic aid, technical cooperation, and other forms of assistance to foreign countries), and shall specifically include—

(1) field checks upon planning and programing and the procurement, delivery, and end use of economic aid commodities, with the cases selected for study being sufficiently numerous and widely spread over different program sectors in various countries to provide information from which fair and useful conclusions can be drawn regarding both policy and operations;

(2) a detailed inquiry into the use of military assistance funds, including planning, programing, obligational procedures, procurement methods both in the United States and overseas, accounting systems, and the use of military funds to achieve economic purposes;

(a) a thorough investigation, both in the United States and overseas of the relationships between the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the International Cooperation Administration at policy and operational levels;

(4) a study of the International Cooperation Administration staffing pattern, including all factors involved in the recruitment and assignment of personnel;

(5) an investigation as to the theoretical and actual responsibilities and procedures for formulation of foreign aid policy and the implementation and enforcement thereof at operational levels, both in the agencies above named and in the other Federal agencies participating in foreign-aid programs; also an investigation with respect to overlapping and duplication of functions, the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy with which programs are participated in, and the appropriateness of the distribution of such activities among the respective agencies.

(6) an investigation respecting overlapping and duplication as between foreign aid administered by Federal agencies and foreign-aid programs in which the United States participates, conducted by international agencies (both affiliated with and independent of the United Nations) and respecting the theoretical and actual responsibility for procedures and policies followed by such international agencies, their practical operation, and the advantages and disadvantages inuring to the United States through participation therein;

(7) an investigation as to policies followed in determining whether foreign aid shall be made a country by way of loan or grant, steps taken for insuring the repayment of loans, and the policies and safeguards with respect to the custody, management, and disposition of counterpart funds;

(8) an investigation of the policies and procedures in granting or denying aid to countries with respect to large and small industrial projects, with respect to increasing food supplies, and with respect to the provision of technical assistance;

(9) an investigation of the extent, if any, to which foreign aid is extended for projects or undertakings where private investment capital is available, and the extent to which aid is made contingent upon bona fide effort of the recipient country being made to improve inducements for investment by its domestic capital and foreign capital;

(10) an analysis of the manner in which appropriation requests are originated, justified, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and submitted to the Congress in the form of illustrative country programs; and

(11) an examination of the methods employed to convert appropriations into country allocations and ultimately into approved programs and projects.

(b) The committee shall, on the basis of the information developed by its staff under subsection (a), evaluate the foreign aid programs of the United States and determine what changes therein are necessary in its opinion to accomplish the purpose of this concurrent resolution.

(c) The committee shall report to the Senate (or to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session) and to the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Upon submission of such report the committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. In carrying out its duties under this concurrent resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee or member thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places within or outside the continental United States, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the committee or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, against any individual subject to the laws of the United States, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. KERR):

S. Res. 281. Resolution relative to the conservation and development of land and water resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works, jointly.

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

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. Res. 282. Resolution to amend Rule XXXVII with respect to procedure on treaties which operate to modify or supersede acts of Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

COMMISSION ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the establishment of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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. 4035) for the establishment of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Re-

lations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Foreign Aid Evaluation Act of 1956."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to insure the soundness and maximum effectiveness of any foreign aid program in which the United States may hereafter be engaged by providing, on the basis of a detailed study and evaluation of the policies and operation of our present and past foreign aid programs, a means for—

(1) clarifying the objectives of any foreign aid program of the United States, and the considerations which should govern the selection of methods and policies to attain those objectives;

(2) determining specific organizational standards, procedures, and practices to promote improved administration of any such program at the operational level; and

(3) developing a policy on foreign aid which will most effectively secure the implementation of such objectives while maintaining maximum economy and efficiency in all parts of the program at all levels of operation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the purpose set forth in section 2 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Aid Programs (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life.

(b) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. The Chairman of the Commission shall be designated by the President. The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 6. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the operation of the present and past foreign aid programs of the United States, in order to provide complete information on the basis of which such programs can be evaluated, giving particular attention to the accomplishments and failures of such programs, the actual cost of such programs, the specific purposes for which such costs were incurred, and the relation of such costs to the effects of such expenditures upon the United States and upon the countries receiving aid under such programs. Such study and investigation shall cover all matters involved in the furnishing of foreign aid (including the furnishing of military assistance, defense support, direct forces support, economic aid, technical cooperation, and other forms of assistance to foreign countries), and shall specifically include—

(1) field checks upon planning and programing, and the procurement, delivery, and end use of economic aid commodities, through the making of case studies, the cases selected for study being sufficiently numerous and widely spread over different program sectors in various countries to provide information from which fair and useful conclusions can be drawn regarding both policy and operations;

(2) a detailed inquiry into the use of military assistance funds, including planning, programing, obligational procedures, procurement methods both in the United States and overseas, accounting systems, and the use of military funds to achieve economic purposes;

(3) a thorough investigation, both in the United States and overseas, of the actual relationships existing between the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the International Cooperation Administration at policy and operational levels;

(4) a study of the International Cooperation Administration staffing pattern, including all factors involved in the recruitment and assignment of personnel;

(5) an analysis of the manner in which appropriation requests are originated, justified, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and submitted to the Congress in the form of illustrative country programs; and

(6) an examination of the methods employed to convert appropriations into country allocations and ultimately into approved programs and projects.

(b) Evaluation: On the basis of the information so obtained, the Commission shall evaluate the foreign-aid programs of the United States and determine what changes therein are necessary in its opinion to improve their effectiveness and efficiency.

(c) Reports: The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress (1) interim reports at such time or times as the Commission deems necessary, (2) a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies on or before ----------, and (3) its final report not later than ----------, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U. S. C. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

SUMMARY SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1950, to reaffirm the discretion conferred thereby upon the President.

In connection with the bill, I ask unanimous consent that a release of the national public relations division, the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., relating to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Steve Nelson may be printed in the RECORD.

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

referred; and, without objection, the release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4052) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1950, to reaffirm the discretion conferred thereby upon the President, introduced by Mr. MCCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The release, presented by Mr. MCCARTHY, is as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.—The American Legion has gone on record urging the United States Congress "to preserve the powers" of the States and Territories to make and enforce antisubversive laws in their respective areas.

The action, taken by the national executive committee here May 2–4, was a consequence of the recent Nelson decision of the United States Supreme Court which is believed to jeopardize the validity of countersubversion measures on the statute books of 42 States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The resolution, submitted by the National Americanism Commission and unanimously approved by the NEC, points out:

"This great number of State laws relating to sedition and subversive activities is evidence of the grave concern of the States and of the need for such State legislation for the preservation of law and order within their respective borders."

On April 2, 1956, the Supreme Court handed down a decision in the case of the *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, holding that the Smith Act of 1940, as amended, superseded the Pennsylvania Sedition Act and preempted the field of legislation involving advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, by majority opinion of 6 to 3, rendered a decision on April 2, 1956, in the case of *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, holding that the Smith Act of 1940, as amended in 1948, superseded the Pennsylvania Sedition Act and preempted the field of legislation prohibiting the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States and any political subdivision thereof by force and violence; and

"Whereas, 42 States, together with the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, now have laws penalizing the advocacy of violent overthrow of the Federal, State, or Territorial Governments, and the validity of these laws is now questionable because of the broad rule laid down by the aforesaid Nelson decision; and

"Whereas this great number of State laws relating to sedition and subversive activities is evidence of the grave concern of the States of the need for such State legislation for the preservation of law and order within their respective borders: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion, meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., May 2, 3, 4, 1956, That the National Legislative Commission be and it is hereby directed to prepare appropriate legislation and obtain the passage thereof by the United States Congress, to preserve the powers of the several States and Territories and the sovereignty of the States of the United States to enact and enforce legislation penalizing sedition and subversive activities within the boundaries of such Territories and sovereign States."

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS REGULATION NO. 1 (A), RELATING TO DISABILITY PENSION AWARDS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to liberalize and increase the disability awards for veterans of World War I. This bill is identical with H. R. 7886, as amended, which was reported favorably from the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Previously, I introduced Senate bill 3436, which pertains to the same subject, and which was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. I hope this bill will supersede Senate bill 3436, and that the Committee on Finance will table Senate 3436 and consider this measure.

Because of the interest in this measure, which is endorsed by the American Legion, I am asking that the bill lie on the desk until Friday in order that Senators who may wish to join me in sponsoring the bill may have the opportunity to add their names.

I am sure the Senate is aware that the veterans of World War I are now over 60 years of age average, and that if the Congress ever intends to adopt any program in their hour of need, now is the time to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 4053) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am about to submit a resolution, 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 Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a Senate resolution dealing with vital matters concerning the relationship of the executive departments with the Senate of the United States.

Joining me in the sponsorship of the resolution are three distinguished Members of the Senate: the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. CHAVEZ]; the chairman of the Subcommitte on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. ANDERSON]; and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. KERR].

The subject matter of the resolution relates to fundamental subjects which are the responsibility of two committees. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be referred for consideration to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and to the Committee on Public Works, the chairman of which is agreeable to this procedure.

I shall request the cooperation of the chairman of the Public Works Committee in holding joint hearings on the resolution at the earliest convenient date, possibly within the next 10 days. In the meantime, the comments of the executive agencies concerned and the Bureau of the Budget will be requested, and spokesmen for these agencies will be invited to testify. It is our hope to conclude the hearings speedily, so that appropriate consideration may be given the resolution promptly.

The resolution is comparatively brief. The preamble recites cogent reasons for its submission and consideration by the Senate.

Briefly, these reasons are based in part on the promulgation by the Bureau of the Budget, late in 1952, of Budget Circular No. A–47, prescribing standards, procedures, and policies for the evaluation of proposed Federal projects for land and water resources development. It also calls attention to revision of Circular No. A–47, which would impose further restrictions on Federal participation in land and water resources development.

The resolution would declare the sense of the Senate to be that water-resource development continues to be a responsibility of the Federal Government. It warns against nullification of this long-established policy by executive agencies, and asserts that such action constitutes a usurpation of the legislative function. Comprehensive planning of land and water resources is stated to be vital.

Of particular concern to all Members of the Congress is the "layering" process in the executive agencies. The number of agencies dealing with water resources should be reduced, rather than increased, as proposed by the President's Committee, so that the administrative procedure of review could be simplified and shortened.

Section 4 calls for the submission to the Congress of project reports that conform to criteria presented by congressional committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter. It seeks to assure to the Congress a full disclosure of all essential facts, estimates, and views without limiting reports to preconceived views of executive agencies.

Section 5 declares that any departures from established policies, procedures, and standards by executive agencies shall be effected only after "full examination and consideration of the Congress."

In brief, we propose that the Senate shall go on record against government by fiat of the executive agencies, rather than by orderly congressional procedures.

The preamble also deals with the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, and mentions that the President asks that the Congress give prompt attention to its proposals. Pointed reference is also made to the failure of the executive branch of the Government to implement recommendations of the Water Policy Advisory group. This omission has come about, notwithstanding the President's statement that legislative pro-

posals would "be submitted to implement the recommendations."

I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, the text of the resolution be printed in full, together with a statement which I have prepared, explaining in detail the reasons and the objectives of the proposal.

Attached to the statement is a copy of my memorandum dated April 4 to the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This memorandum outlines a problem which has confronted our committee—as I am sure it has others—in connection with the attitude of some of the executive departments, at least on occasions, with respect to reports on bills for which official requests have been made. The immediate occasion for the memorandum was the cogent comments of two distinguished members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming, and Mr. GOLDWATER, of Arizona]. Their remarks are attached to the letter for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the joint reference of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution (S. Res. 281), submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. KERR), was received, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, jointly, as follows:

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget, on December 31, 1952, issued Circular No. A–47, prescribing standards, procedures, and policies for the evaluation of proposed Federal projects for land and water resources conservation and development; and

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget, on November 29, 1954, proposed a revision of Circular No. A–47, the application of which would impose further restriction by the executive agencies on Federal participation in the conservation and development of land and water resources, and on which hearings were held by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs March 15 and March 30, 1955; and

Whereas, on January 17, 1956, the President of the United States transmitted to the Congress the Report (H. Doc. No. 315, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, consisting of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture, designated by the President May 26, 1954, with a recommendation that "the Congress give prompt attention to its proposals"; and

Whereas it is stated, at page 84 of the Economic Report of the President, transmitted to the Congress January 24, 1956, that "in due course, legislative proposals will be submitted to implement the recommendations" of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, but no such proposals have yet been submitted to the Congress and instead it is indicated that the recommendations may be implemented by direct action of the executive agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the stabilization of the national economy and the effectuation of the wisest, most orderly, and most economic utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation for the widest possible public benefit require that the Federal Government continue to exercise all of its constitutional powers not only to encourage but to participate in the conservation and development of such resources for all purposes, and that the continued nullification by the executive agencies of this fundamental and long-established national policy would constitute a usurpation of the legislative power.

SEC. 2. That land and water resources development should be planned on comprehensive bases and with a view to such an ultimately integrated operation of component segments as will insure the realization of an optimum degree of physical and economic efficiency.

SEC. 3. That the number of Federal agencies, offices, and organizations having to do with the planning and review of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should be reduced, rather than increased, and that technical and administrative routing and review procedures should be simplified and shortened in order to facilitate and to accelerate the submittal of reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects.

SEC. 4. That reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the congressional committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter, and that they should fully disclose the details and results of all studies and analyses of all potential utilizations, costs, allocations, payout, and benefits, both direct and indirect, made by all interested operating agencies.

SEC. 5. That the preservation of the constitutional principle of separation of powers requires that any departure by the executive agencies from the observance and employment of the traditional policies, standards, procedures, and techniques reflected in and growing out of the settled administration of the large body of organic law governing the conservation and development of the land and water resources of the Nation be effected only after full examination and consideration by the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the printing in the RECORD of the matters referred to?

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

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 281

The purpose of this Senate resolution is to correct a situation in which the executive agencies of the Government are progressively arrogating to themselves land and water resources development policymaking functions which properly reside with the Congress.

It is elementary that the National Government has a set of constitutional powers which provide the legal foundation for broad activity in this field. These derive from the commerce clause, the property clause, the treatymaking provisions, the war powers clauses, and the power to provide for the general welfare.

For more than a half century the Congress has repeatedly exercised these constitutional powers through the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of works and directing the conduct of activities in myriad fields of land and water resources conservation and development. These fields include the following:

1. River regulation.
2. Rivers and harbor and inland waterways.
3. Improvement of navigation.
4. Control of floods.
5. Conservation, storage, and replenishment of surface and underground water supplies, and their release and delivery for domestic, agricultural, municipal, and industrial purposes.
6. Generation, transmission, and marketing of hydroelectric power and energy.
7. Watershed management.
8. Soil conservation.
9. Salinity repulsion.
10. Stream pollution abatement.
11. Beach erosion control.
12. Conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources.
13. Protection of life and health.
14. Enjoyment of recreational benefits.

The Congress has regularly appropriated moneys for loans, grants, and direct expenditures for the foregoing purposes.

These many years have built up a large body of organic law, with an attendant growth of traditional standards, procedures, and techniques, all reflecting a fundamental and well-established national policy of Federal participation in the full utilization of all of our land and water resources.

More recently, however, a dangerous trend of encroachment by the executive agencies on the constitutional powers of the legislative branch of the Government has become apparent.

On December 31, 1952, the Bureau of the Budget issued Circular No. A–47, on the subject of "Reports and budget estimates relating to Federal programs and projects for conservation, development, or use of water and related land resources." It is generally recognized that many land and water resources projects which already are in varying stages of authorization, construction, and operation could not have been justified as economically feasible by the rigid, executively imposed standards of Circular No. A–47.

It is empirically demonstrable, nevertheless, that the potential contributions of these projects to the national wealth exceeds the initial Federal investment by many times.

On November 29, 1954, the Bureau of the Budget proposed a revision of Circular No. A–47. This revision, if adopted, would establish even more inflexible standards for Federal participation in the conservation and development of land and water resources.

Circular No. A–47 and the proposed revision were the subjects of hearings conducted by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs March 15 and 30, 1955. It was then indicated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that formal issuance of a revision of the circular would await the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, consisting of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture. This Committee had been designated by the President May 26, 1954, with an instruction to submit its recommendations "* * * not later than December 1, 1954."

The Committee's Report was not submitted however, until December 22, 1955, and it was transmitted to the Congress by the President January 17, 1956, with his recommendation that "* * * the Congress give prompt attention to its proposals." Shortly thereafter, on January 24, 1956, the President transmitted to the Congress his Economic Report, in which it was stated that "in due course, legislative proposals will be submitted to implement the recommendations" of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. No such proposals have yet been submitted to the Congress, nor, on the other hand, has the proposed revision of Budget Circular No. A–47 been formally adopted.

However, there are indications that the executive agencies may undertake to put the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy into actual operation by administrative fiat. The practical application of a number of them would have a most serious and damaging impact on the continued conservation and development of the land and

water resources of the Nation, by reason of the resultant curtailment of Federal participation in such activity.

Exemplary of the expressed executive attitude is a statement of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy in the submittal of its Report to the President. It is there stated that the recommendations are believed to "* * * avoid the undue intrusion of the Federal Government into this field." The Committee further has recommended that individual units within regional or river basin plans be set up as component segments or projects, stating that "to so separate general plans into their component projects offers much wider opportunity for participation of non-Federal agencies, and thus not only reduces Federal responsibility but leaves the door open for local initiative."

The Committee has recommended an extraordinary and highly layered scheme of organization for the planning and review of land and water resources projects. This would include (1) a number of regional or river basin water resources committees, composed of Federal and State representatives, which would "* * * coordinate resources planning and development activities" and recommend annual work schedules "* * * to be reflected in the budget requests of each cooperating agency," (2) a permanent Interagency Committee on Water Resources, composed of high-level officials of six Federal agencies, to "* * * have authority by unanimous action to determine finally interagency relationships," (3) an office of Coordinator of Water Resources, in the Executive Office of the President, which would "* * * cooperate with the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers in the evaluation of departmental requests for appropriations, and assist in the reconciliation of water resources policy with other Federal policies," and (4) a Board of Review for Water Resources Projects, also in the Executive Office of the President, composed of three persons "* * * who have had no part in the original planning of the projects they would be asked to review and who would not be involved in the subsequent construction of such projects."

The functions of all of the foregoing would be in addition to and separate from the functions of the several operating agencies and the budgetary, fiscal policy review, and legislative clearance functions of the Bureau of the Budget. It is manifest that the repetitive review which these processes would entail could succeed in bringing Federal participation in land and water resources conservation and development to a complete standstill.

The Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy has failed to accord adequate recognition to the development of hydroelectric power potential as a national water resources problem. This is particularly true with respect to the essential financial significance of such development in the economic justification of multiple-purpose projects for the irrigation and reclamation of arid and semiarid lands in the 17 Western States.

The Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy has recommended that "no loans or guaranties should be made to cover costs of developing projects or portions thereof for power or municipal and industrial water, since, if these are economically sound, they may be readily financed otherwise."

With respect to the evaluation of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy has recommended (1) that the separable cost-remaining benefits method of costs allocation be employed to the exclusion of other methods, (2) that benefit-cost ratios be calculated on the basis of primary benefits only, (3) that the evaluation period for estimating benefits and costs in no circumstances be greater than 50 years, and (4) that all Federal agencies conform to uniform standards of evaluation.

It is imperative that the Congress reaffirm and implement its constitutional responsibility for establishing national policies and prescribing standards in the field of land and water resources conservation and development. Legislative acquiescence in a contrary course of executive action would constitute an abdication of that responsibility. This resolution will make clear the sense of the Senate.

APRIL 4, 1956.

You will be interested in the attached excerpts from a colloquy between Senators GOLDWATER and BARRETT at a committee hearing on Monday, March 19, on S. 863 (and Senator BARRETT'S amendments thereto), a bill to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

In reviewing the transcript of the hearing, I was impressed with Senator GOLDWATER'S views on two points, which I regard as of moment to bring to the direct attention of the members of the committee individually. When you have reviewed the comments of our two colleagues, particularly with respect to the trend that has been accentuated in the present administration with respect to the reports on pending legislation, I shall be glad to have your views as to appropriate action looking to correction of the situation emphasized by the two Senators.

Senator GOLDWATER'S comments, while particularly pointed to the reports on S. 863, are directed generally toward the trend in the executive departments. I am sure we all feel that this trend is not particularly new but that it is now being accentuated, as the Senator emphasizes. I quote the following paragraphs from the statement of the junior Senator from Arizona, which I feel are especially pertinent:

"I do not know why we in the legislative branch have to wait patiently and bend over backward and salaam toward the upper end of Pennsylvania Avenue waiting for these reports.

"I have read the Constitution a thousand times and I cannot find anything which says that when we are writing our legislation we have to wait for somebody up there to say 'Yes' or 'No.'

"Personally, I do not like the idea of such report having such a bearing on legislation. I think it is a complete infringement on the intent of the Constitution to have the Executive, through its various agencies, influencing legislation down here."

Other phases of Senator GOLDWATER'S statement relate to the merits of S. 863 and the proposed amendments, as well as to the ever greater need for the Western States to take action against the accelerated trend toward complete Federal control, especially with respect to water laws. The legislation before us well may be a step toward solving the water rights phase of the problem.

My purpose in bringing the observations of Senators GOLDWATER and BARRETT to the attention of each individual member of the committee is with a view to determining whether the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should consider the adoption of a rule which would seek to remedy the situation that is stated so succinctly. I have noted, over the years, the growing tendency in the executive departments to attempt to dictate to the Congress. They hold over our heads the threats of veto by the President, although I doubt if any President is often consulted directly prior to the making of such threats except with respect to major pieces of legislation which carry out his announced program.

When you have considered this memorandum, together with the attached copy of Senator GOLDWATER'S observations and those of Senator BARRETT on this subject, I will appreciate your comments by April 20, on the following suggestion:

That the committee consider the adoption of a rule that would, among other things, seek expressions from the executive agencies only along these lines:

(a) Objective or factual reports to be submitted promptly as a matter of information;

(b) Specific authority or precedents are to be cited by the agencies in support of whatever conclusions they wish to state;

(c) Recommendations shall be couched in language that recognizes the legislative responsibility as separate from that of the executive; and

(d) Unless reports are furnished promptly, the committee will assume there is no objection on the part of the executive agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget;

(e) That when expressions such as "in accord" or "not in accord" with the President's program are used, there shall be specific references to the President's views rather than generalizations.

On receipt of your comments, I will call a special meeting of the committee to consider the subject. The date will probably be a day convenient to the majority of the committee.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

EXCERPTS FROM A COLLOQUY BETWEEN SENATORS GOLDWATER AND BARRETT AT A COMMITTEE HEARING ON MONDAY, MARCH 19, ON S. 863 (AND SENATOR BARRETT'S AMENDMENTS THERETO), A BILL TO GOVERN THE CONTROL, APPROPRIATION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF WATER

Senator GOLDWATER. Senator BARRETT, as you know, you and I discussed this situation last year when these court decisions came down and I agreed with you at that time concerning the necessity of legislation, and I do now more than ever.

I, myself, as a Republican, am deeply concerned and disturbed by the attitude of this administration as reflected in the several reports that we have before us where this administration heretofore has diverted most of its domestic efforts to getting the Federal Government out of the business of the several States, in conformity with the 10th amendment, it now seems bent on getting into the area that is most sacred and most important to the arid and semiarid States of the West.

They are, in effect, tampering with the way of life in the West that has existed since the West has existed; in fact, as was brought out this morning, the present recognition of water rights stems from the very founding of California and has been borne out through over 100 years of practice as accepted by the people of the West.

This attitude of the several agencies of the Government I think will seriously affect western land values inasmuch as water rights and land values are one and the same thing when one is figuring property and property values in our part of the country.

I think the very fact that these several agencies of Government have expressed themselves as being of a mind that the Federal Government should get into an area where the States have historically operated will probably throw a cloud over these values even as of now.

Now, one of these reports, the report of the Bureau of the Budget, I believe, they state on page 2, and I quote in part as follows:

"The fact remains that serious problems of Federal policy regarding the exercise of water rights, particularly in the arid and semiarid areas of the West, have existed for a long time and there are basic conflicts which must be resolved."

Now, Mr. Chairman, you and I, coming from the West, know that that is not true. I cannot recall in my memory where the Federal Government and the State of Arizona have come into any argument that has not been resolved amicably, and quickly, and usually in the direction that the Federal Government wanted it to be resolved in.

Senator BARRETT. If my colleague will yield to me, the next witness is going to be the State engineer of Wyoming, and I am sure that he will confirm the statement that I am about to make, which is that there never has been a conflict between the Federal Government and the State of Wyoming with reference to water rights that interfered with the Federal Government in any shape or form.

Senator GOLDWATER. I knew that the experience of the chairman was the same as mine and I think witness after witness from all the 17 Western States will bear us out.

Many people, particularly people in non-Indian States, express concern over the Indians' rights. That is an area that might be called Federal policy.

I would just like to put this for the record: that in every major decree that Arizona has ever had concerning its rivers, the Indians' rights are the first to have been spelled out.

That is true of the Colorado compact and in the Kent system, which comprises the Salt and the Verde and the Gila decrees that applied to the Gila, the Indians' rights were fully and adequately protected. So it is just not true what the various Federal agencies of the Government are saying.

I concur in what Senator MALONE has said; they have either done it through ignorance, and I would like to think that that is the case, or they have done it through malicious intent to interfere with our way of life and, as a Republican, I would resent that.

I appreciate the opportunity to make this statement and I also want to compliment you, Senator BARRETT, on the excellent statement you made covering the whole problem this morning.

Senator BARRETT. Thank you very much, Senator GOLDWATER. I may say, in defense of the administration, that several departments of the executive arm of the Government are in favor of this legislation; so I have been advised for quite some time.

It is true, as you point out, Senator GOLDWATER, that the Justice Department has raised some legal questions, some constitutional questions, in hearings over on the House side.

I may say that water lawyers who have had extensive experience in that particular field for a long period of years in the West have examined the record and are wholly in opposition to the position taken by the Justice Department.

I am hoping as a result of these hearings we can at least convince every reasonable man on this committee that they are wrong in their contentions and their position and that the rule, as laid down by the Congress for the past 90 years, is a sound one and that there is no good reason why we should not reaffirm or restate that at this time.

I want to congratulate you at this time, Senator Goldwater, on the splendid statement you made here this morning.

Senator GOLDWATER. If I may be permitted to go one step further, because this brings up something that has been extremely distasteful to me before I came to the Senate and particularly since I have been here, and that is the idea that the executive branch of the administration enter into the legislative branch's work by the submission of these reports.

I do not know why we in the legislative branch have to wait patiently and bend over backward and salaam toward the upper end of Pennsylvania Avenue waiting for these reports.

I have read the Constitution a thousand times and I cannot find anything which says that when we are writing our legislation we have to wait for somebody up there to say "Yes" or "No."

Personally, I do not like the idea of such reports having such a bearing on legislation. I think it is a complete infringement on the intent of the Constitution to have the executive, through its various agencies, influencing legislation down here.

Here is legislation that affects 17 Western States, some 138 million acres of land, which is more land than lies east of the Mississippi, and the millions and millions of people that live on it, and yet if we are to follow the accepted practice of Congress during the last 25 or 30 years, I would say that this legislation has a pretty bad start because several people, and I imagine most of them are from the Eastern States, have written these reports and written them in a way that will not be of benefit to the people that we represent.

I think it is incumbent upon us in this legislation, and in all legislation, to disregard whether it is favorable or unfavorable to those reports insofar as they influence legislation.

Senator BARRETT. I may say to my colleague that Senator KNOWLAND spoke to me just a few minutes ago and he wants an opportunity to appear before this committee. He feels just as strongly as you do that while the committee may feel under some compulsion to consider the reports that are brought up here by these departments of the Government, that, nevertheless, we in the Congress have the final responsibility and that it is going to be incumbent upon us to write legislation that we think is fair and equitable for the Western States and legislation that will at the same time protect the legitimate interests of the United States.

So far as I know, I think that is precisely what this committee is going to do and what the Senate will do, and I hope what the House will do.

When we get this legislation down there to the White House, then is when their responsibility starts and if they want to take the position contrary to the position taken by the Congress since 1866, that again is their responsibility.

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes.

Senator BARRETT. Thank you very much, Senator GOLDWATER.

Senator GOLDWATER. Thank you very much.

AMENDMENT OF RULE, RELATING TO PROCEDURE ON CERTAIN TREATIES

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution to amend the Senate rules relative to committee reports on certain self-executing treaties.

As Members of the Senate know, article VI, paragraph 2 of the Constitution of the United States permits some treaties to become the supreme law of the land without implementing legislation by the Congress. The text of the treaty-control amendment (S. J. Res. 1), which was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, does not make all treaties non-self-executing.

Accordingly, there is a need for some procedure whereby lawyers and other interested parties can be notified that acts of Congress may have been superseded or modified by treaty provisions. At the present time, a lawyer can study the United States Code with the utmost care and diligence and still be unaware that an apparently existing law has been abrogated or modified by a treaty subsequent in time. This is an intolerable situation. No law, whether in treaty or statutory form, can be truly just unless the people affected thereby have adequate notice of its existence.

In the final analysis, of course, the courts must determine whether or not a particular treaty is self-executing or non-self-executing. The resolution I have introduced does not deprive the courts of this power. My resolution merely provides that the committee report on a treaty shall state to what extent, if any, ratification of the treaty will operate to supersede or modify an act of Congress. If, in the judgment of the reporting committee, ratification of the treaty would abrogate or modify any Federal law, the resolution would require a copy of the Senate committee report to be forwarded to the law revision counsel of the House Committee on the Judiciary for use in annotating pertinent sections of the United States Code.

I am indebted to Mr. Donald C. Beelar of the District of Columbia bar for making the suggestion which has led to the introduction of the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the resolution and the thoughtful article by Mr. Beelar which appeared in the September 1955 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 282), submitted by Mr. BRICKER, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"4. When a treaty is reported from a committee recommending the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the report of the committee shall state to what extent, if any, ratification thereof will operate to supersede or modify an act of Congress.

"5. When the Senate advises and consents to ratification of a treaty which, in the judgment of the reporting committee, will operate to supersede or modify an act of Congress, a copy of the Senate committee report shall be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to the Clerk of the House of Representatives for use by the Law Revision Counsel of the House Committee on the Judiciary in annotating pertinent sections of the United States Code."

The article, presented by Mr. BRICKER, is as follows:

TREATY-MADE LAW: A CASE IN POINT ON PROCEDURAL DEFICIENCIES

(By Donald C. Beelar, of the District of Columbia bar)

(Most lawyers would probably feel themselves well equipped to answer a simple question like, "Can an alien be licensed to pilot an aircraft in the United States?" Particularly so if they had a week or 10 days in which to do the necessary research in the applicable Federal statutes and regulations. Mr. Beelar's article shows that it is not so simple—not if the question is in an area of the law in which the provisions of some treaty may be relevant. Mr. Beelar declares that his point is well taken regardless of the final disposition of the Bricker amendment.)

"Laws are intended for all our people to live by; and the people go to law offices

to learn what their rights under these laws are."—Justice Jackson, title 341 United States Code, section 384, at page 396.

If you are an attorney who comes in contact with Federal law you doubtlessly rely on the United States Code. It is gratifying to learn that the 1952 edition is one-fifth "positive law" and the remaining four-fifths, now prima-facie evidence of the law, are in the process of codification and reenactment into positive law. Nothing less than "positive law" can give an attorney that feeling of confidence which is so essential in dealing with a subject covered by a Federal statute. But is this confidence well founded?

There is one glaring deficiency in the lawyer's facility to ascertain what is the law. Most everyone by now is familiar with the fact that provisions of a Federal statute can be indirectly repealed or modified by a subsequent convention, treaty, or executive agreement. Also new law can be "enacted" without notice or knowledge. It is not our purpose here to fan the smoldering fires of the Bricker amendment. Our query is how does an attorney know whether a positive provision of law has been displaced or superseded by some convention or treaty?

Consider for example an actual case. (Only the names and places have been withheld to protect the inocent.) And it could happen to anyone, even you and me.

An airline company in, say, the central United States, desired to employ a certain pilot. The answer to the citizenship question was "Canadian." The personnel department, being either curious or efficient, asked for a legal opinion on the employment eligibility of an alien pilot.

Perhaps if this question were given to a dozen different lawyers they would start out in as many different directions. A bit of research in almost any direction would soon establish that the licensing of persons to fly airplanes has long since been preempted by the Federal Government. This would lead to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. sec. 401, et seq.), a careful reading of which, however, would reveal nothing about the licensing of alien pilots. In dealing with a field under regulation by a Federal agency, it is not the statute that is revealing or complicated but the bulk output of regulations thereunder. This search brings to light CFR Title 14: Civil Aviation, a neatly printed volume of 983 pages not including the pocket supplement of 367 pages. Somewhere in this tome, you say to yourself, there should be some fine print on the alien-pilot question. It occurs to you all along that there just must be aliens flying airplanes in the United States, e. g., like driving cars or boats. There are foreign-flag airplanes daily coming into or transiting the United States.

Maybe the difficulty has to do with the piloting of an aircraft of United States registry? Section 21.12 of the regulations turns up with a paragraph entitled "Citizenship." This provides (to paraphrase) that a pilot must be a United States citizen or a citizen of a foreign government which grants reciprocal pilot privileges to our citizens. This would seem to provide a clear-cut answer if we only knew whether Canada grants reciprocal rights.[1] There are a large number of other regulations dealing with "aeronautical knowledge," "physical condition," "aeronautical experience" and various proficiencies including, to wit, "radio skill" (sec. 21.18). No mention is made in these regulations that the exercise of radio skill in an aircraft cockpit is restricted by another law and a sister agency, the FCC, to one holding a license to operate a radio transmitter.

It just so happens that you know from experience one of the many duties of a pilot is to communicate by radio. This leads you on a detour out of the civil air regulations back into the main body of the law, the United States Code, title 47, i. e., Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Section 301 of that act prohibits a person from using and operating a radio station without an FCC license. Nonobservance can add up to $10,000 or 2 years' imprisonment or both. The prohibition expressly applies to radio stations upon any vessel or aircraft of the United States. Moreover, section 318 provides that each radio station, even though licensed, must be actually operated by a person holding an operator's license. The payoff provision is found in section 303 (l), which restricts the licensing of radio station operators to citizens of the United States.

It begins to look bad for our Canadian pilot applicant.

An attorney never jumps to conclusions without a lot of cross checking. The FCC, like the CAB and CAA, also has its file of regulations, part 9 of which is entitled "Aviation Services" (47 C. F. R. 9.10–9.1005). This body of agency dealing with aviation radio services in general, and aircraft radio stations in particular, is negative of any provision either on Canadians, aliens, or licensed operators of aircraft stations. FCC part 13, however, entitled "Commercial Radio Operators," quite positively requires a radio operator's license by any person operating an aircraft radio station. Rule 13.5 on eligibility of a licensed radio operator specifies United States citizenship, which could hardly be otherwise in view of section 303 (l) of the act. The next step in this research is to run through all available annotations, looseleaf services, and in this case the trade service, Pike & Fischer, Radio Regulations. Everything checks out. The controlling regulations are still in force. There has been no change in the law. Section 303 (l) is decisive.

Conclusions:

1. A Canadian citizen otherwise qualified may obtain an airman's certificate which will authorize him to pilot a United States aircraft.

2. A Canadian citizen, however, is disqualified by statute from being granted a radio operator's license which is required for the operation of an aircraft radio station.

3. Since the duties of a transport pilot embrace both flying of the aircraft and operation of its radio transmitting equipment, the alien's disqualification to perform an inseparable part of the duties of a pilot operates to disqualify a Canadian citizen from pilot employment with the airline company.

These conclusions seem unassailable. To hire a pilot who can't operate a radio station would be like hiring a paperhanger who didn't have even one arm.

You have complete confidence in the answer given. You wish that all legal opinions were susceptible of such a definite answer. Your opinion is thereupon put into final form, signed, and delivered. The file is marked "Closed."

If that were all, there would be no story. The sequel happened about like this. The next time you heard of the case, the personnel department is on the telephone reminding you of your opinion on the Canadian pilot question and telling you that you are as wrong as rain, or words to that effect, and how come you had never heard of Treaty Series 2508. No attorney likes to be told he is wrong, especially by a layman.

For a flashback of the supervening events, it seems that the Canadian applicant had made inquiries back home about employer discrimination in the United States against Canadian citizens. This got into diplomatic channels to Washington where it found its way into the roulette of interdepartmental references which came to rest on No. 2508, being Telecommunications Convention Between the United States and Canada, effective May 15, 1952. Article I thereof provides in full as follows:

"With respect to radio equipment installed on civil aircraft of either country and properly licensed by the country of registry for the primary purpose of navigation and safe operation of the aircraft a United States citizen holding a pilot license and, in addition, a radio operator license issued by the United States of America, may operate such radio equipment on an aircraft registered in Canada and operated in either country, and a Canadian citizen holding a pilot license and, in addition, a radio operator certificate issued by Canada, may operate such radio equipment on an aircraft registered in the United States of America and operated in either country; provided, that the operation of such radio equipment shall be in accordance with local law and regulation and complementary to his functions or duties as a pilot; provided also, that either country may require, for security purposes or to assure familiarity with domestic radio operating regulations and procedures, the registration or examination of citizens of the other country and the issuance of a permit for the privileges set forth herein."

After some days' delay in obtaining a copy of this 5-cent document (which is about the amount you feel like after reading article I), you begin to wonder how the existence of this thing didn't show up anywhere in your research. You back-track, like a criminal returning to the scene of the crime, over all statutes, CAA, CAB, and FCC regulations and their annotations. After painstakingly tracing these sources you arrive at the following somewhat astounding findings and conclusions:

1. The available compilations of Federal law contain no reference to treaties which may change existing law or enact new law.

2. Although the principal purpose of TS–2508, the United States-Canadian Convention, was to overcome the disability of section 303 (l) of the Communications Act of 1934 as to Canadian nationals being granted radio operator licenses, the convention makes no mention of section 303 (l). The annotations to that section contain no reference to the convention.

3. The rules and regulations of the CAB and CAA contain no reference to the convention. On the contrary, these regulations imply no citizenship disability for persons performing pilot functions including radio.

4. The FCC rules and regulations, as pertains to section 303 (l) or part 9, Aviation Services or part 13, Commercial Radio Operators, nowhere indicate the existence of the Canadian convention. On the contrary, these rules show no breach in the absolute prohibition against aliens being radio operators of aircraft radio stations.[2]

5. There is no cross-reference between the CAA regulations and the FCC regulations relating to use of a pilot's license by one in possession of a valid radio operator's license, or relating the exercise of an aircraft radio operator's license to one in possession of a valid airman's certificate.

6. Due diligence in the use of facilities normally available to a law office would not reveal the existence of TS–2508 or its contents.

Of course, once such a treaty becomes known, it is not difficult to corroborate its existence. Like any puzzle, it is very simple if you already know the solution. With

[1] Subsequent to the event in question, the CAA itself found it administratively impractical to ascertain what foreign countries granted reciprocal pilot rights to United States citizens and in March 1954 sec. 21.12 was changed so that a pilot may be a citizen of any country or of no country.

[2] Pike and Fischer, I R. R. 52.501 does have 8 pages of the fine print listing treaties relating to radio, 1910 to date, giving the T. S. number and bare-subject-title but their provisions are not cited or collated in the specific provisions of law or rules.

the existence of TS-2508 having come to your attention, albeit in the unorthodox and unprofessional manner above recited, you delve more intensely into the problem; why no notice, no citation, no red flag. You bridge the gap in this post-mortem phase of the research with the following:

1. No notice of the proposed convention was carried in the Federal Register.

2. Senate ratification was devoid of any indication that section 303 (1) was being modified.

3. Annual report of the Federal Communications Commission for the year in question, although reporting on subject matters such as international treaty activities, aeronautical radio services, aviation organizations and conferences, and aircraft radio stations, contains no mention of the United States-Canadian Convention.

4. This treaty is not listed in United States Code Congressional Service.

5. Although the annual output of treaty law for 1951 is contained in a 2-volume compilation of 2,589 pages entitled "United States Treaties and Other International Agreements," there is no subject-matter digest of these documents. There is no current slip service or digest and the bound compilations are some 2 years behind, e. g., the 1952 edition is not available as of January 1955. (See 1 U. S. C., sec. 112a).

6. Little and Brown's edition of Laws and Treaties advertised in title 1, United States Code, section 113 may provide some assistance except that telephone inquiries of two leading book stores in the Nation's Capital produced the information that according to them no such edition currently exists.

Concluding caveat: When dealing with a provision of positive law of a sort which might be changed or superseded by some treaty, convention, or agreement the chances are you won't know about and can't find it.

The saying at law is where there is a wrong there is a remedy. In any event, the problem illustrated by the above case would seem to indicate, as a minimum, the following procedural improvements:

1. It would seem reasonable that the United States Senate when called upon to ratify a treaty should know whether or not it is changing or superseding existing statutory law.

2. When the subject matter of a treaty changes or enacts new law in a field regulated by a Federal agency, some public notice of the proposal should be given. (At this point of metamorphic juncture from a foreign affairs function to domestic law, public notice would seem to facilitate good administration.)

3. Where a treaty changes or supersedes a provision of law regulated by an agency, the rules of the interested or sponsoring agency should contain a citation to the treaty, and, if necessary, modifications should be made in the rules.

4. Publishers of legal services should annotate or cite applicable treaties which affect statutory law, or raise a flag in the preface that no consideration is given to treaty-made law.

The foregoing improvements should be placed in effect quite regardless of the Bricker amendment controversy or its outcome.

SOCIAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 7225, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. THYE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 7225, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1956, and ask that it be printed and lie on the desks of the individual Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER—REQUEST FOR HOUSE TO RETURN JOINT RESOLUTION (H. J. RES. 472)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to give notice of a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 472) for the relief of certain aliens was passed by the Senate on June 11, 1956. Also, I move that the House be requested to return to the Senate the joint resolution, which has already been transmitted to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the House will be requested to return the joint resolution, and the motion to reconsider will be entered.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT REPORT ENTITLED "COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY" (S. DOC. NO. 129)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report of that committee's Subcommittee on Legislation Affecting the Food and Drug Administration, entitled "Compulsory Inspection of Poultry." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address entitled "Appraisal of Air Force Public Relations," delivered by Senator GOLDWATER before Air War College, Montgomery, Ala., June 12, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON VARIOUS CIVIL-RIGHTS PROPOSALS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I desire to give notice that the committee will resume hearings on the various civil-rights proposals beginning at 2:30 p. m. Tuesday, June 19, 1956, and at 2:30 p. m., Friday, June 22, 1956, in the committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM G. JUERGENS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 19, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Fred L. Wham, retired.

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 Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSALS TO EXTEND THE VETERANS' LOAN-GUARANTY PROGRAM, BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce that there will be public hearings before the subcommittee next week at 10 a. m., June 20 and 21, on pending bills to extend the veterans' loan-guaranty program. The hearings will be held in the Old Supreme Court Chamber, P-63, in the Capitol. Anyone wishing to testify should call the committee staff director, Stewart McClure, on extension 41.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 13, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2967) to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that at the conclusion of the morning business I shall ask the Senate to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business, S. 3982, and proceed to the consideration of the

public-works appropriation bill. Following action on the public works appropriation bill, the Senate will revert to the mining bill, Calendar No. 2169, S. 3982.

I am hopeful that today and tomorrow we may be able to consider:

Calendar No. 2113, H. R. 8102, to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military material in transit;

Calendar No. 2114, H. R. 8693, to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

Calendar No. 2115, H. R. 8922, to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services;

Calendar No. 2120, Senate Resolution 274, a contempt citation against Joseph Bruno;

Calendar No. 2121, Senate Resolution 275, a contempt citation against William Frazier Evans;

Calendar No. 2122, Senate Resolution 276, a contempt citation against Robert I. Hasoi;

Calendar No. 2123, Senate Resolution 277, a contempt citation against Salvatore Santaro;

Calendar No. 2124, Senate Resolution 278, a contempt citation against Jesse Alexander;

Calendar No. 2125, Senate Resolution 279, a contempt citation against Joseph Bendinelli.

The contempt-citation resolutions will be in charge of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], chairman of the subcommittee handling the narcotics legislation.

The Senate will then proceed to Calendar No. 2039, S. 3448, the airlines capital-gains bill, provided the Department has supplied the information desired by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Then the Senate will proceed to Calendar No. 2155, H. R. 7763, amending the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act.

During today I hope to confer with the distinguished minority leader and perhaps announce other bills which may be considered on tomorrow.

I am hopeful the conference committees on the appropriation bills and the road bill may be able to reach an agreement during the week, so we can clear up the calendar in regard to those measures.

SUPPORT OF ADLAI STEVENSON FOR DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Star, pointing out the widespread nature of the support of Adali Stevenson for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States.

As Mr. Stokes points out, Adlai Stevenson has demonstrated in primaries from Florida to Alaska, climaxed by his great victory in California, that he is the people's choice and the people's candidate.

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

THE NEW "PEOPLE'S CANDIDATE"—STEVENSON VIEWED AS ONLY DEMOCRAT ATTRACTING SUPPORT IN ALL REGIONS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The only seeming obstacle now to Adlai Stevenson's renomination by the Democrats in Chicago in August is a possible combination against him behind an outsider or "dark horse."

But the chances of a successful operation of that sort appear, as of now, very poor, and for two reasons: One is historical; that is, ill luck usually has attended such allied stop movements directed at a front runner. The other is a circumstance pertinent to the present situation, which is the lack of a candidate who in himself could rally enough support among party leaders and divergent delegate elements in the convention to defeat Adlai Stevenson. He has broad-based support, not only among party leaders but in the voting public itself. That he demonstrated again in the climactic California primary, as he has previously in other tests.

His only open and public challenger in test by popular vote, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, was finally and irrevocably eliminated by Adlai Stevenson's sweeping and conclusive California victory. The Tennessee Senator's adopted title of "the people's candidate" was whisked away like a leaf of autumn in the hurricane of votes against him in his five successive primary defeats by Adlai Stevenson—California, Florida, Oregon, District of Columbia, and Alaska, to backtrack the trail.

Senator KEFAUVER thus lost the only argument that had the slightest chance of moving party leaders who, in fact, are even more hostile toward him now because of his bitter attacks on Adlai Stevenson in the Florida-California windup.

One way to describe the situation that now seems to have developed in the Democratic Party is that the type of candidate needed to beat Adlai Stevenson in the convention would be another Adali Stevenson; that is, one who could attract support among all groups and in all regions of the very motley Democratic Party and yet remain the respected figure that he is.

None such appears among those listed as "dark horse" or "compromise" candidates. You can check them off one by one: Gov. Averell Harriman of New York, who has the handicap of deep-seated southern antagonism; Gov. Frank J. Lausche of Ohio, vetoed by powerful labor and New Deal-Fair Deal elements in the party and evoking no warmth among many regular party leaders because of his party irregularity; Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, regarded as too vague a political character to inspire enthusiasm; Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, Senate party leader, a regional candidate who stirs no rank-and-file interest beyond the South, if much there, and who has a health handicap in the heart attack he suffered a year ago.

In such a situation, you also encounter an obstacle that has been observed so often before in this reporter's long experience with national conventions. This is the inability of such a group to agree on which among them should be "it." They do have to agree and pool their vote resources, for it will take all the delegate strength they might pull together to block a front runner such as Adlai Stevenson is now. Such alliances usually fall apart on the rocks of personal egotism, which is especially highly developed in the political species.

Lest someone bring up the 1952 Democratic convention where Senator KEFAUVER, himself then the front runner, was blocked, it may be pointed out that he lacked support among convention leaders and, furthermore had antagonized powerful big city bosses by his crime investigation. He had limits beyond which he could not enlist recruits and therefore he never could have won. He had gone as far as he possibly could go and got into a stalemate with other candidates who likewise had gone as far as they possibly could go. None could get a majority, since delegates attached to one would go to none of the others. This created an impasse in which an outsider agreeable generally to all could be brought in to break the deadlock—and that was Adlai Stevenson.

For Ike-cowed Democrats, California is clearly the biggest shot in the arm of this primary, preconvention season. This is because of the size of the Democratic vote, indicating interest and high party morale, and because Democrats found they still have a champion and a leader capable of exciting the voters and a leader, as well, who has support all across the board. Special appeals by Senator KEFAUVER, approaching the demagogic, failed to shake loose from Adlai Stevenson support from such groups of the elderly folks and Negroes who voted for the 1952 Democratic candidate in large numbers. That indicates the latter offers the best hope of unifying the Democrats—if that were possible.

California, as the climax of his series of victories, was a real personal triumph for Adlai Stevenson. It was the glorious end of a comeback road from Minnesota in March where he suffered a heavy blow at the hands of the Tennessee Senator. What Adlai Stevenson has done since is a measure of his inner strength and of his determination. Anyone who knows him knows what an ordeal it was for him to get out and grub for votes, town by town, street by street, handshake by handshake. Yet, he set himself resolutely to it and not only came to enjoy it but also became most adept at it. His desire to win became infectious. He transported it finally to those he met.

He has, indeed, become sort of a people's candidate himself.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION AND THE PROBLEM OF SEGREGATION IN THE SCHOOLS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, one of the major issues with which this Congress has been faced, and still confronts, is the issue of Federal aid to education and its relationship to the problem of segregation in the schools in some parts of the country. I, myself, have long felt, ever since this proposal was made in the Congress 2 years ago, that essential as the basic measure is, it is likewise essential to insure that Federal funds raised by taxation of all the people shall not be used to further and accentuate segregation, and shall not be used to build schools, in States and school districts, in a manner and with the purpose of maintaining and deepening the pattern of segregation in education, in the face of a Supreme Court decision, under the Constitution.

This is a question on which men of good will can honestly differ. There are some liberals who sincerely believe that this issue should not be raised in connection with the Federal-aid-to-education bill.

There are other persons, of course, who are opposed to an antisegregation proviso on the aid-to-education bill because they are determined to defend the pattern of segregation in education.

Among the liberals who take different views on this question, a considerable debate has been in progress over the past

6 months. I was privileged to participate in such a debate in the pages of the Progressive magazine, a responsible periodical published in Madison, Wis. My opponent in this debate was my very good friend and most respected and admired colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

He and I see eye to eye on most issues. I know that we see eye to eye on the basic issue of Federal aid to education. Of course we see eye to eye on the vital questions of civil rights and civil liberties. Hence, our debate on this particular question was carried on, and will continue to be carried on, in the friendliest spirit. I honor the sincerity of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I know that he honors mine.

I think it would be very useful to the Senate and enlightening to the country to have the views I have expressed in the pages of the Progressive magazine, and the contrary views expressed by the Senator from Oregon, spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article I wrote on the question of amending the Federal school-aid bill so as to prevent the Federal Government from promoting segregation in the schools be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, to be followed by the very able presentation on the same subject, but on the opposite side, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

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

ARTICLE BY SENATOR LEHMAN IN MAY ISSUE OF THE PROGRESSIVE, ON SCHOOLS, SUBSIDIES, AND SEGREGATION

Why do men of good will differ on the question of an antisegregation amendment to the Federal school aid bill? Part of the answer may be found in the confusion over the nature of the question. The short title—"antisegregation amendment"—might be one of the factors in the confusion.

The amendment I propose to the school aid bill is not designed to end segregation in the public schools. It is not designed to implement or enforce the Supreme Court decisions on segregation. Whether Congress should act directly to implement the 14th amendment in reference to public school education is quite another question. I happen to think it would be a good idea, but that is not the question we are dealing with in the school aid bill, which is clearly not the vehicle for such a difficult, debatable, and comprehensive undertaking.

What I propose is simply a "law-and-order" amendment, designed only to restrain the Federal Government from aiding and abetting recalcitrant States and school districts in their defiance of the law and the Constitution. Early last year I served notice in the Senate that I would propose such an amendment. It is this proposed Lehman amendment that I want to discuss here. I hasten to explain that while my amendment is somewhat different in its scope and mode of operation from the Powell amendment in the House, the general intent and philosophy of both amendments are the same. In any event my amendment is going to be the one offered and I assume will be the one considered in the Senate.

My amendment would authorize and direct the President to put in escrow the funds which would otherwise be paid to those States and school districts which are known or found to be actively defying the Supreme Court mandate to give all schoolchildren within their States that equal protection of the law required by the Constitution. Thereafter the money would be paid to these States and school districts as soon as it is established that they are trying "in good faith" to comply with the Supreme Court decision.

There is no thought of requiring that the States should have completed the desegregation of their schools as a condition precedent to receiving Federal aid—only that, in accordance with the Court decree of May 31, 1955, they are proceeding to "make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance."

I do not expect by this amendment to force unwilling States and school districts immediately to desegregate their schools. That would be like trying to stop a rampaging elephant with a peashooter.

Actually, this amendment is not really aimed at the States at all, but at the Federal Government, and at the integrity of the laws of the Nation as a whole. The least Congress can do in this connection is to restrain the Executive from abetting defiant States and school districts in the very performance of their acts of defiance.

I cannot see how it can even be argued that States and school districts strenuously engaged in resisting the Court's prohibitions against the practice of racial discrimination in the schools should still receive Federal funds collected from all taxpayers, for the construction of the very instruments of legal defiance and racial discrimination.

Suppose we proceed to consider the chief arguments of the liberal opponents of this amendment. They can, I believe, be roughly summarized as follows:

The amendment will kill the school-aid bill because the southerners will filibuster it to death.

The amendment is irrevelant to the purposes of the school-aid bill.

The amendment is unnecessary because the President has the power to do everything the amendment proposes.

The amendment is unnecessary because the courts are going to take care of the problem.

Killing the bill by means of this amendment will penalize all the States and all schoolchildren in order to punish a few recalcitrant States.

Withholding the funds from the defiant States and school districts will retard rather than advance the cause of desegregation in those States, and will not help but rather harm the Negro children in those States and districts.

II

Notice that most of these arguments really flow from the first—that the amendment will kill the school-aid bill. Therefore, the liberal opponents of the amendment are, in effect, not only urging that the amendment should not be adopted, but that it shouldn't even be offered. The rest of their arguments, I am afraid, are largely rationalizations for their fear that the amendment, if offered, will be adopted and thus provoke a filibuster.

I for one am not at all willing to concede that the consideration of this amendment will mean the death of the school-aid bill. This is a defeatist assumption which accepts in advance, without the test of trial and opposition, the blackmail threat of the filibuster.

I believe the amendment is not only sound but absolutely essential for the sake of the integrity of this legislation. I want to test the opposition to it. Let the southern opponents of this amendment bear the burden of challenge to law and order, and to orderly procedures in the Senate. Let us see if they have the strength of conviction and purpose, on the issue of defying the Constitution, to conduct a filibuster.

Let us see how many will join in the grinding test of the filibuster on this issue of law and order—which is quite different from FEPC. My own guess is that on this issue there will be less than an all-out filibuster. This is not 1949. This is 1956.

Of course, I could be wrong. I could be misjudging the temper of my colleagues in the Senate. But is our moral purpose so much weaker than theirs that we should not even hazard the attempt? I cannot believe this.

I think a filibuster on this issue can be overcome if the liberals and others committed, politically or otherwise, to the cause of law and order unite in support of this amendment. We can invoke the rules of the Senate which permit 1 Senator no more than 2 speeches on the same proposition. We can circulate a cloture petition. As shamefully inadequate as the cloture rule is, I propose to find out whether we cannot, on this issue, get the 64 votes required for cloture. It will be a good occasion for men to stand up and be counted.

But how about the argument that the amendment is irrelevant to the legislation? I am convinced it is as much a part of the question of Federal aid for education as a limb is a part of the human body. It can be cut off, but its absence will be noticeable. Some might wish it weren't so, but the Supreme Court's decision of May 17, 1954, made the one question an inseparable part of the other. Indeed, it can scarcely be denied that the question of segregation in education more and more dominates the question of Federal assistance to education.

Shall Congress act as if the historic event of May 17, 1954, had not taken place? Shall we take no notice of the mighty pageant of events which has occurred since that day? It is pure wordmongering to pose the question of whether Congress should take cognizance of these events, in connection with this or any other legislation. Congress, like the rest of the country and the world, has taken cognizance. Today the school segregation issue, and all it implies, dominates all our thoughts and conditions almost all our actions.

For Congress to fail to consider an amendment to the school-aid bill dealing with the situation that has developed as a result of the Supreme Court decisions would constitute, in itself, a negative action of powerful eloquence and tremendous significance. It would mean that Congress was deliberately refraining from taking a stand not only on the question of segregation, but more directly on the question of how the Executive should dispose of public money for the support of local education in cases where that education was being conducted in overt defiance of the laws of the land, and in overt violation of the constitutional rights of those to be educated.

It might even be argued by the defiant States and school districts that such an action by Congress constituted a repudiation of the Supreme Court's rulings.

Now, for the argument that the amendment is unnecessary because the President has the inherent power to do what the amendment would direct him to do: True, the President has the power. He could proclaim, consistent with his oath of office—"to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution"—that he intended to withhold school-aid funds from those States and school districts which publicly undertake to evade and defy the rulings of the Supreme Court prohibiting unconstitutional and unlawful discrimination in education.

If the President were to do this, it might not be necessary to press the amendment—although I think it would still be preferable for Congress to establish the standards for withholding, as well as to provide specifically for the holding of these funds in escrow, pending the time of compliance. But if the President were to indicate quite clearly and rather specifically how the executive branch would take care of this problem, I think the

Congress would be justified in leaving it to his discretion.

The fact is, however, that the President has not proclaimed any such intention, despite repeated appeals that he do so. He and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education have replied negatively to inquiries on this point, in a manner that strongly suggests the executive branch would not exercise such an authority unless specifically instructed by Congress. So Congress has no alternative but to act.

What about the argument that the amendment is unnecessary because the courts are going to take care of the problem, and that Congress should not interfere?

This argument is inapplicable to my amendment, which, I repeat, is not designed to bring segregation to an end, or force compliance with the Supreme Court's decision, or interfere in any way with the work of the courts. I do not propose, in this amendment, either to supplant or supplement the courts in wrestling with the grave, overall problem of resistance to the law and the court rulings. That is another and much larger problem which must be separately and prayerfully considered.

III

Yet this discussion would be incomplete without some reference to the overwhelming difficulties faced by the courts in pursuing their present course. The amount of time it may take the courts to confront and consider all the various devices that are being busily improvised to avoid and resist compliance literally staggers the imagination.

There are four States—Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina—which have proclaimed their determined defiance of the law, and have, each in a different manner, staked out a course designed to resist compliance. These States, moreover, have enacted legislation which will effectively prevent—and in some cases violently penalize—any attempt by any locality to comply with the court decrees.

Two States—Virginia and North Carolina—while they have moved in a complex manner to evade the constitutional requirements—have enacted legislation which may make it possible for localities to integrate their schools if they so desire. But the likelihood of large scale integration in these States is remote, until the State laws themselves have been legally attacked and disposed of in the courts.

In general, no two of the resisting States are following exactly the same course. They are dispersing their devices, as if by design, and running down different alleyways in their determination to escape from compliance. Some propose to turn over all authority over the schools to the local school board. Some have enacted legislation purporting to grant immunity to local school boards from all court orders and decrees. Some propose to lease school facilities to "private" organizations.

Altogether, the arsenal of proposed means of "legal" evasion of the Supreme Court's ruling is depressingly vast and is growing by the hour. It probably will take years to confront each one of these devices in the courts and place it under the ban of the Constitution.

To those who are interested in reading a comprehensive summary of the various legal means which are being invoked to thwart the Supreme Court decision, I commend the study by Prof. James Nabrit in the symposium on racial desegregation and integration published in the March 1956, Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Sciences. A briefer and more readable summary appears in the April 3 issue of Look magazine, where Prof. Fred Rodell has listed some of the possibilities of evasive action and consequent delay.

Now I should like to turn, in answer to the last two arguments against my amendment listed earlier in this article, to a consideration of the moral nature of the issue.

I want to emphasize again that my amendment is not a "penalty" or a "punishment" of anybody. It is a restraint only on the Federal Government which, in the school aid legislation, is launching not only a new program, but a one-shot program. This is not permanent legislation, but emergency legislation. When the money authorized under the school aid bill is expended, the program will be over.

The Federal Government bears the responsibility for the manner in which the money is spent and the uses to which it is put. The Federal Government is responsible to the taxpaying public, to the general public, to the schoolchildren, to the future of the Nation, and to the rest of the world.

Whatever disguise is given the legally enforced practice of segregation, it remains the defensive shield for the concept of white supremacy and the drawn sword for the enforcement of that concept. That is the doctrine which is being defended by the resisting and defiant States.

Some thoughtful Southern leaders have already undertaken to grapple directly with this central issue. Shall we be less outspoken than they?

Msgr. Charles J. Plauche, Southern-born Chancellor of the New Orleans Archidiocese, recently declared that "racial segregation is a shameful blot on our national escutcheon and can no longer be ignored and set aside for future consideration. As an American I submit there is no acceptable moral alternative to the condemnation of segregation of the Negro and the acceptance of integration of the races in public and semi-public institutions and agencies."

Monsignor Plauche has been far from alone in the South in his definition of the moral values involved in this issue.

Indeed, the reaction of the South to the Supreme Court decision has been far from monolithic. Of the 17 States and the District of Columbia in which school segregation was officially sanctioned and practiced prior to May 17, 1954, only a handful stand today in attitudes of open defiance. The others have either integrated completely or are moving, unsteadily, and unhappily in some cases, in the inevitable direction.

I fear that failure of Congress to take cognizance in the school aid legislation of the overt defiance being offered by a few will encourage, and even force, others into the ranks of the resistors.

What of the rest of the world? What will the great majority of mankind think if we, in Congress, insist on pretending that the issue is not before us, even when we are considering school legislation? What will happen to our pretense of leadership of free mankind, both colored and white?

IV

Now what about the school children? How does all of this affect all of them? It is their plight, after all, which moves us to consider this legislation. Will they have reason to be grateful to us for failing to consider that aspect of the segregation issue which necessarily intrudes upon the question of school aid? What of the Negro children?

It is mistakenly maintained by the opponents of my amendment that even segregated education works in the direction of desegregation. Nothing could be further from the fact. The segregated schools are one of the prime training grounds for the acceptance of the practice of segregation. The schools are one of the few places where all children come into direct contact with the authority of government. What does government teach them in the segregated schools? It teaches them to accept segregation and discrimination as a way of life. It teaches Negroes that they are, by nature, inferior. It teaches whites that they are, by nature, superior. It teaches them "separateness" and "differentness," so utterly repugnant not only to law but to life.

How can we in Congress say that we benefit anybody, whether white or black, by refraining from posing the law-and-order issue in connection with this legislation?

It is important, I know, to build more school buildings for our school children. But stone and mortar do not make a school. A school building is not the only factor in the training of our young. What do we tell our school children, in these fine new buildings, about the sanctity of law and order, and the dignity of American citizenship? How do we explain to them that Congress provided the money for these buildings, but didn't bother even to consider the question of the evil practices of racial discrimination in some States and some school districts? I am not referring to the children in the segregated schools, but to all our school children.

Isn't the integrity of our democratic processes just as vital a factor in the education of the young as the quality of the classroom walls and of the gymnasium facilities?

I do not believe that I can be any more eloquent in stating the moral issue involved than a Federal judge in New Orleans, Southern born and Southern bred Judge J. Skelly Wright, when, on February 15 of this year, he ordered segregation in the schools of Orleans Parish to be brought to an end, and when he overturned the segregation statutes of Louisiana which required this segregation. He said:

"The problem of changing a people's mores, particularly those with an emotional overlay, is not to be taken lightly. It is a problem which will require the utmost patience, understanding, generosity, and forbearance from all of us. But the magnitude of the problem may not nullify the principle. And that principle is that we are all of us, free-born Americans, with a right to make our way, unfettered by sanctions imposed by man because of the work of God."

We in Congress can do no less than to accept our responsibility to abide by this principle, and to fight for it when it comes to issue, and to acknowledge it as among the highest principles we know, not to be sacrificed out of timidity or on the alter of expediency.

ARTICLE BY SENATOR NEUBERGER IN MAY ISSUE OF THE PROGRESSIVE, ON SCHOOLS, SUBSIDIES, AND SEGREGATION

"The common school is the greatest discovery ever made by man."—Abraham Flexner.

A committee of the Senate has reported: "Millions of children still attend schools which are unsafe or which permit learning only part time or under conditions of serious overcrowding." More than a million children are going to school in buildings not designed originally for school use. Two children out of five have been attending school in structures which do not conform to minimum fire-safety requirements. Elementary teachers in cities of medium size are paid less than railroad switchtenders, automobile workers, coal miners, or glass blowers. Over 75,000 teachers quit the profession each year. Furthermore, during the next 5 years, the number of schoolchildren will rise from 30 million to 45 million, with no means in sight to provide properly for their education.

This is not happening in Russia or the Congo or Malaya.

It is happening in the United States of America, a Nation where corporate profits stand at an all-time high, where $40 billion is spent annually for armaments, and where the stock exchange creates new bonanzas and new millionaires almost each day.

Many local school districts are bonded to the hilt. Others are so strapped for funds

that their credit is gone. State governments have run out of sources of revenue to tap for school purposes. My own State, not a realm of great industry or wealth, has saddled itself with the highest State income tax in the land in order to carry its educational responsibilities. The one ultimate solution, unless we are to default on our duty to the children of America, is Federal aid to education. Only the Federal Government has the fiscal resources to end the school crisis.

I rank this as a primary obligation of the 1956 session of Congress. Nothing must be permitted to form a barricade between this country's boys and girls and an adequate education. That is why I oppose adding any amendment, whether Senator LEHMAN's or Representative POWELL's, to the bill which would authorize $400 million annually, for each of 4 years, in the form of Federal aid to school construction. Both the Lehman and Powell amendments, they are similar in purpose if somewhat different in emphasis and language, would imperil early authorization of school construction funds. I shall refer to the antisegregation rider in the remainder of my argument as the Powell amendment since the proposal is best known to the public by that title.

II

If we lived in the best possible of worlds, I would favor the Powell amendment denying assistance to any State or district practicing segregation in the schools. But we live in a world where the rules of the United States Senate permit practically unlimited debate. Those rules make it possible for a minority—namely the Dixiecrats from the South—to prevent passage of a school-aid bill carrying an antisegregation amendment. Therefore, we are confronted with the alterntive:

1. To pass the Federal-aid-to-education bill, without the Powell amendment.

2. To add the Powell amendment and watch the bill filibustered to death.

These are harsh choices for somebody who detests segregation and discrimination as much as I do. In the Oregon Legislature, my wife and I have been sponsors of legislation to assure equal treatment of all races and creeds in public places, to guarantee fair employment practices and to end a legal ban against mixed marriages, a ban which dated from frontier hostility against the American Indian. Even while in the Army during the building of the Alaska Highway, I did all that a second lieutenant could to bring about better housing and other facilities for colored troops helping valiantly to hack that great corridor out of the sub-Arctic solitudes. So my own record in this respect is clear, I trust.

But I also believe strongly in education. I think it is disgraceful the way we have allowed our school facilities to deteriorate, in a country as rich and mighty as the United States. Ending segregation is a noble cause; aiding education is likewise a noble cause. Shall we imperil the fate of both by tying them together legislatively?

A newspaper as consistently liberal as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has recently had this to say editorially about the Powell amendment: "There is more than a suspicion that some of the backers of this step are moved by cold cynicism which is quite willing to defeat Federal aid to schools, court the northern Negro vote, and expose the Democratic Party split over segregation, all in one fell swoop."

I had occasion to remember that editorial when the congressional delegation from our State met at breakfast with a group of Oregon school principals. The Republican Member of Congress from the second Oregon district said on this occasion that he felt it necessary to support the Powell amendment, in order to be consistent with his oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. Yet, as a State Senator, this same man had cast 1 of only 5 votes against Negroes in Oregon trade schools. Furthermore, the Congressman also eventually admitted to the school group that he doubted if Federal aid to education were really necessary or desirable.

Now, I realize this is far from true of a man like Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, who has fought all his life for equal treatment of all peoples, and who is one of the kindest and most warmhearted human beings it has ever been my privilege to know. But it should give us pause to consider that there are men actively involved in the struggle for the Powell amendment who do not have HERBERT LEHMAN's long record in behalf of equality and fairness. Indeed, some of the backers of the Powell amendment have been more identified with antagonism toward Federal aid for schools than in support of integration for the races of mankind.

In addition, why make the children the pawn in this controversy? If it is wrong for Federal funds to go to places where there is segregation in the schools, then what of the Federal funds that help to build hospitals in which the races are segregated? If anything, it is more inherently evil to turn away a sick or injured man from a hospital erected with Federal aid than to deny a child schooling in a classroom built with Federal aid. Both are wrong, but why pick on one and not the other?

Would backers of the Powell amendment apply it to Federal-aid highway funds which assist in the construction of roads over which Jim Crow buses travel? And what of the federally financed Salk vaccine that has been going to children during this past year, through distribution in the schools? Do advocates of the Powell amendment care to withhold Salk vaccine from States encouraging segregation in the school systems? And what of Federal farm-price supports in rural counties where Negroes are intimidated away from the ballot box? Should Federal navigation locks accommodate boats which force separate quarters on Negro crews or passengers?

The extent of such application of the Powell-amendment theory is virtually endless. Why, then are its sponsors splicing it only to the bill for Federal aid to schools? This is being done for the very reason which should discourage such a course—because of the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public-school systems.

The defiance of the Court's decision by inflamatory and lawless groups in the South has dramatized the school situation. It is in this sphere that applying the Powell amendment can attain the maximum dramatic and political impact. Yet, through fiat of our highest judicial tribunal, the Federal district courts throughout the South have been empowered to work out obedience to the school-case decision. In other words, schools are the realm where the Powell amendment is needed the least. The ruling of the Supreme Court already has begun to operate, albeit slowly, in the field of education. Where the Powell amendment might be far more justified is in the case of segregated hospitals and segregated highway usages, where no Supreme Court decision has yet been rendered.

III

On top of all this, coupling the Powell amendment to the school bill is on the shakiest kind of moral and ethical ground. In educational budgets, haste often is of the essence. Jefferson said that our young people come this way but once. This was in the era when the old Northwest Ordinance of 1785 was first establishing the idea of public support of education. While the political argument goes on over the Powell amendment, a whole generation of young Americans can lose out educationally. The sufferers will not be the politicians on each side of the issue, those intransigent ones in the North and the South. No; the victims of the debate will be the schoolchildren of America. By starving education, we merely prepare the sod for more seeds of intolerance in the future.

Even forgetting the Powell amendment, the schedule for Federal aid to our schools is all too tardy, at best. The school-aid bills are only authorizations. Should they pass in this session of Congress, already more than half over, the necessary appropriations probably would not be enacted until the 1958 fiscal year, which begins July 1, 1957. It will take at least 2 full years, perhaps 3, for the new school buildings constructed with these Federal-aid funds to be transferred from the drawing boards of architects into steel and glass and bricks and concrete.

Under the most favorable circumstances, a child will practically have gone all of the way through high school and halfway through grammar school before the present Federal-aid bills now before Congress could contribute affirmatively to the improvement of his education.

To slow down this discouraging schedule by the inevitable complications of the Powell amendment is to venture a grim risk, indeed, with the destiny of America's most precious resource, its children. If the Powell amendment is tied to the school bill, a Senate filibuster by southern extremists and by decent southerners frightened politically by extremists, is as inexorable as tomorrow's sunrise. The result will be the defeat of the school-aid bill. It will be talked to death. If it dies, so will the hopes of millions of teachers, parents, and children for better and more adequate schools.

This is a time for political courage on both sides of the Mason and Dixon line. We of the North hope and pray that some of the politicians of the South will resist their extremists and fomenters of hate. We are disappointed when some southern liberals find themselves unable or unwilling to do so. But the bell likewise tolls for us. We, too, must be brave enough to stand against extremists of our own, who would imperil the school aid required by all children, white and black, in order to punish the segregated schools of the South. Adlai E. Stevenson resisted this demand, and it may have cost him dearly in terms of political popularity. Yet I believe that somewhere, if only in Abou Ben Adhem's book of life, there is a mark honoring Stevenson's singular act of political valor.

I am one Senator who is quite willing to see the civil rights issue fought out on the floor of the Senate. I should like to see before us bills to remove the poll tax, to assure fair-employment practices, and to end discrimination in such public places as hotels and restaurants. I believe legislation ought to be passed allocating seats in the House of Representatives not on a State's census population but according to the number of people who participate in elections. This would prevent Southern States from securing congressional representation as a result of Negro residents who are denied the right to vote. The present situation is as incongruous as a father who qualifies for income-tax exemptions because of children he fails to feed and clothe.

In addition, I should like to see the rules of the Senate modified so that a simple majority of Senators can shut off debate. An argument can be made for filibusters, but I believe they generally do more harm than good. In my opinion, Senator LEHMAN was right early in 1955 when he proposed a fight by liberal Senators to reform archaic Senate rules.

I make no defense of Dixiecrat Senators who would use the existing rules of the Senate to filibuster into oblivion a school-aid bill, if it includes the Powell amendment. Such men are dominated by bigotry rather than reason. Yet I know they probably never will change their basic thought patterns—at least not within the foreseeable

future. I also know the Senate rules cannot be changed immediately. And aid to schools must be provided long before these slow-moving political changes ever occur, unless our educational plant is to decay shamefully. I think most Americans are aware of this, as demonstrated by the March 21 Gallup Poll showing a 2-to-1 majority against any effort to tie conditions to school-aid legislation.

The Powell amendment, good though may be the intentions of its principal author, Representative POWELL, would make the school systems a mere baton to be passed back and forth in a political marathon. Let us keep the two issues separated. After all, one might validly add an amendment to the school bill denying Federal aid to any State or district which failed to pay its teachers properly or which throttled academic freedom. Why not similarly penalize districts which fail to take advantage of the school-lunch program? Public-power advocates may want to deny Federal aid to school buildings that burn kilowatts from private utilities in their light bulbs. And what if organized labor insisted that the new schools be constructed only by men belonging to trade unions? My wife, Maurine, who once taught physical education in the schools of Oregon, has reminded me that some health "nuts" like herself could conceivably suggest a restriction of Federal aid to those schools where physical education, modern dance, or gymnastics are required subjects.

Let us avoid these side shows, which endanger the safety of the main tent. The important challenge before us all is to secure some adequate measure of Federal aid for our schools, without jeopardizing local control of education. This cannot be put off into the distant and remote future, following a prolonged national controversy over the Powell amendment. It is urgently needed now, today, immediately.

DECLARATION BY MICHIGAN DEMOCRATS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to a document known as the Michigan Declaration.

This document expresses the philosophy of the Democratic Party of my State of Michigan, as adopted at the recent State convention. I shall not burden the RECORD with the full text of the Michigan Declaration, since it is my understanding that Democratic members of the Michigan delegation in the House of Representatives intend to place the text in the RECORD.

However, I should like to comment on the Michigan Declaration. As I said, it expresses the philosophy of the Democratic Party in my State. It is not a radical document. On the contrary, it is a moderate—but understanding—approach to many problems facing our country. It puts into words many things that need saying.

The preamble of the declaration states that the world is embroiled in total revolutions of great peril or promise in the affairs of men and of nations. The revolutions specifically noted concern atomic energy, automation, weapons of war, anticolonialism, Soviet imperialism, atheistic communism, integration, and time and space.

None of these are particularly startling. They exist—and we all know it. The question is: What are we going to do?

As the declaration states:

> The peril or promise of these revolutions cannot be met by part-time administration of halfway programs under indifferent leadership with lukewarm concern for the needs of the people.

The declaration continues:

> The National Republican administration feeds Americans an opiate of complacency in these times of vast scientific and ideological turmoil. It commits a psychological betrayal of the people by not informing them of the true nature of events.

The declaration goes on to list very briefly the moderate approach to the various problems that face us, suggesting the broad goals for which we should strive.

It urges the Democratic Party not to rest on the laurels of past accomplishments, stating in these words:

> The Democratic Party must renew the great concepts with which it is identified, protect them against betrayal and reversal, enlarge their scope to make government grow in service to the people.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read the Michigan Declaration.

SCRAPPING OF THE BATTLESHIP "OREGON" FAMOUS VESSEL OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR IN JAPANESE SCRAPYARDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last summer, in 1955, when I first heard that the hull of the once great battleship *Oregon* was imminently to be sold for scrap, I immediately asked my staff to investigate the situation. As a citizen of Oregon, born in Portland, I had from my earliest memory heard the stirring narration of naval history which was recited from grade to grade, and from year to year. I shared the common pride in the illustrious achievements of the gallant ship, and I thrilled with my fellow Oregonians whenever I passed it on the Portland waterfront, where for some years it was berthed in a friendly Willamette River harbor. Schools all over Oregon organized pilgrimages, and thousands of school children vicariously relived the events written into its glorious record of accomplishment in the Spanish-American War and World War I as they filed along its decks.

The tranquil chapter of the *Oregon's* existence was rudely ended in 1942 when, stripped of her superstructure and nearly everything else, the battleship was reduced to duty as an ammunition barge serving the Pacific Fleet. The final chapters in the history of the *Oregon* were foreshadowed at that time.

A letter from A. C. Mumma, rear admiral, United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, was the official confirmation answering my inquiry. Pleased that the Navy would be alert to any parts remaining which might have historic interest for the schools or historical museums of my State, I put aside my previous misgivings, to accept the verdict of the naval authorities. I had the impression that the worn hull was so unseaworthy that even the scrapping would have to be done in far-distant Guam, where it performed the humiliating utility of a breakwater. It seemed more fitting that it should there be scrapped, rather than left to disintegrate on the coral reefs. The recent news of its sale to a Japanese firm, which found it no insuperable problem to tow the hull to Japan for final cutting into scrap, indicates that the hull must have been in better repair than we had been led to believe.

In Oregon this final chapter has, not unexpectedly, met a wave of chagrin, disappointment, and indignation—chagrin that the final chapters of the *Oregon* were so completely humiliating, disappointment that the Navy showed no interest or feeling corresponding to that expressed by Oregonians, and indignation that the final salvage came in a distant port where the last identity would fade into the rusty anonymity of the scrap heap.

In the discussions carried on with the Bureau of Ships, the memorandum in my files indicates that the Curator of the Navy had reviewed the possibility of further salvage of possible items of historical interest. Suggestions as to the possibility of striking medallions from the steel of the bulkheads elicited the information that this had been done in connection with the famous battleship *Maine*, but with disappointing results; the public had failed to respond, and the Navy had on hand a supply of medallions for which there was no demand.

I am sure, Mr. President, that schools and museums in Oregon would have welcomed such medallions from the *Oregon*, which would memorialize the happier chapters in the career of the illustrious battleship. Realizing that the last opportunity for such a project was fast slipping away, and that only through the intercession of the Japanese Government could anything at all now be done, I have passed on the suggestion to the Japanese Embassy.

Before exploring the subject, which they will do, they have reminded me that the transactions which have resulted in the towing of the *Oregon* to a Japanese port are between private firms of the respective nations, and may be beyond the accomplishment of governmental action at this late date.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news story by Roger Stuart, which appeared February 1, 1956, in the Washington Daily News; a letter from the Department of the Navy, a letter on the subject to a constituent; a copy of the letter I addressed to the Japanese Embassy; and a news release relative to this matter.

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

[From the Washington Daily News of February 1, 1956]

THE END HAS COME FOR U. S. S. "OREGON," "PRIDE OF PACIFIC"

(By Roger Stuart)

Want to buy a battleship? You won't get much by way of fighting power. But there's salvageable metal wrapped up in the offer—plus a good bit of honest sentiment.

Once she was the proud U. S. S. *Oregon*, "Pride of the Pacific," they used to call her "Bulldog of the Fleet."

Yes; the same *Oregon* whose unprecedented 71-day, 17,000-mile dash around Cape Horn in time to join the fleet action in the Spanish American War thrilled Americans of a half-century ago, and proved the need for a Panama Canal.

The same *Oregon* which, in the Battle of Santiago, slam-banged into action through the smoke off the *Brooklyn's* starboard quarter, adding her thunderous salvos of 13-inch guns to the *Brooklyn's* 8-inch, and both sending out continuous sprays of metal from their quick-fire guns.

UPS AND DOWNS

Her history since then has been one of ups and downs—mostly downs, but with a kind of glory in World War II.

It was back in the early 1920's—she was 21 years old then—that she was first designated "no longer useful" and marked for scrapping.

But she wasn't scrapped. The citizens of the State of Oregon requested the loan of the old battlewagon for use in an exposition. She remained in Portland Harbor quite a while.

As World War II was drawing near, Uncle Sam had need of a lot of ships. But not the *Oregon*. In February 1941, she was designated an "unclassified miscellaneous ship." And 18 months after that, she was stricken from the Navy's register.

Ironically, it was on December 7, 1942—1 year to the day after Pearl Harbor—that the *Oregon* was sold for $35,000 to two Portland businessmen. Her superstructure was scrapped, her engines, boilers, pipes, generators, and other equipment ripped out—to net the purchasers $193,620.

GIVEN NUMBER

They loaded her hull with dynamite and other explosives and floated her across the Pacific to Guam. There, during the rest of the war, she served as a floating ammunition depot.

She was useful, but perhaps not useful enough to suit the *Oregon's* intrepid spirit. In any event, she broke her moorings several times. Apparently she was determined to get out to sea. The last time she broke away she became mired on a coral reef.

Again it was decided her days of service were over. The Navy came to the conclusion that she should be sunk by gunfire. But historians and others, the record shows, protested such treatment for the once glorious *Oregon*. She was spared.

DECISION REACHED

Then, in the summer of 1955, the decision was reached to tow her out to sea and scuttle her. Meanwhile, however, Congress had passed a bill permitting the Navy to keep both the *Oregon* and another famous ship, the *Olympia*, for 6 months more.

But time finally ran out on the *Oregon*. Now she's up for sale as scrap. The Brooklyn Navy Yard has been assigned responsibility for her disposal. The *Oregon's* shattered hulk remains in Guam—and any potential purchaser who wishes to inspect her must get clearance from the Navy. Bids will be accepted until March 18.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am writing to apprise you of the Navy's plans for disposing of the U. S. S. *Oregon*.

As you probably know, the *Oregon* is presently moored at Guam. She is a hollow hulk with no existing compartmentation and has been stripped of her superstructure and all machinery and appurtenances. For your information, I am enclosing a photograph of this relic.

The act of July 23, 1954 (Public Law 523, 83d Cong.) authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of the *Oregon* after July 23, 1955, in the event that no application for transfer to a qualified donee is approved by this date. The act further provides that the vessel may be disposed of by sale or by scrapping, in the discretion of the Secretary.

As no application for the *Oregon* was received, the Navy is now authorized to dispose of this relic. After careful consideration of the various factors involved, it has been determined to be in the best interests of the Government to dispose of the *Oregon* by sale for scrap purposes only.

Prior to the sale of the *Oregon*, any parts of the ship that are of historic interest will be removed for retention by the Navy or for loan or gift to nonprofit historical or educational institutions.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
A. G. MUMMA,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of Bureau.

JUNE 1, 1956.

Mrs. HOWARD VENN,
Lake Grove, Oreg.

DEAR MRS. VENN: I can understand, exactly, the sense of anger and sorrow that you felt when you read of the "final ignominious fate of the old battleship *Oregon*." Last year, shortly before time for adjournment, my attention was called to the imminent disposal for scrap purposes of the hulk of the old battleship. Feeling concerned at that time that the final chapter of the historic vessel would be a sorry one, I began a series of discussions over the probable fate of what was left of the former great battleship. Particularly I inquired if there was anything that could be salvaged and preserved in museums or used in any way to commemorate the glorious early chapters of the *Oregon*. Government officials, as a result of my recurring inquiries, made a further investigation, reporting back that there was nothing left that could be salvaged—that all that remained was the steel plate that composed the hulk. I stressed to the officials that even buckets of old rivets might be of interest as souvenirs for elementary schools of the State. We even investigated the possibility of stamping out of the steel plate small commemorative plaques of medalions which could be placed in public and school libraries. This request produced information that such a project had been attempted with the remains of the old battleship *Maine* and they suggested rather facetiously but to the point, that if I knew of any market where quantities of these old medalions might be sold the Government had a ready supply for such a market.

There would seem to be no recourse from the Navy's judgment that all that was left of the *Oregon* was a partially submerged hulk having value only as scrap. From the description of the unseaworthiness of the old hulk, I gained the impression that perhaps it would have to be cut up for salvage in Guam where it had been towed following the war.

The story, announced a few days ago relating its final sale to scrap merchants of Japan, as a last and final irony, reemphasizes the ridiculous fiasco that began with its return to the service in World War II. Economically, it is perhaps best that its end has come as described in the recent news story, on the other hand, however, in the sense of what it has meant to us historically, your suggestion that it be blown up and sunk, is certainly understandable. Again let me say that I understand completely your feeling of offense and indignation over the ignominious end of the old battleship.

Sincerely,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 11, 1956.

His Excellency the Honorable SADAO IGUCHI,
The Ambassador of Japan, Japanese Embassy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: This letter will formalize the remarks of Mr. Jones, my administrative assistant, pursuant to the scrapping of the hull of the old battleship *Oregon*, in the recent telephone conversation to the Embassy.

I am sure you have some familiarity with the illustrious history of the battleship—its 17,000-mile race from the Atlantic around the Horn to joint the fleet action in the Philippines during the Spanish-American War and its illustrious career as flagship of the American fleet in World War I.

The *Oregon* for a number of years was berthed in the Willamette River in Portland, Oreg., where it very appropriately served as a naval memorial, visited daily by scores of school children and proud citizens.

In 1942 it was again returned to duty, over the most strenuous protests of hundreds of Oregonians. Used as a barge and later a floating warehouse, it more recently had the sad fate of serving as a breakwater in Guam.

Now that it is to be cut up for scrap after its purchase by a Japanese firm, a great deal of indignation and protest is coming from many of my Oregon constituents. They feel, quite understandably, that to be cut up for scrap metal is the most ignominious end that could be conceived for a battleship whose feats wrote a bright chapter in American naval history.

In view of this public feeling of profound disappointment, it seemed to me that if there should be anything at all salvageable, something which might in some way be made available to schools and public libraries as a memorial of our great ship, it could be the basis for an effective gesture of good will between the two nations.

What I am suggesting might follow the pattern of action incident to the battleship *Maine*. From the sheets of steel composing the bulkhead of the *Maine*, commemorative medalions were stamped out. Medalions, of course, could very appropriately be placed in schools and public libraries, or sold at a nominal sum to the public at large.

I realize the hull of the *Oregon* has passed into the hands of a private firm which will cut it into scrap. However, a few sheets of scrap steel or some other part could be made into commemorative articles.

I thought your government might wish to explore the possibilities, knowing that such a gesture would be productive of infinite good will between the people of Oregon and Japan, who face each other across the vast expanse of the Pacific.

Respectfully,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, has asked for the assistance of the Japanese Ambassador in obtaining as souvenirs for distribution to Oregon schools and libraries "even a bucket of rivets" from the remains of the old battleship U. S. S. *Oregon* which has been sold to Japanese interests for salvage of scrap steel.

The hull of the *Oregon*, which raced 17,000 miles around Cape Horn in 68 days to take part in naval maneuvers of the Spanish-American War, has been taken from Guam, where it was stripped down for use as an ammunition barge during World War II, and will be cut up for scrap metal. NEUBERGER requested the Japanese Embassy to determine what action could be taken to obtain metal objects from the ship which might be of interest as memorabilia of the ship's historic past.

The Oregon Senator recalled that last year it was brought to his attention that the half-submerged vessel would be disposed of as scrap.

"At the time, I inquired if there was anything that could be salvaged and preserved in museums or used in any way to commemorate the glorious early chapters of the *Oregon*," NEUBERGER said. "However, Government officials checked and discovered that there was nothing left that could be salvaged—all that remained was the steel plate that composed the hull.

"We even investigated the possibility of stamping out of the steel plate commemorative plaques or medallions which could be placed in public and school libraries. This request produced information that such a project had been attempted with the remains of the old battleship *Maine* and it was suggested rather facetiously but to the point, that if I knew of any market where quantities of these old *Maine* medallions might be sold, the Government had a ready supply for such a market.

"The story relating the *Oregon's* final sale to scrap merchants of Japan is a final irony which reemphasizes the fiasco that began when it was returned to service in World War II. Economically, it is perhaps best that its end has come as described in the recent news story, since much of our foreign aid program is directed toward rehabilitation of the Japanese economy so it may withstand the threats of Communist aggression. However, in the sense of what the ship has meant to our State historically, it is regrettable that its final disposal has been so ignominious.

"It is my hope that a portion of the remains can be obtained from the Japanese salvage company, so they can be disposed of appropriately through the Oregon Historical Society, and to the end that there be kept alive the memory of a day when the *Oregon*, Dewey and Manila Bay were names indelibly written in American history."

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement I have prepared on the subject of Armenian independence.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

It is a great temptation these days, when we are searching our minds and hearts for ways of protecting the free world against Communist aggression, to forget about those countries that have already been engulfed by the Soviet tyranny. But we must remember that we all—the whole human race—are in this thing together. We must not forget that the very fate that we and the other nations of the free world seek to avoid has already befallen nations which were, unluckily, located closer to the source of Communist power. These nations have been living in slavery for 10, in some cases upwards of 30 years. The people of these nations know intimately the agony of oppression which we only know about indirectly; and they look to us for their deliverance. We should never cease to remind ourselves and the rest of the world of our moral duty to help these people—and of our vow, affirmed in countless national documents, not to rest until their deliverance has been accomplished.

I refer specifically today to the gallant people of Armenia who, some 2 weeks ago, celebrated the 38th anniversary of their national independence day. On May 28, 1918, the Armenian nation proclaimed itself a free and independent republic.

The independent Republic of Armenia was recognized by the United States, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and most of the leading powers of Europe and Asia. For nearly 2 years the Armenian people made a noble effort to consolidate their newly won independence and to establish themselves permanently as one of the free, democratic nations of the world. Unfortunately this struggle came to a tragic end toward the close of 1920 when Armenia was overrun by foreign invaders operating under a plot hatched in Russia by Lenin and Stalin.

After a year of ruthless Communist rule, on February 18, 1921, the Armenian people once again rose up and threw off their oppressors. This new bid for independence was, however, short-lived. Once again the Communist armies crossed Armenia's borders and overran the country. Armenia was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and the Armenian people have lived in bondage ever since.

Still, to this day, the Armenian people, in both the homeland and abroad, continue to strive for freedom and independence. I know that their heroic struggle will one day be rewarded because I know that the American people are firmly determined that communism shall one day be erased from the face of the earth.

A "REFRESHING PAUSE"

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, each time I think the Eisenhower administration has gone about as far as it can go in its cold-blooded attitude toward human problems, I get a new surprise.

The latest example of this callous approach to suffering is the news story that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey depicts our economy as enjoying a refreshing pause.

As he was quoted in press reports this morning, Mr. Humphrey told a congressional subcommittee that it is "just as well to hesitate a little."

I am doubtful, Mr. President, that the more than 220,000 unemployed workers in my State of Michigan are enjoying this refreshing pause or the long hesitation in receiving pay checks.

Would the associates of Mr. Humphrey and the Eisenhower administration enjoy a refreshing pause in the stock market?

Mr. Humphrey also offers this comment on the plight of the auto industry:

Conditions are now proceeding in a very satisfactory manner.

Mr. Humphrey has a strange idea of "satisfactory" when more and more auto workers are being laid off daily. And perhaps he thinks the manufacturers are enjoying this refreshing pause in sales.

Mr. President, this attitude of Mr. Humphrey's coincides exactly with the recent remark of President Eisenhower's assistant, Howard Pyle, who said the "right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy."

They take this attitude because they know the auto industry will come out of its recession eventually and profits will bounce back up into the stratosphere.

But they have no feeling at all for the hundreds of thousands of workers who will never catch up for the months of no pay checks.

This is not a recent attitude of the Eisenhower administration. It has been distressingly obvious ever since the great "crusade" took over the White House.

Back in 1954, when the auto workers were also enjoying their "right to suffer," Secretary of Defense Wilson made this prediction:

Oh, the new models get into production in November and December—maybe a few people will go back South when it gets a little cold—I think you'll about balance out by Christmas.

Mr. Humphrey himself said that year that 4 million unemployed was a "relatively low figure" and added that it was "remarkable that it is not worse than it is."

Secretary of Commerce Weeks, another member of the Eisenhower team, also said in 1954 that the unemployment situation was "coming along in a satisfactory manner," just as Mr. Humphrey says today that "conditions are now proceeding in a very satisfactory manner."

Mr. President, we can do little about this deep-rooted, big-business attitude short of election day.

After that I trust we shall have a long refreshing pause from the Eisenhower administration.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in the June 11, 1956 issue of the Providence (R. I.) Journal there appeared a very fine editorial in support of realistic funds for medical research. I invite the attention of all Members to it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

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

THE SENATE ACTS BOLDLY TO PROMOTE MEDICAL RESEARCH

The United States Senate took a heartening forward step a few days ago to reinforce the battle lines of an offensive that is perhaps less newsworthy than the building up of our arsenal of nuclear weapons but, in the long run, is probably a good deal more significant. This is the far-flung research offensive against the scourages of cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and other major cripplers and killers.

Upholding a recommendation of its appropriations subcommittee headed by Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama, the Senate voted a record-breaking appropriation of $184,400,000 for medical research under the auspices of the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year beginning July 1. The sum is $57,900,000 more than the administration had asked for, $48,900,000 more than the House has authorized, and 82 percent larger than the appropriation for the current year.

If the Senate version prevails, next year's allotments for the National Cancer Institute and the National Institute of Mental Health will be virtually double their current appropriations. The National Heart Institute will get $14,500,000 more than it has for this year.

Rhode Island's Congressman FOGARTY, who is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee in the health field, may be expected to play a key role in the matter when the medical research bill goes to conference between the two branches. It is to be hoped that Mr. FOGARTY will use his potent influence to try to prevail upon his colleagues in the House to go along with the Senate in assuring more adequate financing for the battle against disease and premature death.

The Hill subcommittee based its recommendation for a sharp increase in research funds upon the testimony of some of the country's most distinguished medical scien-

tists, including Dr. Paul Dudley White and Dr. Sidney Farber. After listening to a long procession of competent witnesses, the subcommittee called for a grand national strategy of medical research to pursue the exciting laboratory leads which have been hobbled by a lack of funds.

There are few investments promising richer dividends in health, happiness, and longer life than medical research. What can be accomplished when sufficient funds are made available to the researchers has been dramatically demonstrated by the development of the Salk polio vaccine. With the formidable problem of the chronic diseases still to be solved, a concerted research attack certainly appears worth an annual investment considerably below the cost of a single atomic aircraft carrier.

CONTRADICTORY STATEMENTS ON AIR BASE CONSTRUCTION

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, this morning I read in the press a news dispatch by the United Press reporting that the Air Force's construction chief in his appearance before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigating American airpower, had stated that, first, the air base construction is lagging behind the buildup of the Air Force because of a shortage of money; second, that by mid-1957 the Air Force will have only minimum facilities to handle its planes; third, that these bases will be substandard, thereby limiting the combat effectiveness of the wings; and, fourth, that this condition comes from a "scanty purse" as a result of the economies ordered both by the Defense Department and Congress.

I am shocked and puzzled by this statement of the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Installations, because his superiors, the Air Force Chief of Staff General Twining and the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management, Mr. Lyle S Garlock, in answer to pointed and direct questions I asked them recently when they appeared before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, both stated categorically that Congress had given the Air Force all the money it had requested for air bases, and very definitely and unequivocally that Congress was not responsible for any cut in funds for air bases, but rather that the responsibility for that was within the executive department. In other words, whatever cuts were made were those dictated within the Department of the Air Force, itself, the Department of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget.

I first raised this question with General Twining because of his article, "The Air Force in the Jet Age," in the March issue of the magazine Air Force, in which he had made the statement:

> We cannot even get enough base money to properly prepare existing bases to accommodate our modern, high-performance aircraft.

Later in the presence of the Secretary of the Air Force at the public hearings of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, in answer to my questions General Twining categorically and unequivocally denied that Congress had failed to give the Air Force all the money it had requested for air bases. Secretary Quarles made no dissent to General Twining's strong denial to me that Congress had any part in bringing about a shortage of funds for air bases.

Mr. President, I am getting just a little weary of pinning Air Force representatives down on loose statements they make which either indirectly imply or directly accuse Congress of not giving the Air Force all the money it has requested for air bases.

Consciously or unconsciously, in these conflicting statements by its duly authorized representatives the Department of the Air Force is guilty of nothing less than duplicity. These false statements which, in substance, charge the Congress with undermining our national air security cast a serious cloud over the integrity and reliability of the Air Force when its representatives make statements either for public consumption and before congressional committees.

Surely our confidence is shaken and we do not know what we can believe from the Air Force when its representatives go out of their way to make false representations and accuse Congress of something of which apparently the Department of the Air Force, itself, is guilty, in conjunction with the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, in making whatever cuts are made in the amount of money requested by the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Installations and his associates for air bases.

Mr. President, when the bill for appropriations for air bases comes before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I shall certainly demand that the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff, together with the Air Force Chief of Staff, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management, and the Secretary of the Air Force be requested to appear before that subcommittee at the same time and in round-table manner explain these conflicting statements and the reasons for Air Force representatives continuing to make false charges against Congress.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the President's illness has called attention to the remarkable position which he occupies throughout the world and our own country.

This is clear by the interest displayed in the capital of every nation.

President Eisenhower has achieved a unique position of world leadership as no other man of our day.

He is the symbol of the free world's resistance to communism without sword rattling.

He is the symbol here at home of stability without complacency.

The world prays for his speedy recovery. The 20th century needs him.

LEO M. HARVEY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few days ago Mr. J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion, presented a Legion citation to a great American and a great industrialist, Mr. Leo M. Harvey. The citation honored this man for his patriotism, his philanthropies, and his peacetime and wartime services as a citizen of the United States.

The citation reads:

> Presented by the American Legion to Leo M. Harvey, citizen-patriot, industrial leader, philanthropist.
>
> In recognition of his contributions to the general economic welfare, and to the military strength of the United States in three wars 1917–18, 1941–45, 1950–53, and in appreciation of his many personal acts of kindness and generosity on behalf of the children of America.

I am most happy to see Mr. Harvey's work recognized and lauded. I am sure all of his many, many friends share my feelings.

Founder and president of Harvey Machine Co. and Harvey Aluminum, Leo Harvey has devoted much of his apparently limitless energy to the industrial and commercial welfare of the United States since he came to this country over 40 years ago. He has been and is an outstanding success in American life. And many of his achievements have made contributions to the ability of our country to defeat its enemies and to maintain its high standards of peacetime living.

We in the Far West know Leo Harvey to be one of the finest examples of the free enterprise system in action in the United States. The tribute paid him by the American Legion was well merited.

I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks of National Commander Wagner on the occasion of the presentation of this citation to Mr. Leo Harvey printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY J. ADDINGTON WAGNER, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT LUNCHEON, HARVEY ALUMINUM, TORRANCE, CALIF., TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1956

Anyone who has the good fortune of being raised in the State of Michigan acquires an appreciation of the industrial strength of America.

In my case, it wasn't even necessary to go to Detroit or Flint to sharpen that appreciation. We had—and still have—in Battle Creek one of the truly great centers of American industry; and the chief product, as you may have heard, generates far more energy than its production consumes.

I must confess, however, that I have seen here today what is to me a new dimension in technology. Certainly those of us who are here for the first time are tremendously impressed by the size and the equipment and the production techniques of Harvey Aluminum. The claim has been made that only a dedicated engineer can fully appreciate engineering tools and their products. Perhaps so. But it seems to me that anyone coming here and touring your facilities as we have done, is bound to see something awesome and exciting in the work you are carrying on.

We, of the American Legion, of course, find a special appeal in your work. We are veterans of war. We have fought the enemies of our country, using arms and materiel supplied by you of Harvey Aluminum and your colleagues in industry. For us there is assurance here that vitally important defense production is being maintained and that those who man our defense forces today are being furnished the best that science and ingenuity and hard work can provide.

You will recall that the theme of Armed Forces Day, earlier this month, was "Power

for peace." I think that phrase expresses the prayerful hope of all of us. It is not our first choice to discourage attack by preparing to resist attack. Rather, the choice has been forced upon us by those in the world who do not cherish peace as we do and who would permit us to remain at peace only if we manifest our power.

The American Legion believes unqualifiedly in a strong preparedness program. To be effective, this strength must be real and measureable. It must exist—not as ideas or blueprints in the planning room—but as functioning weapons in the sky and on the ground and sea. That is the kind of peace-preserving strength that you in Harvey Aluminum are producing now; and in our judgment it is just as vital to the Nation's security as production in time of war.

It strikes me that there is something more important than the industrial strength of America on display today. The spirit of America and all that America means in terms of human liberty and individual opportunity also are very much in evidence.

Many of you know Mr. Leo Harvey far better than do I. After a relatively few hours' acquaintanceship with him, certainly it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to measure him as a man or as an American. But some things I do know about him, and they deserve to be said for the benefit of the rest of us and our appreciation of the land we love.

We believe, as a cardinal principle of Americanism, that a man can go as far as his talent and initiative can carry him. We hold that under our free enterprise system, the individual controls his pursuit of happiness and success, and that his starting place—no matter how modest or seemingly unfavored—does not bar his way. Abraham Lincoln is perhaps the most noted case in point, but there are many others of more recent times—among them, captains of industry like Henry Ford and William Knudsen and Andrew Carnegie. And yet, none of these provided a more emphatic or more inspiring success story than is told in the still current record of the gentleman who is our host here today.

He came to America 41 years ago, a young man virtually alone in a land whose people and customs were foreign to all he had known. Like the forefathers of most of us, he was poor in goods and rich in spirit. He brought with him a belief in Almighty God, a desire to be a good American, and a willingness to work hard. All that he has achieved since—all that he has today—gives proof that these are the keys that really count in the United States of America.

It might be said that America has been good to Mr. Harvey. It must be said that Mr. Harvey has been good for America. He has been good not only as a responsible leader of industry, but as a responsible and generous citizen.

Some of his most important works have nothing to do with aluminum products or the management of a great business enterprise. They have a great deal to do, however, with the future health and happiness of thousands of children throughout the country who are having a hard pull.

This, too, is part of the spirit of America and of private American enterprise. For a system which offers great prizes for the individual who can earn them also needs private enterprise in behalf of the public welfare.

Because they overlook this human factor, some of our friends abroad fail to understand America's standard of values. They say that we worship only the machine and the things it makes. If they could know the history and the philosophy of Americans like Leo Harvey, they would understand better where the true strength and greatness of America are to be found.

Now, Mr. Harvey, I am going to conclude these observations by performing a very pleasant task, for which authority was given me by the American Legion's national executive committee. To you, sir, I want to present a token of the esteem and admiration in which you are held by American Legionnaires. We wish for you continued success and many more happy years of service to your community, your State, and your Nation. We hope that this symbol of our gratitude will convey to you some measure of our sincere appreciation for all you have done to prove—once again—that in America good men can make good dreams come true.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Montana in congratulating Mr. Leo M. Harvey upon his receiving so impressive a citation from the national commander of the American Legion.

As one of the Senators from the State of Oregon, I am in a position to know of Mr. Harvey's pioneering in the field of industrial development. There soon will be erected on the banks of the Columbia River, at the city of The Dalles, in our State, a great aluminum plant of the Harvey Machine Co. This plant will employ our people, it will shape our raw materials and resources into vital metal for peacetime uses and for defense, and it will contribute to the general prosperity of our region.

Leo M. Harvey, who came to the United States over four decades ago, thus typifies the best in the American tradition. All of us, except for fullblooded American Indians, are either immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. It is part of the American genius that men and women from overseas have performed so capably and so illustriously in contributing to the progress and development of this great Nation.

By helping to encourage competition in the aluminum industry, Leo M. Harvey has done his part toward strengthening our free-enterprise system, which is so essential to our well-being as a nation.

I know that many people in our State of Oregon, where soon the new aluminum plant of the Harvey Machine Co. will stand on the banks of the West's greatest river, join the senior Senator from Montana in congratulating Leo M. Harvey as he receives this citation from the American Legion for his service to our Nation in war and in peace.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to join my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, in saluting Mr. Leo Harvey.

As we all know, Mr. President, tomorrow will be Flag Day. As the Senator from Montana spoke, I could not help but think of how very meaningful tomorrow's patriotic ceremonies will be for Mr. Harvey, a man whose life, career, and whose public spirit personify the essence of America.

As the Senator said, Leo Harvey arrived in this country 40 years ago. When he arrived his pockets were empty of funds, but his heart was full of hope. In this country of ours, now, and in the past, and, God willing, in the future, a man—any man—can hope. He can hope to make his fortune, can hope to make his life a full one, rich in human value. He can do these things when hope is coupled with energy.

Leo Harvey, in the years following his arrival, translated his hopes into realities. With his determination, his vitality, and his confidence in this Nation, he built one of our country's fine firms. He also possessed vision and out of this vision was erected a great aluminum company. Mr. Harvey's business firms made invaluable contributions in the two great wars fought by the United States to protect man's individual right to hope, and only a free man can hope.

Last May 29, Leo Harvey was awarded a citation by the American Legion. In my humble judgment, that award was well deserved. Leo Harvey, a captain of industry, came up through the ranks. This one-time immigrant became one of our most active citizens, and the young man who arrived with empty pockets now is an outstanding philanthropist.

I congratulate Mr. Harvey upon his citation by the American Legion, and commend him for confirming—through his business and personal life—the fine American traditions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in the remarks with reference to Mr. Leo Harvey. I think the citation awarded to him by the American Legion speaks for itself. His career is a fine example of the kind of contribution which can be made to American life by an immigrant.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Washington for his comment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying high respect to Leo Harvey, not only because of his enterprise, but because he has made a great contribution to civic affairs and to the welfare of his community.

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and other Senators in the fine compliments they have paid to Mr. Leo Harvey, one of the great manufacturers of the United States. I have known Mr. Harvey for many years, and I believe the award which has been made to him is fully justified.

PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further morning business, the morning business is concluded, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

PUBLICATION OF SPEECH OF KHRUSHCHEV EXPOSING AND DENOUNCING JOSEPH STALIN

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Department of State has performed an important service in making public the remarks of Khrushchev exposing and denouncing the crimes and brutalities of Joseph Stalin. In many significant ways, this document is historic and unique. Certainly, no one in the free world has ever done as well as Khrushchev in revealing the faults and evils of the Soviet system.

Khrushchev catalogs in detail the wrongs committed by Stalin against the Russian people and his comrades in the Bolshevik movement. But the speech, as we have it, does not set the record straight on Stalin's crimes outside Russia's borders. Perhaps a portion of the speech is missing.

Khrushchev did say:

> The willfulness of Stalin showed itself not only in decisions concerning the internal life of the country but also in the international relations of the Soviet Union.

But Stalin's offenses in foreign policy are not enumerated. In particular, the document is silent on what may be Stalin's greatest crime against the human race—namely, his frustration of plans to eliminate from national arsenals atomic bombs and other weapons of mass destruction.

The record on this issue is clear and decisive. In 1946 the United States made bold and revolutionary proposals to the United Nations for the abolition of such weapons and a system of inspection and control.

Remember, Mr. President, that in 1946 we alone had the atomic bomb. There were no hydrogen bombs. There were no long-range missiles. In the interests of world peace, we were prepared to relinquish our monopoly on the wartime atom. The stage was set for a massive breakthrough in international cooperation.

With dictatorial bluntness, Stalin brushed aside this historic opportunity. He frustrated and blocked the effort to reach agreement. By the fall of 1948, all members of the U. N. were agreed on the basic elements of a plan for armaments reduction and control—except for Russia and her satellites. It was Stalin who slammed the door in the face of this bright hope for peace.

As a result, the shadow of devastating weapons today darkens the whole world. Stalin's legacy to his countrymen, as well as to us, is a competition in the fabrication of weapons whose destructiveness cannot be exaggerated. Bombs of almost limitless force, intercontinental missiles of incredible speed—these are not the products of phantasy but the hard prospects of sober reality. The armaments race is a tragic monument to Stalin's rigid rule.

Of course, Mr. President, Stalin told his people that the United States scuttled efforts toward disarmament. This was a colossal lie. The story that America plotted atomic war was a fabrication conceived by Stalin, propagated by Stalin and spread across the globe by Communist agents. It is time the Russian people knew the truth. Khrushchev should make known the full record.

America did not spawn the arms race. To avoid that contest, we were prepared to take unprecedented steps. Even after Stalin blocked arms reduction and control, our defense forces were maintained at a minimum level. Only the Communist invasion of South Korea forced a change in our policies. Since the end of the Korean war, we have continued our defense buildup for two reasons. First, because Russia's military power stands at the highest level in history and continues to expand. Second, because Khrushchev and his colleagues persist in their unyielding opposition to effective arms controls.

Very soon the Senate will be called upon again to vote great sums of money for defense—both at home and abroad. Many of us will vote for these programs as a vital safeguard for our security. But had the disarmament efforts in the early postwar years succeeded, had Stalin not stood in the way, we would not now need to spend such vast amounts for military purposes.

It is hard to conceive what could be accomplished if we could take this money and spend it for the economic and social betterment of man. What incredible progress we could make toward a fuller life for our people and less privileged peoples throughout the world.

In 1950 and 1951, the late Senator Brien McMahon sponsored a resolution in support of effective disarmament and the use of the resources thereby saved for economic development on a global scale. Together with other men of both parties, I introduced an identical resolution in the House of Representatives.

I believe those resolutions still summarize the fundamental desires of the American people. We want to find some means of barring mass destruction weapons from the earth's surface. We do not like to channel our human and material resources into arms programs. We would much prefer to join in efforts to attack poverty and want throughout the world.

Hardly a day goes by without some notice in the press of a hearty wish by Khrushchev to promote good will and understanding among nations. If Khrushchev is sincere, he can prove it to the world by a simple first step. He can tell the Russian people the truth—that it was their own mad leader, Stalin, who blocked disarmament. He can tell them that it was Stalin who established a pattern of hostility toward the free world which has made these postwar years, years of crisis. He can tell them that it was Stalin's dogmatic rule which led to the trials of the Berlin Blockade and the Korean war.

Perhaps, Mr. President, it is hoping for too much to expect Khrushchev to give the Russian people the facts about Stalin's foreign policy. Until he does so, however, we can derive little comfort from his denunciation of Stalin's domestic errors. For history will show that Stalin's crimes against the free world equal, if not surpass, the evils he wrought against his fellow Russians.

Doubtless the truth would come as a great shock to the Russian people. We might well find them pressing their leaders for moderate and honest policies. For certainly the mass of mankind is united in its desire to avoid incineration by hydrogen bombs.

If Khrushchev takes this first step and tells the Russian people the truth about Stalin's foreign policy, perhaps we could respond with more assurance to the Soviet smile.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Washington upon the statement he has just made, because I think he has emphasized exactly what the situation is and has certainly brought home some points which need a little more elaboration before we can place any trust in what the leaders of the Soviet Union have to say, especially statements made by Messrs. Khrushchev and Bulganin.

I note that the Senator in his speech made the statement that Khrushchev should make known the complete record. I wonder if the Senator can tell the Senate why Mr. Khrushchev is so modest about disclosing the part which he and Messrs. Bulganin, Malenkov, and Molotov played in the affairs of the Soviet Union during the time Mr. Stalin was premier.

Mr. JACKSON. I think of Mr. Khrushchev and his crowd have resolved to use a historic "out" which all totalitarian leaders employ, namely, that of a scapegoat. They are using Stalin as a scapegoat for their troubles within the Soviet Union.

The difficulty with the position of Mr. Khrushchev and the others who are associated with him is that when they make statements they do not come before the world with clean hands. If they could come with clean hands, they would be in a better position, in my judgment, to expect the world to consider their words to have true and sincere meaning. But they have been very careful to confine their attack on Stalin to the domestic conduct of Stalin within the Soviet Union. They have not stated that Mr. Stalin was the cause of world tensions and of the terrible possibility of a hydrogen war which hangs over the heads of free men and women everywhere.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the Senator is emphasizing the foreign policy aspects of the reports being issued by Mr. Khrushchev. I say that, of course, with the thought in mind that foreign policy is not being given much consideration in the devastating confessions which are now being made.

I am wondering, however, if perhaps it is not significant that some of the old gang, of which Messrs. Khrushchev, Malenkov, and Molotov were a part, are not being liquidated, but are being retained in inferior positions. It seems to me that what we are witnessing is a continuation of the old style tactics dressed up in new clothes, with the objectives of the Soviet Union still being the same and being carried out in the persons of

Mr. Khrushchev, especially, and Mr. Bulganin, who seems to hold a title but really does not exercise much authority in the way of power.

Mr. JACKSON. The distinguished Senator from Montana has made an excellent point. It seems to me that it is the same old house which is sought to be remodeled by the making of a few changes. But I think the results will be devastating if the same old crowd continues to live in the house.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator in his speech said:

He—

meaning Krushchev—

can tell the Russian people the truth—that it was their own mad leader, Stalin, who blocked disarmament.

Is it not true that Mr. Khrushchev is himself at the present time doing a pretty good job of blocking disarmament?

Mr. JACKSON. That is absolutely correct. Not only is Mr. Khrushchev blocking disarmament, but the man who was his foreign policy spokesman until a few days ago—Mr. Molotov—is a past master of obstruction; and apparently the new foreign minister is a specialist in the same field. Particularly is he an expert on the Middle East, where Russia is now getting ready to expand its base of operations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the Senator from Washington has mentioned that, because it is common knowledge that the new foreign minister, Dimitri T. Shepilov, is the one who negotiated the arms deal in the Middle East. It is anticipated that on his trips to Syria, Libya, and Greece he will stir up more trouble in that part of the world.

It is quite pertinent, I think, that we should examine Russian foreign policy, because I anticipate, and anticipate strongly, that the Soviet Union is in the Middle East and in Africa to stay.

It was especially pleasant for me to note that the distinguished Senator from Washington referred to the proposal made by the late Senator McMahon. I recall serving with the Senator from Washington in the House at the time he introduced a similar proposal there. I am delighted that he is keeping alive the memory of Senator McMahon, by reintroducing the resolution, because I think he is following in the footsteps of the man who, as a Member of this body, was the first Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on which the distinguished junior Senator from Washington so ably serves.

Mr. JACKSON. Our Nation and the other nations of the free world owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to the late Senator Brien McMahon. Brien McMahon appreciated the danger which confronted the free world. It was under his leadership as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that this Nation's atomic energy efforts were expanded. It was Brien McMahon who worked day and night for the program of effective, rascal-proof disarmament. We can all be proud of our late distinguished colleague for the contribution he made to the national security and the furtherance of peace in this troubled world.

OIL AND GAS DRILLING IN NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES IS INCONSISTENT WITH ORIGINAL PURPOSE OF THESE GAME SANCTUARIES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I call on Secretary of the Interior Seaton to cancel the oil and gas leases upon our National Wildlife Refuge lands, which were handed out so generously and recklessly by his predecessor in office.

Wildlife—in the air, under the water, and on the surface of the earth—is among our most precious heritages. These animals, birds, and fish are particularly important and symbolic to our young people. Already we have made perilous inroads on the continent's supply of wild creatures. Unless our wildlife refuges are protected, the depredations will multiply and increase.

When ex-Senator Seaton was confirmed by the Senate on June 6, I pointed out that the way in which he measures up to the challenge of this oil drilling on wildlife refuges may decide whether he ranks in history as another Douglas McKay or another Gifford Pinchot.

Gifford Pinchot was the great conservationist who took the lead in setting aside our vast forest reserves for future generations of Americans. Douglas McKay is the man who threw wide open the portals of the wildlife lands to the oil and gas companies.

OUR WILDLIFE SANCTUARIES DATE FROM 1903

The people of the United States are proud of our great system of wildlife refuges. These domains are especially essential to the ducks and geese which fly miraculously along the flyways between their summer homes in the Canadian Arctic and their winter nesting grounds beside southern waters. In the marshy sanctuaries, the birds can nest, feed, breed, and restore spent energies. There they are protected. There they are safe, at least temporarily. The first Federal wildlife refuge was established in 1903, when a true friend of conservation, Theodore Roosevelt, occupied the White House.

It so happens that petroleum deposits often are found near the swampy terrain that is ideal for a wildfowl sanctuary. Thus the oil and gas companies have eyed the refuges for years with greedy eyes. The Interior Department stewardship of Douglas McKay offered them their big chance; they leaped at it, avidly.

Listen to the words spoken not long ago at the 21st North American Wildlife Conference in New Orleans, by Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson, first director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, now head of the Wildlife Management Institute:

It is not possible to explore for oil or gas, or to develop oil or gas fields, without doing damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat.

SHALL WATERFOWL SUFFER FATE OF PASSENGER PIGEON?

Dr. Gabrielson is a lifelong Republican, but, ahead of that, he is a lifelong conservationist. He realizes that any species can become extinct. We take our ducks and geese for granted. Yet the passenger pigeon, once the most numerous bird on the globe, became a relic because of terrible destruction and depredations. The last passenger pigeon died in the Cincinnati Zoo in 1914. Her name was Martha. There never will be another one of these lovely little birds on our planet if the earth endures for a billion years. The same could happen to mallards and teal and Canadian geese, if we let oil derricks become more predominant than nesting grounds on our wildlife refuges.

Declared Dr. Gabrielson, who, I am proud to say, is an illustrious graduate of Oregon State College:

During the time that Secretary McKay's famous "stop order" was in effect, from August 1953 to December 1955, several hundred leases were issued, while only 11 were issued from 1920 to August 1953.

Think of that, Mr. President. Secretary McKay promulgated a "stop order," presumably to halt oil and gas drilling on the refuges. While the so-called stop order was in effect more oil and gas leases were allowed than during any other period in the history of the refuge system, by many times over. Is not such trickery ample justification for the rescinding of these leases by the new Secretary, Mr. Fred Seaton?

ARE REFUGES FOR WILDLIFE OR OIL?

One of the outstanding wildlife experts in the country is Michael Hudoba, an editor of Sports Afield magazine. In his regular column for March 1956, this leader among the organization known as Outdoor Writers of America has highlighted some of the sinister aspects of the McKay policies regarding national wildlife refuges.

Writes Michael Hudoba:

The primary purpose of any wildlife refuge is to conserve and restore wildlife species. That purpose now is diverted. Wildlife now must share the refuges with the oil- and gas-drilling operations.

Secretary McKay's order raises the question whether wildlife preservation can continue even to remain the primary purpose of the refuges. It is the most serious reversal of policy toward wildlife conservation since the refuge system was established and built laboriously over the years.

I concur with Mr. Hudoba's cogent analysis. Apparently the adverse effect of ex-Secretary McKay's policies is widely recognized by many able editorial commentators in publications devoted to the interests of sportsmen and other outdoor enthusiasts. Mr. Harold Titus, the noted editor of Field and Stream, in the June issue of that magazine, also commented on the oil leases granted under ex-Secretary McKay. He said:

Well, the conservationist who doesn't feel uneasy about the future of resources under management like that is a rare bird, indeed.

Once the Interior Department officially recognizes that oil and gas prospecting occupies a parallel role with wildlife and waterfowl protection on the refuges, what then becomes of the original purpose of the refuge system? Is a particular sanctuary a nesting ground for wild birds or a potential source of petroleum riches? What if the General Services Administration decided to rent out Government offices for hotel rooms

each night? Would the original purpose of the Federal offices thus be furthered and served?

Some of the most questionable leases have been permitted inside the great Lacassine Waterfowl Refuge to the Frankfort Oil Co., a subsidiary of the Seagram Whisky Distilleries. Under the McKay regime, 6 leases were issued to the Frankfort Corp. 4 days after new regulations were announced governing oil and gas drilling. The leases were issued without competitive bidding and predated to 1 day prior to the official establishment of the new regulations.

"ANOTHER LONG BACKWARD STEP"

Dr. Gabrielson has properly referred to Mr. McKay's policy of issuing oil and gas leases on a wholesale basis as "another long backward step in wildlife conservation." This was also the general conclusion of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which spent considerable time studying this whole question of oil and gas leasing within the refuges.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the six major conclusions and recommendations of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, concerning this vital matter.

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

Pursuant to the authority contained in House Resolution 118, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries undertook an investigation of the wildlife refuge system within the Department of the Interior.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The record of the hearings is a picture of extreme administrative confusion. There has been absolutely no effective liaison and coordination between several of the bureaus in the Department of the Interior, between the Washington office and the field of the Fish and Wildlife Service or even between the various branches within the Fish and Wildlife Service.

2. Notwithstanding that only 11 leases had been issued on wildlife refuge lands over the years since the original Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and notwithstanding the fact that a stop order was issued in August 1953, directing the suspension of action on all oil and gas leases then pending, 60 leases were granted between the issuance of the suspension order and the issuance of new regulations on December 2, 1955. In addition, during this same period some 214 leases were granted on other lands administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, as against 281 leases on such lands issued prior to August 31, 1953. Such increased activity in the issuance of leases by the Secretary of the Interior, or by those under his immediate supervision, can only result in serious damage to the wildlife refuge system in this country. The fact that this activity took place while a suspension order was in effect for the ostensible purpose of revising the regulations to provide greater protection to wildlife lands only aggravates the situation.

3. It is incredible that the Fish and Wildlife Service had no knowledge of the stepped-up tempo of leasing by the Bureau of Land Management, when almost 500 leases were granted in 1 area. The necessary activities in connection with location and exploration certainly should have been sufficient to prompt a report by the field employees to the Director of the Service. And the failure on the part of the Washington office to keep informed as to activities in the field points up the necessity for changes either in personnel or organization.

4. The Fish and Wildlife Service is also to be criticized for its failure to establish a uniform procedure for handling those leases about which it was informed. In the case of the Railroad Valley leases, the regional office handled the details, while in the Lacassine leases similar transactions were handled almost exclusively through the Washington office, with no information about them in the regional office.

5. The new regulations fall far short of providing the degree of protection to the refuges which the activities of recent years prove to be necessary. Superficially these regulations appear to give a veto power to the Fish and Wildlife Service. However, under applicable laws, oil and gas leasing in wildlife lands is a matter solely within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. Consequently, the veto power exists only so long as, and to the extent that the Secretary permits the regulations to control.

6. The hearings clearly demonstrated the necessity for some legislative check on the authority to make disposals which might lessen the value of wildlife refuges for conservation purposes. The committee found itself somewhat uncertain as to the manner in which the requisite control should be exercised. The bills under consideration seemed to contemplate the enactment of special legislation for each disposal of any interest in a wildlife refuge. This procedure, it seemed, would be impractical for a number of reasons. Hence, it was decided to try, for an experimental period of time, an arrangement between the Secretary of the Interior and the committee under which each proposed alienation or relinquishment of any interest the Fish and Wildlife Service has in lands under its jurisdiction would be submitted to the committee, and the committee would have 60 days to indicate its approval or disapproval of the action contemplated. If this arrangement does not work satisfactorily, the committee intends to reconsider the problem, as well as alternative solutions thereto, including the enactment of appropriate legislation.

MEMBERS OF BOTH PARTIES AGREE ON REFUGES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, let me emphasize that these conclusions represent the unanimous views of 17 Democratic members of the House committee and 12 Republicans. I want to stress just 1 or 2 of their ideas further. Note that 60 leases were granted on major National Wildlife Refuge lands during the 2 years that the presumed McKay stop order was in effect, as contrasted with a mere 11 leases during the prior 33 years.

While his stop order existed, Secretary McKay countenanced an average of 30 oil and gas leases on wildlife refuges per year. However, since 1920 there had been approved by earlier Interior Secretaries, both Democrat and Republican, only an average of one such lease every 3 years. This is the McKay record in the realm of safeguarding wildlife refuges, so far as oil and gas prospecting is concerned.

Members of the Senate also should take notice of the significant fact that the House committee unanimously referred to extreme administrative confusion and also to the undeniable circumstance that such increased activity in the issuance of leases by the Secretary of the Interior, or by those under his immediate supervision, can only result in serious damage to the wildlife refuge system in this country.

And the House committee has added:

The fact that this activity took place while a suspension order was in effect, for the ostensible purpose of revising the regulations to provide greater protection to wildlife lands, only aggravates the situation.

STOP ORDER VIOLATED BY WHOLESALE OIL LEASING

That phrase from the unanimous report of this important committee in the other Chamber, Mr. President, merits the searching study of both the Senate and Secretary Seaton. With the supposed McKay stop order in effect, conservationists were off guard. They presumed all was well on the marshy nesting grounds where the free-winging waterfowl were at ease. Men like Dr. Gabrielson and his associates could justifiably have been turning their backs for a moment. It was during this hiatus, this truce, that the McKay regime issued oil and gas leases in such indiscriminate quantities on the refuges which had been reserved for our wildfowl, for our grazing animals like bison and antelope, and for other creatures of the air and the field.

Mr. President, the profligate issuance of oil and gas leases by Secretary McKay and his subordinates during the span of their own stop order was a sneak attack. It was an ambush, a blow in the dark. These leases on our wildlife refuges would have been bad enough at any time. During the existence of an alleged stop order, they were doubly or even triply reprehensible. These circumstances, alone, should more than justify the rescinding of the oil and gas leases by the new head of the Interior Department, Secretary Fred A. Seaton.

SENATOR CITES RECORD FOR WILDLIFE PROTECTION

I believe, Mr. President, that my sincere interest in the welfare of our wildlife has been many times demonstrated. I am the sponsor of a bill, passed by the Senate on June 11, to use surplus feed grains for our migratory waterfowl. I endured considerable criticism because I protested the elimination of the famous and historic White House squirrels—a species which had fascinated many of our great Presidents, but which was proscribed for removal because of claw marks upon a new golf putting green. I have introduced legislation to cancel licenses for dams that would impede the famous steelhead trout runs of the Deschutes River or choke off the magnificent waterfalls and lakes of the upper McKenzie River. I am opposing proposed Federal projects in the watersheds of the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers, which would have such disastrous effects on the great Chinook salmon runs of the Northwest and on the remaining elk herds of the Lochsa-Selway wilderness.

Our wildlife, Mr. President, cannot be sacrificed to wanton commercialism and still survive. In some places we have to make a choice. Ex-Secretary McKay made the wrong choice when he yielded to the importunings of those who would try to superimpose oil and gas prospecting upon our national wildlife refuges.

In a way, I believe that the President of the United States has repudiated the

damage done to our wildlife refuge system, because Mr. Eisenhower very properly disregarded ex-Secretary McKay's recommendation that the Cabinet position go to Under Secretary Davis, who had helped to approve the oil-drilling program. Several newspapers even have reported that Mr. McKay sent utility lobbyists to the White House to urge the Davis selection upon the President. Instead, the President bypassed the McKay satellites completely and went outside the Interior Department to choose former Senator Seaton, who had been a personally popular member of this body.

OUR WILD CREATURES BELONG TO THE NEXT GENERATION

Mr. President, political figures come and go—Presidents of the United States, Vice Presidents, Cabinet members, Senators, Representatives, judges. All are mortal, physically as well as politically. But the great riddle of earth's eternal process of birth, growth, and death is never ending. Part of that process occurs in the environment inhabited by the beasts and birds placed here by the Almighty. Man, despite his ingenuity, cannot create a living thing. No scientist on our planet ever can shape another passenger pigeon. But man can help to reserve a protected realm, where some of God's creatures will be safe from man's own depredations and attacks. That is what our National Wildlife Refuge system has meant. That is why the alarming threat to this system, posed by oil and gas prospecting, must be reversed and thrown back. That is why I make such an appeal from the floor of the Senate today.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article from the March 1956, issue of American Forests magazine, entitled "Our Vanishing Species," by Will Barker, which illustrates how lack of protection has contributed toward the sad and steady diminution of such living things as grizzly bears, American bison, whooping cranes, and landlocked salmon.

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

OUR VANISHING SPECIES

(By Will Barker)

As competition for the land continues unabated, several species of native wildlife are finding survival increasingly difficult. Currently there are about 15 of these endangered species as the National Wildlife Federation designates those members of the wildlife community whose existence is in jeopardy.

Among the birds and mammals on the Federation's 1956 list is the grizzly bear, first described scientifically by Lewis and Clark after their return from exploring the headwaters of the Missouri and Columbia Rivers in 1805–6. Only a few hundred of these great humpbacked bears with dished-in faces and grizzled coats are left in the United States.

In wilderness areas of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, and in Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks, individual grizzlies roam over territories that are about 20 miles in diameter and use well-defined routes that lead to above timberline. Outside the United States there are large areas that may still be designated grizzly bear territory. In Alaska, the Yukon, and British Columbia grizzlies in considerable numbers wander over individual territories in the rugged mountains and across vast expanses of tundra.

Alaska is reported to have more than 10,000 grizzly bears, and though figures are unavailable, western Canada is supposed to have a good-sized population of this bear, whose fur may have a dark-brown cast, the usual color, or a hue that is yellowish, grayish, or blackish. Light-tipped hairs on the upper parts of the body give the animal the grizzled appearance from which it gets its common name.

A grizzly does not reach full size until the animal is 8 to 10 years old, about one-half of its life span in the wild. A mature male weighs anywhere from 500 to 800 pounds—occasionally as much as 1,000 pounds—measures 6 to 7½ feet in length, and stands 3 to 3½ feet at the shoulders. A full-grown female weighs about 400 pounds, with the other physical proportions scaled to this smaller weight.

To preserve the grizzly bear in Alaska, the Territorial Game Commission has reduced the limit from 2 to 1 grizzly or brown bear except in southeastern Alaska. Such a measure should maintain a sufficient breeding stock of these bears in Alaska so that the species will be perpetuated—provided, of course, that wilderness habitat is always available, the great problem for saving stateside grizzlies from extinction even if all hunting is prohibited.

In November 1955, the world's only flock of whooping cranes, 1 of the birds on the Federation's list, returned to their wintering grounds with 8 young. These 8 juveniles constitute the largest increase in the flock since the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge on the Gulf of Texas. At Aransas the whooping crane is given special attention.

The first official count of the whooping crane, a great white bird with a red-crowned head and black-tipped wings, was made in 1938–39. There were only 18 birds then and in 1941–42 there were only 15 whoopers—representatives of an indigenous North American bird that was apparently never numerous. In the early 1800's the range of the whooping crane was from the Arctic coast to central Mexico and from Utah to South Carolina. Each whooping-crane family needed a considerable area for its wintering ground and for its nesting and breeding ground in summer. Settlement of the country, expansion of agriculture, and related activities including drainage of wetlands and coastal marshes, reduced the range of the whoopers, and many of the birds were either deliberately shot or mistakenly shot on their southern migration—a flight of nearly a thousand miles.

To survive, the greatest need of the whooping crane is protection from hunters during the fall migration and privacy on their wintering grounds. Establishment of the Aransas refuge has assured these birds the necessary privacy, but little can be done by officials charged with enforcing Federal and State regulations during the cranes' fall migration when they fly through provinces and States whose waterfowl hunting seasons open early. Therefore it is up to all of us—hunters, amateur and professional ornithologists, and conservationists—to cooperate in protecting the whooping crane so that this representative of our once truly abundant wildlife can survive.

An indigenous fish whose numbers are so few that its continued existence is open to question is the Montana grayling—a fish that is purplish blue on the back and a lighter purple on the sides and lower margins. The large dorsal fin is a dusky green flecked with rose and orange. The Eskimos call the grayling "hewluk-powak," meaning fish with a winglike fin and the last two words of its scientific name, Thymallus signifer tricolor, are apt. Signifer, meaning standardbearer, and tricolor, three colors, truly describe the enormous dorsal fin, which readily distinguishes the grayling from the trout.

Originally there were two species of grayling in the United States—the Michigan and the Montana. The Michigan grayling was considered extinct by 1931, but the Montana grayling has managed to survive in a small part of its former range—all of the Missouri River drainage above Great Falls. Although pollution and siltation played a large part in the decline of the Montana grayling, the introduction of exotic fishes is believed to be one of the major causes for the greatly reduced numbers of grayling.

To survive, the grayling needs clear, cold, and unpolluted streams with sand or gravel bottoms. In the fish's original range there are only a few such spots; these areas are in the upper tributaries of the Big Hole and Beaverhead Rivers. In the tributaries of the Big Hole River artificial propagation is the means by which the grayling is maintained, but the upper drainage of the Beaverhead in the Red Rock Lakes area is much as it was in the days when grayling were comparatively abundant. Here the grayling maintains itself naturally.

Since irrigation on Red Rock Lakes—a national wildlife refuge—has been curtailed or not permitted until after July 1, there has been a marked increase in young grayling and in 1955 adult spawners were seen in three creeks where none had been seen for many years. However, despite this increase—an increase of sufficient numbers to permit limited fishing—management must be continued and have the support of all those interested in the preservation of a native species, a species most numerous in an area which has been the means whereby a once-endangered species has been saved from extinction.

In 1935, the 40,000-acre Red Rocks Lakes Migratory Waterfowl Refuge was established in southwestern Montana to preserve and protect the trumpeter swan, largest of the North American waterfowl. In 1935 there were only 73 swans by actual count; today there are more than 600 of these great white birds, that stand about 3 feet and have a wingspread of more than 7 feet. These birds, closely related to the more numerous whistling swan, have been saved from extinction by the timely action of all those interested in saving a part of America's wildlife legacy. The increase of the trumpeter swan is conservation-in-action at its best, and is an example of what can be done to save an endangered species, whose habitat had been greatly reduced by civilization's encroachment—to be regretted but nonetheless inevitable due to our constantly growing population.

In a U-shaped region about 100 miles long in the mountains and foothills surrounding the southern San Joaquin Valley of California, about 60 of our largest soaring land birds survive. These survivors of another native American species are the California condors, birds with black plumage and a naked head that is bright orange. A condor weighs about 20 pounds and has a wingspread of 9 feet. To survive the condor needs above all else protection from disturbance by man and a Federal law specifically naming the bird as one which cannot be shot.

In the Southeast on the Florida Keys, from Big Pine Key to Key West, the little key deer, a pint-sized edition of the Virginia whitetail, has increased in the face of tremendous odds until there are about 130. All this little deer needs to maintain itself is a reasonable amount of habitat and protection. The establishment of a protective area for the key deer, now known as the Key Deer National Wildlife Refuge in 1935 should do much to give the little animal the necessary

protection. In fact it is thought that this area—home of American crocodiles, alligators, and raccoons—will support 300 key deer provided a year-round supply of fresh water can be better distributed throughout the refuge.

Another unique American species, the everglade kite, exists in numbers about twice those of the whooping crane. In all there are possibly 60 everglade kites, a mouse-gray bird in the case of the male, dark brown for the female. The kite, known only to Florida, has a long, slender, and strongly hooked bill, and eats only one species of freshwater snail.

As marshes were drained the food of the kite disappeared and with its going the kite went too, and numbers of kites were shot due to ignorance or thoughtlessness. At present the Florida Audubon Society, the Florida Game and Fish Commission, and Federal authorities have posted certain marsh areas where the kite still probes for snails and are publicizing the need to give this unusual bird a chance to survive.

Once our largest woodpecker, the ivory-billed woodpecker, was found in the large river swamps from southeastern North Carolina to eastern Texas, in the Mississippi bottomlands north to the mouth of the Ohio, and in the great cypress swamps of Florida. The only recent reports that this once-numerous bird still exists have come from northern Florida. If these reports can be verified, then the remaining ivory-billed woodpeckers, if any, must be given rigid protection on a forest area which has to be managed so that there is an abundant food supply.

Although not in danger of extinction except in the Great Lakes, the lake trout is on the list of species which needs some form of aid for their preservation in the Great Lakes. Since 1939 the commercial and sport fisheries in the Great Lakes have constantly decreased until 22 pounds of lake trout were caught in Lake Michigan in 1954.

The cause of this decline in the catch of lake trout is the sea lamprey—an eel-like predator, which subsists entirely on the blood and body juices of fishes.

The remaining species on the list are the Great Lakes sturgeon, now so few in numbers that in some lakes it may be impossible to save it; Attwater's prairie chicken, at present know to exist only in parts of 11 Texas counties; the once abundant Eskimo curlew; the desert bighorn sheep; and the rare black-footed ferret.

No one knows with any certainty which of these species can be saved or which will become members of the wildlife America that was. But if these species have not passed over the threshold, that is become too few, where it is impossible to restore them, there may be a conservation miracle similar to the one which saved the rare sea otter from extinction.

In 1911 there was only a remnant of the once-abundant sea otter herd left in the Aleutian Islands area. Today there is a herd of several thousand in the waters around these foggy, treeless, and windswept islands, and a small herd of about 300 off the California coast near Carmel. Rigid protection is responsible for the increase of the sea otter—a mammal with a rich dark brown or black coat and a white-whiskered face that makes the animal look like a quizzical old man—the reason for the nickname "old man of the sea."

It may not be possible to save all these endangered species or even build them back to such numbers as the trumpeter swan or the sea otter, but let us hope that the majority of them can be saved—living representatives like the once-endangered buffalo of the wildlife America that Audubon, Douglas, and Muir knew and loved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Medford Mail-Tribune of June 7, 1956, by the able and distinguished editor, Mr. Robert W. Ruhl, winner of a Pulitzer prize for outstanding editorial work. Mr. Ruhl comments on the reaction of conservationists to the wildlife refuge oil-leasing policies of former Secretary McKay, and points up the consternation felt by those interested in preserving wildlife at what has been described as "one of the worst blows to conservation on record."

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

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune of June 7, 1956]

FIELD AND STREAM SCORES MCKAY

The race between Senator MORSE and former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay will not be decided by the Republicans—much as they would like it to be.

Nor will it be decided by the Democrats.

It will be decided by the independent voters in between who hold the balance of power, who discount the slanted propaganda on both sides, and after determining the facts vote for the candidate they believe best qualified for the job.

In this search for the facts they won't go to the campaign "hand-outs" of either party, but to the records of the two men and especially to facts from informed and impartial sources.

It will be remembered by those who listened to Secretary McKay in his primary campaign, that he was in practically a perpetual state of extreme indignation. The chief cause was the charge of "giveaway." Most emphatically Mr. McKay denied such charges in toto, and declared, instead of following any giveaway course he served the best interests of the people of his State and Nation.

No single charge aroused Mr. McKay's ire more strongly than the charge that he permitted oil drilling in wildlife refuges under his control, to the detriment of wildlife extension and protection.

This charge, he claimed, was not only untrue but the exact reverse of the truth. Under his administration, he maintained, wildlife refuges had been increased, and he suspended certain regulations promulgated by his predecessors—Democratic—because they failed to properly safeguard wildlife and true conservation values.

Well what are the facts?

We suggest that those who have no partisan bias or ax to grind read an article in the June Field and Stream entitled "Conservation." It is written by Harold Titus, the editor, and it is hard to believe he is motivated by any sinister partisan considerations, or is dealing with anything but the McKay record in the realm of wildlife conservation, as it stands.

Here is Editor Titus' judgment of McKay:

"Of the thousand-odd working conservationists attending the North American Wild Life Conference in New Orleans, many returned to their office confused, bewildered, and apprehensive. Oil was the disturbing influence, oil beneath the surface of the wildlife refuges. And oil leases by the hundreds safe in the vaults of petroleum-producing companies which had been issued during a period when, as far as the public was aware, all leasing had been suspended. What appears to be the full story of incredibly loose and highly hazardous procedures in the Interior Department was told at the conference. * * * There was a general feeling that wildlife conservation had been dealt a blow that might come to be rated as one of the worst on record.

"A certain amount of reassurance, however, was just around the corner. * * * The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee issued a report that not only strongly rebuked Secretary McKay for the goings on in his Department but called on him to give Congress a 60-day notice before issuing more private oil leases. * * * The report described the management of refuges as a picture of extreme administrative confusion, declared the recent leasing could only result in serious damage to the wildlife refuge system, and expressed the opinion that McKay regulations governing leasing fall far short of adequate protection for public lands.

"To be sure, Secretary McKay had already announced his intention of retiring from the Cabinet to seek a Senate seat, and evidently over 500 oil leases had been granted. But that forceful and completely bipartisan stand by the committee promised to put mineral-development on the refuges under wraps for the closing weeks of the McKay administration. Furthermore, it should stand as a warning to any successor of Mr. McKay's who might feel that the welfare of wildlife is not the direct objective in the maintenance of the national refuge system." * * *

"Well, the conservationist who doesn't feel uneasy about the future of resources under management like that is a rare bird indeed."

There is the opinion of the editor of Field and Stream regarding former Secretary McKay's regime and certainly furnishes justification of the giveaway charge as far as wildlife conservation is concerned. It is unlikely that Mr. Titus fails to reflect the views of true conservationists throughout the country, a verdict based not on party, but on principle.

Moreover this view fits in perfectly with the entire McKay picture. Like the Al Serena case it does not involve any criminal action or intent, and Mr. McKay and his defenders will undoubtedly use the same alibi in both cases, namely, that oil leases in wildlife refuges were granted in previous administrations, just as forest reserves were mined for timber, this attitude based on the old fallacy that two wrongs make a right.

But as Editor Titus indicates in this article, while there are those who maintain drilling for oil does not necessarily impair wildlife protection, just as mining forest reserves for timber, does not necessarily doom forest conservation, both practices on the scale countenanced by the Interior Department under Secretary McKay should stop, and it is hoped will be under his successor, for the sake of the country and perpetuation of the conservation principle.

Editor Titus concludes:

"Finally everybody appeared to have the involved story straight and went home with the understanding that over 550 oil leases (in the wildlife refuges) were outstanding and that if these were exercised the staff of the refuge branch would probably be the busiest young men in public service just reviewing operating plans. For even to the complacent minority the recital of goings-on in the Interior Department was depressing. Just what the effect will be of the demand of House committee that Congress be consulted on lease applications in the future remains to be seen. It is certain, however, that the procedures will be watched from all directions."

So here we have as a result of the McKay giveaway policies to the oil companies one of the worst blows to conservation on record.

That is not the judgment of the political enemies of ex-Governor McKay or the Democratic press but the editor of Field and Stream who chooses that declaration as the title for his article.—R. W. R.

A WORLD FOOD BANK

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, there is in progress right now, in Washington and elsewhere, considerable debate on the matter of this Nation's responsibilities in the field of foreign aid. There is concern over the means and methods of providing assistance to friendly, but less fortunate, democracies whose friendship and security we in these United States need for mutual benefit, for friendly relations, and for protection against the menace of international communism.

Earlier this week the House of Representatives voted on President Eisenhower's request for almost $5 billion for foreign aid. By a rollcall vote of 273 to 122, the Members of the House cut the President's foreign-aid request by more than a billion dollars—from four billion nine hundred million to three billion eight hundred million.

Whatever the outcome of these discussions, these debates, and these votes on the foreign-aid program, it must be recognized that what takes place in Congress reflects the thinking of our people. It must be recognized that the American taxpayer is weary, and weary of paying such a stiff price to maintain friendships. Many people feel, and with some justification, that we are becoming the wealthy uncle who is welcome only so long as the money holds out.

At the same time, I think the American taxpayer knows the value and wisdom of reasonable and sound programs to help free nations remain free. There have been some bad spots in the past, but experience has shown that some foreign-aid programs pay off.

I want it clearly understood that I have always been in sympathy with the spirit of foreign aid to less fortunate friendly nations of the free world. But at the same time, I believe in being realistic. In our zest to help, there must be a businesslike approach, founded on a sound basis.

When it comes to saying how many dollars this or that country should get, that must be determined by the experts; and I am certainly no expert in this field.

But I do know this, and it does not take an expert to see it:

When it comes to sitting down and working out ways and means of approaching many of these overall programs, the administration has turned deaf ears on some proposals and ideas that I think are important.

Take, for example, a resolution I submitted, calling for the establishment of a world food bank. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] submitted a similar measure, and many Senators joined in cosponsoring these resolutions.

The resolution, when adopted, would express to the President of the United States, and to the world, the sense of the Senate that the President should initiate negotiations, through the framework of the United Nations and other international channels, for the creation of a world food bank, patterned after the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. From this bank, member nations could in times of distress, shortages, famine, and other disasters, borrow food, fibers, or both, and repay such loans, when able, in kind, other raw materials, or in cash.

In recent months literally millions of words have been spoken and written about our excess stocks of foods and fibers, and what to do about them. Little has been said, however, about the hungry men, women, and children who people the world, or about what can be done, in a practical way, to fill their empty stomachs.

International statistics show that more than 1 billion people, of the total world population of 2,400,000,000, go to bed at night with their hunger only partially satisfied. We know also that communism and other ideologies foreign to the concept of freedom of the individual man thrive best in lands where the specter of hunger stalks.

To my mind, no more effective weapon could be forged for use in the battle against international communism than the creation of a world food bank with facilities for lessening the pangs of hunger that gnaw in the stomachs of hundreds of millions of people. We have learned, and all the rest of the world has learned, that an international bank conceived and operated along democratic lines and principles can and will, operate successfully for the mutual benefit of all participating nations. As I pointed out earlier, I refer specifically and directly to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Today, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has 56 members; and its balance sheet, the measure of the peaceful services it has rendered in a world torn with strife, tells a graphic story of what nations can accomplish when they work together toward a common goal.

Mr. President, I wish to reemphasize that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is not a charitable organization engaged in a giveaway program—just as the world food bank proposed by Senate Resolution No. 85 is not designed to operate as a giveaway institution.

The record shows that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development pays dividends not only in good will among the participating nations and peoples, but also in dollars and cents. Its net cash income last year, over and above all operating expenses, exceeded $20 million.

The world food bank, as proposed by Senate Resolution No. 85, will serve as a medium of distribution, for the effective and businesslike disposal and utilization, of so-called surplus food, fiber, and other agricultural products which have accumulated or may accumulate or be needed in this or other participating nations. I submit that it is high time to put the presently accumulated stocks of foods and fibers for peace into humanitarian use, without loss to the American taxpayer, through the medium of a world food bank.

How better, I ask, could we improve our foreign relations? How better could we prove to a suspicious world that we mean what we say when we announce we are willing to share the fruits of our technologies and our learning with the peoples of other nations?

When it comes to foreign aid, a world food bank is a natural.

If we want to help friendly foreign nations, and at the same time help ourselves, then I think that we ought to give serious thought to the idea of a world food bank.

The blessing of abundant production has become a burden upon us in the form of heavy surplus farm products. Many friendly nations need the food and clothing these surpluses can furnish. I say it is up to us to work out a way to put them where they are needed. And I sincerely think it can be done without stuffing an unlimited number of dollars into the hip pockets of our foreign friends.

Only 2 weeks ago, a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on the two resolutions that would set up the framework for a world food bank.

Representatives of the State Department, the very people who are now crying for more money for foreign aid, said flatly that such a program was not needed.

In fact, they were strong in their opposition to such an idea.

Such reasoning just does not make sense to me. It is very apparent that some blind spots are throwing so-called vision out of focus.

I want it clearly understood, Mr. President, that I am not criticizing the theory or wisdom of foreign aid, but I do think the attitude of the administration is both shameful and pitiful when it comes to listening to suggestions.

Thought and reason have been put in a cage down in the executive branch when it comes to many of our problems in foreign relations.

I say this with all deliberation, because I am certain that the President is sincere about the funds he has requested.

I also feel that if the President knew the attitude of the State Department about the world food bank he would be disturbed. He would be disturbed because he knows the importance of businesslike approaches to foreign economic problems.

With these thoughts in mind, I ask every Member of the Senate to weigh carefully the foreign-aid legislation when it comes up for final deliberation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9824) to

establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict.

SECURITY REGULATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this week the country has received another disquieting decision from the Supreme Court which strikes down still another safeguard which Congress has created to protect our country against the Communist conspiracy and all other disloyal elements endeavoring to destroy our great constitutional citadel of freedom.

In its split-decision this week, the majority of the Court has utilized its judicial power to prevent the President of the United States from exercising the executive power he felt he needed to establish security regulations for Government employees which are sufficiently effective to protect our country in this uneasy era of the cold war and the continuing Communist acts of aggression and misrepresentation.

President Eisenhower, in strict conformity with his pledge to rid Government of its Reds and to clean out official Washington of any and all lurking spies and Communist agents very wisely, early in his administration exercised the executive authority which Congress gave him in the act of August 26, 1950, to extend security checks and codes of loyalty to all Federal employees. Perhaps in the eyes of the majority of the Court, our Commander in Chief was a little naive because he drew from his long military experience the sturdy conclusion that in any kind of war, victory requires an army—civilian or military—comprised completely of loyal, dedicated, and patriotic people. Believing this—and I am sure most Members of Congress will agree with the President—President Eisenhower issued an executive order based on authority conveyed to him by Congress and in the act of August 26, 1950, applying the Government's security checks and loyalty provisions to all Government employees. This week the majority of the Court deprived our Commander in Chief of this important power to protect our national interest.

Therefore, once again I am introducing remedial legislation in an effort to plug another hole in the defense bastions of America which has been created by another unrealistic and unhappy decision by six isolated members of our Supreme Court. A week ago I felt compelled to introduce legislation suggesting emergency action to shore up America's defenses against the destructive action of the Court in making another split decision which deprived our country of the power to take effective action in depriving naturalized citizens of their citizenship in cases where they had obtained that citizenship fraudulently. That decision was bad enough in the light of current world conditions, but bad as it was the decision this week is a thousand times worse in terms of safeguarding our national security and with relation to our fight for freedom in this era of aggressive, godless communism.

I salute Justices Clark, Reed, and Minton for their courageous and convincing dissent. I simply cannot follow the nebulous reasoning and the strained conclusions of the other 6 Justices; but the 3 great and good dissenters never spoke with greater veracity and acumen than when they said this week "The Court's order has stricken down the most effective weapon against subversive activity available to the Government." What a travesty on our judicial procedure when in the joint efforts of Congress and the Executive to safeguard our fellow citizens against the clear and present dangers of communism, six men in black robes can nullify our every effort and expose the internal workings of our Government to the stealthy espionage and sabotage of Communist agents whose services the Government cannot now terminate unless the agency in which they work be designated "sensitive" or unless their individual positions are classified as "sensitive."

But even then, the majority of the court does not believe that the President, the Commander in Chief, has the authority, the power, or the judgment to determine which such jobs or positions should be regarded as sensitive. They seem to feel that Congress has no such authority. They seem to feel that in some way or other the Supreme Court has been called upon to interpret the mind of Congress, to pass upon the judgment of the President and, from their safe and isolated quarters, arrive at a determination that certain jobs considered by the President to be sensitive are not in fact important to our national security.

Before we find time to appropriate billions of dollars trying to defend ourselves with foreign aid, Mr. President, I hope the Senate Committee on the Judiciary will promptly report favorably the remedial and protective legislation which I am today introducing.

Either communism is a menace or it is not. Either we are in a cold war or we are living in a peace eternal. Either we join ranks and protect our peace and our freedoms or we squander our national resources in appropriating billions for defense and mutual security while we expose our internal governmental structure to the spies of communism and depend on the shreds of protective legislative still left us by the present Supreme Court to maintain the constitutional government which the Court is presumed to help defend.

We shall not get very far in the business of national defense and mutual security if, at the same time we are called upon to appropriate billions to protect ourselves against dangers from without, we continue to riddle our defenses against communism at home, and succumb to and accept Supreme Court decisions which stultify the power of the Government of the United States to defend itself.

If we must stay here all summer, if we must stay here until after the Supreme Court has recessed, if we must stay here until the conventions have begun and until after they have concluded, I submit we have no more important business to attend to than to tighten the internal security defenses of our country, now that they have been completely destroyed in this area by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I introduce and send to the desk, for appropriate reference a bill proposing remedial emergency legislation to correct the condition in which we find ourselves after the Supreme Court decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4047) to amend the act of August 26, 1950 relating to the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Government, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COTTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my bill provides a direct and simple method of closing the great hole shot into our internal defense supports by the Court's decision. I would simply amend the act of August 26, 1950 by adding a single straight-forward paragraph to say:

> Nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit the application of this act to civilian officers or employees occupying positions deemed to be sensitive from a national security standpoint.

That, Mr. President, was clearly intended by section 3 of the act as written, which said:

> The provisions of this act shall apply to such other Departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary in the best interests of national security.

Mr. President, let me read that again, because, I confess it is very difficult for me to determine how six learned lexicographers who serve as judges can read that language and say that Congress did not mean in extending this power to the President to include such other agencies as he deems necessary in the best interests of our national security. Let me read it again because the Congress will have to study the English language very carefully in order to couch its legislative determination in monosyllabic words which the Court cannot ignore and which the Court cannot invalidate. When we wrote the act, I thought the language was pretty clear. We said:

> The provisions of this act shall apply to such other departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary to the best interests of national security.

President Eisenhower did deem it necessary to do exactly that. President Eisenhower did deem it necessary in the best interests of national security to apply the provisions of this act to all the other Government agencies and departments. President Eisenhower's great effort to help protect all Americans against all forms of subversion have been defeated by the action of the Court this week.

I do not know of anything more important than for us to rededicate ourselves to this legislative objective.

We will not win the war against communism merely by building bombs and bombers. We will not win it simply by appropriating money for foreign aid or mutual security; we will not win it by treaties and international conferences; we will not win it until such time as Congress writes a law so clear that even the present majority of the Supreme Court can understand that Congress is serious about giving the President the right and the power and the authority and, in my opinion, the obligation to insist that only Americans shall stand guard today in Federal positions of responsibility.

Six Justices of the Supreme Court have held Congress did not understand the English language. They have held that the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, did not know what he needed in order to protect our national security.

Mr. President, for a long time I have been engaged in the effort to find out what we can do as legislators to protect ourselves against Godless communism. I have been engaged in it longer, I might say, than any other sitting Member of the Senate or of the House. I started away back yonder with Martin Dies. I am still working at it with the able chairman, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I am the author of the first 17 sections of the Internal Security Act, an act on which we labored for 2 long years, an act which was finally passed by the Senate after the second-longest filibuster in history, over the veto of President Truman, an act which was also approved promptly over the veto of President Truman by the House of Representatives. Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress set precedent by overriding a Democratic President's veto of legislation authored by a Republican. Congress was that concerned about security.

I can well understand that if the present attitude of the Supreme Court prevails, when it is called upon to adjudicate the various sections of that act, our Internal Security Act also is likely to be destroyed.

Mr. President, when we find that the Supreme Court destroys our defenses, not because they are unconstitutional, not because the Court finds some conflict in them with other legislation, not because the Court says we are arrogating unto ourselves authority we do not have, but because, as they say to us, "Gentlemen of the Senate and gentlemen of the House, you do not know how to write what you mean," and when they say to the President he has no right to act upon the mandate we have given him, it becomes serious indeed. It creates a security emergency.

The Supreme Court is endeavoring to become a legislative body and write legislation by interpreting what we have in mind and what we say in simple terms, as understandably expressed, as we set forth our intent in the act, when we said in section 3 of the act:

> The provisions of this act shall apply to such other departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary in the best interests of national security.

And if in the eyes of the Supreme Court that is not understandable language, and if in the eyes of the Supreme Court the President has done wrong in responding to his responsibilities as Commander in Chief in the middle of a cold war, by closing the doors of the Government to spies and saboteurs, then Congress has the responsibility to write it all over again. It has that responsibility now, in June and July of 1956, not after we reconvene. It has that responsibility before we consider other measures of national defense. Ours is the legislative body of this land. I say that, Mr. President, because if we decay from within, we will never be strong against dangers from without.

Therefore, I say that Congress once again must take up the melancholy business of rewriting what we have already written, of reenacting legislation which we have already enacted, of restating once again what we have already stated clearly, and of reiterating the determination we have made many times before, that America must have the right to defend itself, and that the Constitution was never intended to be a document creating a system of government incapable of survival or of self-defense.

Mr. President, some of the editorial writers who have consistently fought every effort by Congress to tighten our internal security against communism are applauding this decision by the six majority members of the Supreme Court. They are the same editorial writers incidentally or perhaps not incidentally who said the Alger Hiss case was merely a red herring, the same editorial writers who have always been antianti-Communist the same editorial writers who fought the Mundt-Nixon bill, the same editorial writers who encouraged President Truman to veto the bill and who condemned Congress when it passed the bill over the President's veto—these editorial writers are saying that this is a great victory for civil liberties.

It is not a great victory for civil rights unless catering to communism is a great victory for civil liberties. It is not a great victory for civil rights unless the editorial writers to whom I have referred actually believe that under the communistic system citizens have more rights than they have here. This country provides better civil rights than does any other country in the world. It certainly provides better civil liberties than these editorial writers could hope to secure for themselves or their readers in Russia or in any other area of the world.

Mr. President, their editorial comments entirely ignore the context of the act Congress wrote in 1950. They would uphold this surprising decision of the Supreme Court by saying it is a victory for civil rights because the act gave an agency or a department the right summarily to dismiss someone suspected of being a Communist or who was caught redhanded as a spy and working for the taxpayers of America.

Let me explore the act a little bit, Mr. President. It is Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire act be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks so that readers of the RECORD may follow it.

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

[Public Law 733, 81st Cong., Ch. 803, 2d Sess.]
H. R. 7439

An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), as amended (5 U. S. C. 652), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State; Secretary of Commerce; Attorney General; the Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Secretary of the Treasury; the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission; the Chairman, National Security Resources Board; or the Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, may, in his absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interests of national security, suspend, without pay, any civilian officer or employee of the Department of State (including the Foreign Service of the United States), Department of Commerce, Department of Justice, Department of Defense, Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, Coast Guard, Atomic Energy Commission, National Security Resources Board, or National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively, or of their several field services: *Provided*, That to the extent that such agency head determines that the interests of the national security permit, the employee concerned shall be notified of the reasons for his suspension and within 30 days after such notification any such person shall have an opportunity to submit any statements or affidavits to the official designated by the head of the agency concerned to show why he should be reinstated or restored to duty. The agency head concerned may, following such investigation and review as he deems necessary, terminate the employment of such suspended civilian officer or employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the national security of the United States, and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final: *Provided further*, That any employee having a permanent or indefinite appointment, and having completed his probationary or trial period, who is a citizen of the United States whose employment is suspended under the authority of this act, shall be given after his suspension and before his employment is terminated under the authority of this act, (1) a written statement within 30 days after his suspension of the charges against him, which shall be subject to amendment within 30 days thereafter and which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit; (2) an opportunity within 30 days thereafter (plus an additional 30 days if the charges are amended) to answer such charges and to submit affidavits; (3) a hearing, at the employee's request, by a duly constituted agency authority for this purpose; (4) a review of his case by the agency head, or some official designated by him, before a decision adverse to the employee is made final; and (5) a written statement of the decision of the agency head: *Provided further*, That any person whose employment is so suspended or

terminated under the authority of this act may, in the discretion of the agency head concerned, be reinstated or restored to duty, and if so reinstated or restored shall be allowed compensation for all or any part of the period of such suspension or termination in an amount not to exceed the difference between the amount such person would normally have earned during the period of such suspension or termination, at the rate he was receiving on the date of suspension or termination, as appropriate, and the interim net earnings of such person: *Provided further*, That the termination of employment herein provided shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government: *Provided further*, That the head of any department or agency considering the appointment of any person whose employment has been terminated under the provisions of this act may make such appointment only after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, which agency shall have the authority at the written request of either the head of such agency or such employee to determine whether any such person is eligible for employment by any other agency or department of the Government.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall impair the powers vested in the Atomic Energy Commission by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 or the requirements of section 12 of that act that adequate provision be made for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee of said Commission.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall apply to such other departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary in the best interests of national security. If any departments or agencies are included by the President, he shall so report to the Committees on the Armed Services of the Congress.

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1053), and section 104 of the act of July 20, 1949 (Public Law 179, 81st Cong.), and section 630 of the act of October 29, 1949 (Public Law 434, 81st Cong.), are hereby repealed.

Approved August 26, 1950.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the middle of the first part of the act it is provided that the agency head concerned may, following an investigation, terminate the employment of a suspended civilian officer or employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the national security of the United States.

Mr. President, what is all this about? What are these multibillions of dollars in expenditures meant for? For what reason are all the hearings on defense held by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee? Why all the argument about whether the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force should get an extra billion dollars? Why all the talk about whether we should or should not appropriate more money for NATO and Greece and other nations, if it is not to protect the internal security of the United States from an invasion from without and from, I would dare to hope, sabotage from within? Certainly, Mr. President, the record is horrendous enough when we think about Alger Hiss, what happened at Fort Monmouth, the exposé of Communists working in defense plants, and of the persons it has been necessary to discharge from State Department employment. Harry Dexter White's infamy alone should sober all of us.

Certainly, Congress was acting wisely when it said that department heads should have the right, in the interest of the national security of the United States, summarily to expose and to force the resignation of a Red or a pink or a punk or a spy or a saboteur, or even a sex pervert, Mr. President.

I read further:

and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final.

At this point some editorial writers say, "Ah ha, they are destroying the civil rights of the people. They can kick this poor little Communist spy out of the Government service and make his termination of office final."

That is the opinion of editorial writers who got caught in the switches of having been wrong on this issue for the past 20 years and who are now trying to find some place to which they can retire to justify their earlier errors concerning "red herrings" and the like.

The editorial writers do not read any further in the law. They have satisfied their purposes. They do not bother to read the rest of the act, so I shall read it for them in order that anyone who actually wishes to defend America's internal security will know how far Congress went, and properly so, in defending the civil rights even of the Reds who would reduce us all to the position of slaves.

The act continues:

and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final: *Provided further*—

The editorial writers did not read that. Maybe the Supreme Court did not read it, either; I do not know. We seem to be getting "slaphappy" about the whole subject of internal security. I hear people say, "There is more danger from fascism than from communism." More danger, I suppose from nazism than from communism. That may have been true at one time in the history of the world, but we had better get in tune with the times. It is not true today.

Mr. President, I have just been requested to leave the bill which I introduced on the desk because some Senators desire to become cosponsors. I am happy to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that it be held at the desk so that any Senators who wish to add their names as cosponsors may do so.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was about to discuss a proviso in the act. Congress thought, the President thought, the FBI thought, the Attorney General thought, and those in charge of our internal security thought it might be a good thing, when we caught a suspected Communist, to discharge him at once, not serve notice that he could continue to spy for 30 days and then terminate his employment with the Government. We thought the best time to get rid of him was now, not to wait until he filled his portfolio with secrets and delivered them to Moscow.

I read further from the act:

Provided further, That any employee having a permanent or indefinite appointment, and having completed his probationary or trial period, who is a citizen of the United States whose employment is suspended under the authority of this act—

That includes them all. There are only two kinds of appointments, a definite appointment and a probationary appointment. If a man is a citizen, he has his civil rights.

I read further:

shall be given after his suspension and before his employment is terminated under the authority of this act, (1) a written statement within 30 days after his suspension of the charges against him.

It is not a question of merely kicking a man out. He shall receive within 30 days a written statement spelling out the charges—

which shall be subject to amendment within 30 days thereafter and which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit.

That certainly takes care of him. These are not nebulous charges; they are not charges written in the kind of rubber language which the Supreme Court claims it finds recently in our legislative enactments. They are written specifically. They are set forth verbatim.

Second, the discharged, alleged disloyal Government employee, or whoever he is, if he happens to be an innocent person, has—

an opportunity within 30 days thereafter (plus an additional 30 days if the charges are amended) to answer such charges and to submit affidavits.

He has an opportunity to find out specifically why he was dismissed. He can present his rejoinder specifically. He is allowed as much time as the Government is allowed, and all must act within 30 days.

Third, there is granted "a hearing, at the employee's request by a duly constituted agency authority for this purpose." He is the beneficiary of that wonderful device—"a hearing"—which the editorial writers are always wanting to make certain is available to all the reds, all the pinks, and all the punks. So the employee gets his hearing.

Fourth, he gets more than that. He gets:

A review of his case by the agency head, or some official designated by him, before a decision adverse to the employee is made final.

Fifth, he gets:

A written statement of the decision of the agency head: *Provided further*, That any person whose employment is so suspended or terminated under the authority of this act may, in the discretion of the agency head concerned, be reinstated or restored to duty, and if so reinstataed or restored shall be allowed compensation for all or any part of the period of such suspension or termination in an amount not to exceed the difference between the amount such person would normally have earned during the period of suspension or termination, at the rate he was receiving on the date of suspension or termination, as appropriate, and the interim net earnings of such person.

So he gets his pay even if he is not working if he is restored to his employment.

Provided further, that the termination of employment herein provided shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government: *Provided further,* That the head of any department or agency considering the appointment of any person whose employment has been terminated under the provisions of this act may make such appointment only after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, which agency shall have the authority at the written request of either the head of such agency or such employee to determine whether any such person is eligible for employment by any other agency or department of the Government.

Mr. President, this is a simple act, written in short words and direct statements, and passed in the hope that the Supreme Court would understand what we had in mind.

In all events, the Commander in Chief read it. The act was passed long before General Eisenhower became President or was a candidate for President. He found it in the laws of the land. He said, "This is good. Innocent Americans"—they are the ones we hear so much about—"are entitled," said President Eisenhower, "to have loyal persons in the Government. Innocent Americans are entitled to have spies, saboteurs, and espionage agents dismissed from the Government service. Innocent Americans are entitled to live in a country which believes its public officials have a responsibility for loyalty to their Government and should have faith in our system of government and should believe in democracy and should support the Constitution."

So the President said, "This is a good law. It is good for the Army, good for the Navy, good for the State Department, good for everybody working in the Federal Government."

I think Congress and the people generally applauded the President when he said that. If we apply this salutary law to all the departments and agencies of the Government and remove from office employees who are found to be unfaithful, while giving them the benefit of this long series of "Provided furthers," they can have all their civil rights protected and can be reestablished in their employment if it is found that they have been falsely or fraudulently accused. In the meantime, we protect over a hundred million really innocent Americans against having their freedoms and their civic rights dissipated or destroyed by Communist operatives from within the Government.

Mr. President, we are confronted with a very serious problem this afternoon, because we shall be called upon, and rightly so, by the Defense and State Departments to appropriate vast sums of money to protect America. I feel certain that we will exercise our best collective judgment on that issue. But is there a single Senator among us who believes we can save America in that way alone, by creating a great big sieve full of holes and calling it a screen, through which to accept disloyal Americans seeking employment?

The most naive Member of Congress or the most naive member of the Supreme Court must certainly realize that as a part of the discipline of Communist action which applies to Communist agents in America the first instruction is, "Get into the Government. Weasel your way in. Worm your way in. Sneak into the Government. Get on the inside. Work your way up. Shift into positions of greater responsibility, greater importance, and greater access to information."

Is there a Member of Congress, or a member of the Supreme Court, or an editorial writer who is so naive as to believe that in a sensitive agency there is anything less than a sensitive job? Does he believe that in the Government, in time of either cold or hot war, there is anything which is not a sensitive activity?

If I were directing the Communist espionage apparatus, the installation of a custodian having access to the private offices of Government officials in the darkness of the night would be, in my opinion, a No. 1 assignment. There I would place some of my best operatives. There I would put some of my best sleuths. There I would put some of my most devoted spies. It is so easy to pry open a desk; so easy to piece together information found in wastepaper receptacles; so easy to move through the recesses of a dark, unoccupied building to find information which would be helpful to those being served in Moscow.

What kind of business is it when the Supreme Court suggests that the Commander in Chief in his responsibility has only the right to select certain headline jobs and certain headline agencies and to say to their heads, "You must put Americans on guard. But as for all the other agencies and positions, come one, come all; it is open sesame for every spy. You, Mr. President, have no authority to screen subversives out of the entire Government."

Mr. President, I think we have more important business confronting us than to adjourn the Senate. I wish the majority leader were here today so I could exact from him a promise, if I could, to hold the Senate in session until we could correct the injury done to our defenses by this decision of the Supreme Court. Knowing the majority leader as I do, I think he will join with me in urging that Congress stay in session at least that long. Knowing the members of the Committee on the Judiciary as I know them, I am optimistic enough to predict that they will act on the proposed legislation so quickly that we will not have to delay our adjournment in order to pass it before we go home.

But let us as Senators start getting our eye on the ball. Let us begin to consider a way in which we can save America other than by spending the taxpayers' money in big bundles. Let us measure up to the responsibility which faces us. The Supreme Court has challenged us; let us accept the challenge. Let us do it as men and women of courage and conviction.

In conclusion, I suggest that in the battle for survival it is more important that we reestablish the defenses of our citadel of freedom from within than that we concentrate always on the job of how we are going to increase the defenses of freedom against the dangers from without. As Senators, we have the responsibility to see clearly to the point in this dangerous age. Otherwise, we should abdicate in favor of those who will not concentrate alone on saving America against distant, offshore enemies by spending the money of the taxpayers overseas in a myopic effort to keep out of the country those dangers which we permit to be nourished from within.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator happen to remember the vote by which the bill was passed by the Senate and also by the House?

Mr. MUNDT. Not the exact vote. I remember it was overwhelmingly passed, after it had been carefully debated on the floor. It was passed overwhelmingly. There was not a Member of the Senate, I am sure, who would find himself in agreement with the tortured interpretation of the English language handed down by the Supreme Court this week.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Was not that measure very thoroughly and carefully discussed by many Members of the Senate?

Mr. MUNDT. It was, indeed, and it was one with respect to which Democrats and Republicans alike, good Americans all, said, "This is the way we can make sure of doing something, except to talk and gesticulate, about communism. This is the way to meet the issue. This is a must. Protect the home base first, before starting to chase flies in the outfield."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Has it not always been the duty of the courts to interpret the laws as they were intended by the legislative branch of government?

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely so; and I might add that the Supreme Court was supposed to determine the constitutionality of the laws, and was supposed to see that they were administered in conformity with the legislative intent and their language. We labored long and hard to put into simple English language what we proposed in this act. We did not even make it mandatory. We said if the Commander in Chief of the country, in times of stress, strain, and danger, thinks it essential, to protect America, that he add additional departments to be included under loyalty and security rules, he shall have that right. And it is that right which the Supreme Court sought to strip from our Commander in Chief this week.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to compliment the able Senator from South Dakota. I have not heard all of his re-

marks. I am not immediately familiar with the provisions of the bill he has introduced, but I wish to associate myself with the views and sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I wish to assure him, as one Member of this body, and as a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I shall urge immediate consideration of the bill. I know I favor its general objectives, and I think the able Senator is rendering a service to the country in pointing up this issue and in fighting for remedial legislation that will correct some of the actions being taken by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, I think, should be more concerned in finding ways to sustain and uphold the acts of Congress which are intended to protect the security of our country. I am becoming distressed and alarmed by some of its decisions, and the flimsy pretext and lack of logic and the unsound reasoning on which they are based and I wish to join the Senator in the general sentiments, at least, which he has expressed.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Arkansas very much, indeed, for his helpful contribution. It is so typical of him. I know of his great work in the committee on which he serves. It is frustrating and disillusioning, after the long and hard process of enacting legislation designed to protect America, to have it so cavalierly thrown aside by six members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and to join and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I think it is fine that the Senator has introduced a bill on this subject. I certainly intend to support such proposed legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Texas. With his tremendous influence and power in the Judiciary Committee, I have every confidence that the Judiciary Committee will act promptly. This is an emergency. We are confronted constantly with the need for emergency legislation. We are asked to appropriate billions of dollars for emergencies. This is an emergency which requires a few straight-from-the-shoulder words to the Supreme Court, and I hope the Senate will give the bill prompt consideration.

A great and distinguished member of the opposition party said recently that, in his opinion, there was such a thing as wanting to be President too badly. In my opinion, there is such a thing, on the part of the Justices of the Supreme Court, as a desire to adjudicate too broadly.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a very brief statement on the public works appropriation bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD at an appropriate place following my remarks.

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

[Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Senate. His remarks appear in today's RECORD following the beginning of the consideration of the public works appropriation bill.]

PROGRESS REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, LOBBYING, AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, I made on the 14th day of March a brief report to the Senate with respect to the committee's organization. At that time I also expressed some of my views regarding the committee's duties and responsibilities as they relate to the task assigned to it.

I advised the Senate that a staff would have to be assembled; that a good staff was important to the success of the committee's labors; and that we would promptly undertake to assemble a staff of the quality prescribed by the rules of the committee—a staff capable and competent, and selected solely on the basis of fitness to perform its duties, without regard to political preference or affiliation.

Although the resolution creating this special committee does not require it, as chairman I feel that I should keep the Senate informed by making at proper intervals progress reports on the committee's activities.

Mr. President, I am pleased to advise that the committee has now completed the selection of an initial staff of 14 members, 9 of whom are professional and five of whom are clerical, and each of whom was unanimously approved by the committee. This size staff is adequate to enable the committee to begin its work, although it is probable that the workload of the committee will so increase as to require that additional staff members be added.

On March 19, having in mind the Neff-Senator CASE of South Dakota incident, and by direction of the committee, I, as chairman, wrote each Member of the United States Senate a personal letter requesting that he submit to the Special Committee any facts within his knowledge or any information in his possession, regarding any attempt illegally or improperly to influence him or any other Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government. It was felt that if any such attempt had been made illegally or improperly to influence any Senator, he would know about it, and, therefore, he could report, and it was his duty to report, such attempt or activity to the committee.

To date, only 43 Senators have replied. Only 3 or 4 have reported or suggested any facts or information of the nature requested. One of the incidents reported by a Senator to the committee has already been investigated and disposed of. The other suggested leads are now being processed by preliminary inquiry. All other information or material which has come to the committee from other sources in the form of complaints or allegations is presently being carefully gone over and screened by the staff, to determine whether it has merit and is of sufficient substance to warrant committee action. These matters will be processed as expeditiously as may be practical.

Since the Neff-Senator CASE of South Dakota incident was associated with the Senate's consideration of the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill, the committee at its next meeting following organization unanimously ordered a full investigation of lobbying and political activities of both the proponents and opponents of that measure.

On May 1, a public hearing was held in connection with the activities of the General Gas Committee, a group of gas producers organized to support and promote the enactment of the gas bill. The chairman of the General Gas Committee, Mr. Matson Nixon, testified and made all of the records of that committee available to the special committee, and those records are now under study by the staff.

On May 24, a hearing in executive session was held by the committee to investigate charges in the February 9, 1956, issue of the Leader, a Bismarck, N. Dak., publication, in an article headlined "YOUNG Sells Out Again," having reference to Senator MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota, with respect to his vote on the Harris-Fulbright gas bill. The representatives of the Leader responsible for this newspaper story were subpenaed and placed under oath and given an opportunity to substantiate the charges made in the article against Senator YOUNG. They denied under oath that it was their intention to either charge or imply that Senator YOUNG had yielded or had been subjected to any improper or any illegal influence in connection with his vote on the natural gas bill, or on any vote that he may have cast at any time as a Member of the United States Senate. Therefore, the committee concluded that the headline charge of the article, "YOUNG Sells Out Again," and all of the article's further implication of any wrongdoing on the part of Senator YOUNG were wholly unsupported, without any basis of fact whatsoever, and completely false. The committee immediately issued a public statement to that effect, and made public the proceedings of such hearing.

Mr. President, I wish to state on my own responsibility as a United States Senator that the article of the Leader making the charges against Senator YOUNG is simply that type of "sordid and irresponsible journalism that resorts to the poison pen to contaminate the news and pollute the stream of public information through the media of the free press"; and I so stated to the press at that time. The article was most reprehensible; and I am confident that such malicious and distorted reporting and

editorializing on the news is repudiated and condemned by all the responsible press and by everyone who cherishes the right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, and who associates with that right and privilege an obligation of fairness and decency in reporting and publishing the news.

I should also like to inform the Senate that approximately 1,100 reports are filed quarterly with the Secretary of the Senate by groups or individuals believing themselves to come under the requirements of the Lobbying Act. The committee staff has been instructed to examine these reports for each of the last five quarters, and is now in process of doing so.

Obviously, it is impossible for this committee to examine, interrogate, and thoroughly investigate each of these individuals and groups with respect to their lobbying activities; but in carrying out its purpose to thoroughly investigate lobbying activities and improper influence in connection with the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill, the committee has selected and approved for immediate attention of the staff and for investigation the following organizations some of whom are registered under the Lobbying Act, four of whom supported and four of whom opposed the enactment of the Harris-Fulbright measure. They are: Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Council of Local Gas Companies, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, Natural Gas & Oil Resources Committee, Joint Committee of Consumers and Small Producers, The Mayors Committee on Natural Gas, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and United Auto Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

The committee's selection of these groups does not imply or indicate at this time that their activities were in any way illegal or improper. Nor from this selection is it to be inferred that the committee will not investigate other groups or persons that lobbied or undertook to use influence for the enactment or defeat of the measure. But these have been selected as among those most active and as among those making the largest expenditures.

The representatives of these organizations have already been interviewed by the staff and, in cases in which it is believed necessary, investigations have already been made or are now being made of their records, which they have made available.

As a result of the preliminary work done by the staff in connection with these groups, public hearings have been scheduled for June 14 and 15 and for June 21 and 22. Further public hearings will be ordered as soon as preliminary work of the staff will permit.

Mr. President, other work of the committee is proceeding expeditiously. It is the intention of the committee to examine into any specific charges, information, or leads within its jurisdiction that may come to its attention or be submitted to it that indicate any illegal or improper political activities, lobbying, or campaign contributions. I should like to point out, however, that the committee does not have a nationwide network of staffed offices or a field force of personnel to make investigation and inquiries. We have only a small staff in very limited space located here at the Capitol in the city of Washington. Therefore, it is perfectly apparent that the committee and its staff, on the basis of their own initiative and resources, cannot possibly ferret out and investigate each and every possible action or incident of wrongdoing that may have occurred and that may come within the purview of the committee's duties and responsibilities.

I point out again that this committee must necessarily deal in facts. Innuendoes, inferences, and rumors are of little or no value. It is of no assistance to this committee to have someone tell us that "everyone knows" that there Member of the Senate to supply the committed, but it is of interest and can be a great help to the committee if anyone can tell us the name of someone who may know of such an act or of some document or item of evidence which will demonstrate the fact.

Mr. President, having called upon each Member of the Senate to supply the committee with any facts or information within their knowledge that might be helpful, and in view of the rather meager results that request has produced, and in view of the great public interest in the subject matter of this investigation, I now wish to broaden that request and invitation to include members of the press, columnists, commentators, and all other sources of information, including all citizens and the public at large, to give to this committee any concrete facts within their knowledge or any information they may have, and the source of that information, regarding "attempts to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof or any candidate therefor, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices."

All such information from any reliable source will be received, pursued, appropriately considered, and acted on by the committee.

Mr. President, just as I pointed out and emphasized in my earlier report to the Senate immediately following the organization of the committee, responsibility for the success of this special committee's labors rest equally upon each political party and upon each individual member of the committee, irrespective of party. I also pointed out and emphasized at that time, that the responsibility in this field of each individual member of the Senate had in nowise been lessened or diminished by reason of the appointment of this special committee. I now wish to point out and emphasize as well that it is the duty of every citizen possessing knowledge or information in these areas of activities that would be helpful to the committee to submit such facts and information to it. I most respectfully urge the press and other media of news and public information to give full cooperation and assistance to the committee in conveying this committee's request and invitation to the public.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I commend the Senator for the address which he has just completed, showing the progress of the work of the committee. The work of the committee which he has outlined has been done in a very fair and clear manner.

I also wish to take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Arkansas for the very effective and forceful manner in which he is serving as chairman of the special committee. It is a difficult task, and, with all his other duties, I know it constitutes a great burden. Members of the committee of both political parties are very hearty in their commendation of the job which the chairman of the committee is doing, and are aware of the sacrifices which he is making in rendering that service.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my distinguished friend, the very able vice chairman of the committee, who is working with me. We are all trying to do a clean, efficient job, which will lead to a constructive result.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I also wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas for having submitted this report to the Senate. I wish to associate myself with the remarks which the distinguished chairman of the committee has made with respect to the committee action and activities up to date.

I assure not only my colleagues, but all others, that the committee is proceeding to make the investigation and to obtain all the facts possible relative to any misuse of lobbying or any attempt to exercise undue influence in connection with legislation.

I again commend the Senator from Arkansas for giving us this report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

THE SHORTAGE OF RAILROAD BOXCARS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, many of us from the Midwest are very much interested in a bill now before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which would amend the Interstate Commerce Act in an effort to alleviate the recurring problem of shortages of railroad boxcars. I refer to S. 2770, which has been the subject of hearings by the committee, and which I understand received further committee consideration today.

I am sure that a great many Members of the Senate have had the same experience I have had in receiving, from time to time, urgent pleas for assistance in meeting an acute need for boxcars. I personally have interceded on a number of occasions with responsible individuals in the desire to do everything I could to assist, but oftentimes I have found unfortunately that there was little that could be achieved immediately to meet a critical need at that moment.

It is, therefore, my earnest desire to determine whether we can constructively legislate on the problem, and that is the reason why I today refer to the pending legislation, as I believe we are properly approaching the problem through legislation along the lines of S. 2770.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will bring this legislation before the Senate at an early date. Prompt consideration and action by the Senate thereafter will, in my opinion, give us reason to hope for ultimate achievement in solving, at least partially, this recurring problem.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter I directed on May 16, 1956, to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 16, 1956.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: One of the problems of nationwide concern is the developing shortage of boxcars which, at times, reaches acute emergency proportions. On many occasions, I have had to intercede with those directly concerned with the problem in an effort to assist in alleviating boxcar shortages, particularly those in the Midwest when they occur around harvesttime and need is great.

It is, therefore, for these reason that I have been watching carefully the developments on legislation before your committee, specifically S. 2770. In my opinion, the basic objectives of this proposed legislation are sound, and I am pleased that your committee has it under consideration. In this connection, I should like to bring to the attention of the members of your committee two telegrams I have recently received, and I ask that they be incorporated in the record of your subcommittee's hearings.

I just wish to add that I hope your committee will be disposed to favorably consider legislation along these lines within the immediate future. In my opinion, legislation of this character is desirable, and I view it as a step in the direction of assuring an adequate supply of boxcars to those areas of the country where there is a real and positive need for them.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

FRIENDSHIP INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—PAN AMERICAN AIRLINE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last Thursday I had the honor and pleasure of accompanying diplomatic representatives from 14 Latin American countries as they visited Friendship International Airport, inspected the port of Baltimore, and got a chance to see our fine Baltimore Orioles baseball team in action.

The day's festivities, which were sponsored by the Greater Baltimore Committee, began with the trip to Friendship. Before we left the airport, the diplomats were speaking enthusiastically about its great potential for helping cement the nations of the Americas.

It is unfortunate that so many persons of our own country have failed to comprehend what our Latin American friends saw so quickly.

One of the most glaring examples of the shortsighted treatment of the situation can be found in the East Coast-Florida case, which is now being studied by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In a preliminary CAB report on the proceedings, an examiner reported that the issue should be considered as a domestic affair.

Perhaps that would be true if all the airlines which have submitted applications were strictly domestic lines.

There is one applicant, however, which has demonstrated its ability to provide service over transoceanic routes and which has now offered to integrate its far-reaching system with proposed runs along the east coast.

That applicant is the Pan American World Airways System, and I say that to deny it an east coast route on the grounds that the case is domestic—and that Pan American's plan does not fit into that category—would be as ridiculous as to forbid our vessels from engaging in coastal and transoceanic trade during the same trip.

Obviously the matter is much more than merely domestic, and the very fact that Pan American has provided international aspects to the case makes the application of that airline far stronger than it would be otherwise.

Here is what Pan American proposes to offer:

A service which would not only link the east coast's major population areas with one another, but which would also join them with Latin America, Europe, and Asia without time-consuming layovers, etc.

I have spoken first of the international aspects because, unfortunately, they seem to have been widely ignored or disregarded in some circles.

The domestic advantages offered by Pan American are equally impressive.

What we are attempting to obtain, we must remember, is safe, efficient, adequate service to handle the enormous amount of air traffic along the east coast.

Toward that end, Pan American can provide flying equipment of the highest quality for both passenger and cargo service.

It has trained personnel to conduct the operation.

It has jet planes on order which, when delivered, will be placed into the system at once.

It is the logical airline to be given permission to provide additional service between New England and Florida.

I will not repeat at this time the data offered in the East Coast-Florida case to show that Federal airline subsidies of more than $8 million will be saved if the Pan American application is approved.

Suffice it to say that the possible savings have been widely publicized and that the Congress—and thousands of taxpayers—will be watching attentively to see how the issue is handled.

I do, however, wish to dwell for a moment on the feeling in some quarters that the CAB should not be interested in the question of which airports are involved in these proceedings.

I have always felt—and I am sure that most of my colleagues have had similar beliefs—that the CAB was taking a broad view of the matters placed before it.

I was amazed, therefore, to learn that Pan American's offer to serve the Washington-Baltimore area through Friendship International Airport was not an issue in the case, as far as the CAB examiner was concerned.

Is it not an issue that the world-travellers who fly to and from this region demand additional schedules and services which can only be established through Friendship?

Is it not an issue that Washington's air facilities are heavily over-burdened and that utilization of Friendship would provide a measure of safety which is long overdue?

Of course those are issues. They are the issues.

And since they are so intimately connected with Friendship, I do not see how the East Coast-Florida proceedings can be given adequate consideration unless our modern airport in Maryland and its facilities become an important item in the final determination.

I am confident that the officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board will justify the trust which has been placed in them, and will approve Pan American's application as the one which will provide prompt, safe and adequate service to our East Coast cities within an international network.

At the beginning of my remarks, I spoke of the Latin American diplomats who visited Friendship last week. I should now like to mention them by name and also read into the RECORD the proclamation which Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., of Baltimore, issued in designating a day in honor of them and their countries.

The Latin American visitors to Baltimore were:

From Nicaragua: Ambassador Don Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, Dr. Jorge Alberto Montealegre, commercial and financial counselor; Liceciado Ricardo Parrales, deputy to Dr. Montealegre, and I. Irving Davidson, legal counsel.

From Peru: Don Gonzalo Pizarro, minister plenipotentiary; Jose Urdanizia, counsel general, and Enrique Larosa, first secretary.

From Bolivia: Ambassador Don Victor Andrade.

From Paraguay: Persio da Silva, first secretary, and Miguel Angel Reyes, second secretary.

From Guatamala: Ambassador Jose Luis Cruz-Salazar.

From Dominican Republic: Dr. Oscar G. Ginebra, minister plenipotentiary.

From Panama: Don Juan Manuel Mendez Merida, minister.

From Cuba: Dr. Mario Nunez de Villavicencio, first secretary.

From Honduras: Ambassador Carlos Izaguirre and Dr. Policarpo Callejas B., first secretary.

From Costa Rica: Don Jorge Hazera, counselor.

From Colombia: Dr. Ricardo Anaya, minister counselor.

From Argentina: Santos Goni, first secretary.

From Chile: Ambassador Maria Rodriquez A., and Carlos Valenzula, minister counsel.

From Uraguay: Washington P. Bermudez, charge d' affaires.

In his proclamation, Mayor D'Alesandro said:

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world, and it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations; and

Whereas the friendly relationship existing between the various Latin American nations and the United States of America is based on a spirit of goodwill and a community of interests affecting the social and economic welfare of our respective countries; and

Whereas the purpose of Latin American Day in Baltimore is to bring to the attention of the people of this community the importance of Latin America to the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland; and

Whereas it has been estimated that between 30 and 45 percent of all commerce through the port of Baltimore either originates from or is destined to Latin America, which is indicative of the important role Latin America plays in the economic health and welfare of our city and State:

Now, therefore, I, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim Thursday, June 7, 1956, as Latin American Day in Baltimore, and do urge all our citizens to give serious thought to the importance of Latin America in our economic and social welfare, and to resolve to do everything within our power to further strengthen the bonds of friendship now existing between our respective countries.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The secretary will call the roll.

The legilsative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, Senate bill 3982, to provide for the maintenance of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes, be temporarily laid aside.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11319.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

(The following statement by Mr. FULBRIGHT, made during the speech of Mr. MCCLELLAN, is, by request, printed at this point:)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before returning to the executive session of the Foreign Relations Committee, I should like to comment briefly on the public works appropriation bill. The river development and resources conservation program is of vital importance to the State of Arkansas. I wish to commend the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who served so ably as chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the chairman and the members of the full committee, for the excellent bill which has been reported this year.

The senior Senator from Louisiana and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], have, of course, been long interested in this program, as have all the members of the Committee on Appropriations. In the years to come I am confident that these gentlemen, who have served so diligently in the preparation of this program, will be remembered long after many of the other actions taken by this body have been forgotten. It is a great pleasure when we can appropriate money for something constructive in these days in which practically all, or at least the vast majority, of bills are devoted to purposes which are destructive rather than constructive.

The action by the committee this year is of far-reaching significance, particularly to the vast Arkansas River Valley area. Although a comprehensive flood control and navigation plan was authorized for the Arkansas River in 1946, the project has gone forward at a snail's pace. About all the area was able to obtain was a small appropriation annually for emergency bank stabilization, which is at best only a holding operation and makes little contribution to the long-range development of the area.

Under the bill reported by the Senate committee, I am glad to note that for the first time it will be possible to move ahead with the construction of vital projects.

The committee has approved $750,000 for Dardanelle Dam. This appropriation is long overdue, for, as Senators will recall, the Congress in 1950 appropriated $1 million to begin construction of Dardanelle. Due to the Korean war, the project was delayed and the money was never used. At long last, however, it appears that construction of Dardanelle will be initiated and the people of the Arkansas River will be assured of the benefits of flood control, water conservation, navigation, and irrigation. I might point out also that this project is being constructed in an area which has been losing population due to limited economic opportunities.

Of importance also to the Arkansas River Valley are the three projects in Oklahoma—the Eufala, Keystone, and Oolagah Dams—for which a total of $7,500,000 has been provided for construction. Construction funds are also provided for the Calion project in southern Arkansas.

I should also like to commend the committee for its action in recognizing the importance of early construction of the Beaver Reservoir and the Greer's Ferry Reservoir. It happens that Beaver Reservoir will be located in the section of Arkansas in which I live, and I am particularly familiar with the economic conditions which make the early construction of the dam of vital importance. The Ozark area has suffered serious economic setbacks in recent years, due to drought, and it too has seen the population dwindle because of limited economic opportunities. The construction of the Beaver Reservoir and the Greer's Ferry Reservoir will provide needed employment during the construction period, and will open up unlimited opportunities in the future.

The committee also has recognized the importance of planning several other projects in Arkansas which are essential to the orderly economic development of our area. I shall not comment on these in detail, but I am glad to know that the way is being paved for the construction in the area of other projects which are urgently needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded for purposes of amendment as the original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by agreement to this request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I merely rise as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee which is marking up the foreign aid bill, to pay my tribute of respect to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ELLENDER] dealing with the public works appropriation bill, and to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] who is chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the reclamation provisions of the bill, for the very fine work they have accomplished.

The committee functioned in a bipartisan manner. All members approached the task in a spirit of trying to solve the flood-control problem and other problems. I simply wish to say, because I shall be forced to be absent from the floor of the Senate for the reason I have stated, that the committee has done an outstanding job.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to thank my good friend from California for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Louisiana is agreed to, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title II—Department of the Interior—General Investigations," on

page 5, line 18, after the word "expended", to strike out "$5,270,000" and insert "$5,680,000", and in line 19, after the word "which", to strike out "$4,560,000" and insert "$4,970,000."

Under the subhead "Construction and Rehabilitation," on page 6, line 5, after the word "expended", to strike out "$125,900,000" and insert "$138,961,000."

On page 6, line 24, after the word "nonreturnable", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $233,800 shall be available for the emergency protection of medicinal waters of Soap Lake, Wash., from irrigation operations of the Columbia Basin project, which amount beyond the ability of the water users to repay shall be repayable from surplus power revenues of Grand Coulee Dam."

On page 7, line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $520,000 shall be available toward emergency rehabilitation of the works of the Hayden Lake unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

Under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance," on page 8, line 8, after the word "law", to strike out "$26,500,000" and insert "$27,267,000."

Under the subhead "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund," on page 9, line 9, after the numerals "485", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$13,000,000."

On page 9, line 10, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That funds appropriated under this head shall be immediately transferred to the appropriation entitled, 'Construction and Rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation.'"

Under the subhead "Administrative Provisions," on page 10, line 23, after the word "prints", to insert "construction of minimum recreational facilities at reclamation reservoirs to be nonreimbursable."

On page 13, after line 5, to insert:

"Sums which have heretofore been expended for construction purposes on the Boulder Canyon project from operation and maintenance appropriations and revenue receipts shall be considered as having been advanced to the Colorado River dam fund and repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury as of May 31 of the same operating year."

On page 13, after line 11, to insert:

"Funds made available herein and hereafter to the Trinity division, Central Valley project, shall be available for the design and construction of power and hydraulic facilities totalling not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts."

On page 13, after line 16, to insert:

"All funds expended for construction, operation, and maintenance of the 2,000-second-foot Wahluke siphon, Columbia Basin project, shall be reimbursable, but repayment of those parts thereof and of other expenditures for said project which the Secretary finds properly allocable to irrigable lands located on the Wahluke slope shall be deferred until they are no longer needed in connection with operations of the Atomic Energy Commission and have been irrigated."

Under the heading "Title III—Civil Functions, Department of the Army—Cemeterial Expenses." on page 15, line 20, after the word "cemeteries", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$6,765,000."

Under the subhead "General Investigations," on page 16, line 20, after the word "expended", to strike out "$8,122,000" and insert "$9,322,000."

Under the subhead "Construction, General," on page 17, line 7, after the word "expended", to strike out "$422,034,000" and insert "$463,373,000."

On page 17, line 23, after the word "litigation", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That in view of the physical conditions that developed during construction which increased the cost of land acquisition beyond the legal authority of the city of Grand Forks to provide, the Chief of Engineers is authorized to expend, for land acquisition, not to exceed the sum of $100,000 of the amount herein appropriated for the Grand Forks unit of the Red River of the North project:".

On page 18, line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That in lieu of protecting the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, the sum of $1,935,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, and the sum of $1,196,000 shall be available for the relocation of highways and utilities therein. The substitution of land acquisition for the protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided herein for such land acquisition."

On page 18, line 18, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the sum of $1,341,891 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, and not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project. The substitution of land acquisition for protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, except the heirs of Louis Morin, Jr., on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on the terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided,* That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is authorized to acquire by condemnation proceedings, in the appropriate United States district court, the public domain allotment of Louis Morin, Jr., now deceased, described as the west half southwest quarter, section 16, and the north half southeast quarter, section 17, township 153 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, in connection with the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir: *Provided further,* That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost of the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the construction charge obligation assignable to the remaining lands of said district pursuant to the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), as amended, and the proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district."

On page 20, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000", and in line 15, after the word "appropriated", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That no funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the planning or construction of the Wilkesboro Reservoir, N. C."

Under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance, General," on page 21, line 7, after the word "expended", to strike out "$85,900,000" and insert "$95,900,000."

Under the subhead "General Expenses," on page 21, line 16, after the word "investigations", to strike out "$10,075,000" and insert "$10,400,000."

Under the subhead "Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries," on page 21, line 23, after the word "expended", to strike out "$56,030,000" and insert "$62,791,000."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to endorse very strongly what the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] has said regarding the chairman of the subcommittee before whom I and other witnesses from my State appeared this year. I wish to acknowledge very gratefully the remarkably sympathetic and detailed attention which the Senator gave to the problems of stricken areas, particularly those in New England. That is not intended to be exclusive, by any means, but I am personally familiar with the evidence and the attention the distinguished Senator has given to our problem.

I wish very strongly to endorse the remarks of the Senator from California and to applaud the Senator from Louisiana for the remarkable job he has done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared and which I ask to have appear following the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana on the bill.

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

(The statement submitted by Mr. BUSH appears in the RECORD following Mr. ELLENDER's speech.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana and to the committee for covering in the bill not only the budgeted items, but nonbudgeted items covering uncompleted river and harbor projects in the State of Washington, including Blaine, $116,000; Everett, $120,000; Grays Harbor (Westhaven), $61,000; Willapa River and Harbor, $130,000; Quillayute, $444,000; Columbia River at Baker Bay-Ilwaco (complete planning and start dredging), $70,000; Stillaguamish River (complete survey, report on benefits and costs), $5,000.

We appreciate the fact that as a result of our representations to the committee, funds have been included in the bill for the projects which I have just mentioned. We appreciate the very fine cooperation of the chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, Mr. President, I appreciate all that is being said about me and the committee, but

I am not unmindful of the fact that a great deal of the work was accomplished by the efforts of various Senators who appeared before the committee and made a good case for the projects which they presented.

I wish to commend my good friend from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] as well as his colleague [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Their section of the country was inundated by a recent flood, as was Connecticut. They did very good service in presenting to us in concrete form the various projects, and I am happy that the committee was able to include in the bill many of the projects suggested by the Senators who appeared before us. I express the hope that the Senate conferees will be able to convince the House conferees that these projects are as worthy as we think they are and that they should be retained in the bill.

Mr. President, while bouquets are being thrown at the committee, I wish to say that the members of the staff who worked with me are to be highly commended. We have with us today Mr. Kenneth Bousquet, clerk of the subcommittee, and Miss Grace E. Johnson, assistant clerk, both of whom worked very diligently and assisted in every respect in making it possible for us to report the bill in time.

The hearings started on March 20, and continued through the remainder of March, all of April, and all of May. The committee heard a total of 683 witnesses and representatives of various organizations. Each Senator has on his desk four volumes which contain the evidence taken during the hearings.

I wish to state for the RECORD that all the projects were completely justified by the United States Army engineers, and, of course, no projects were put into the bill or recommended for action except those which received the sanction of the engineers.

Mr. President, this year we proceeded in the same manner as we proceeded last year, with one exception. The funds necessary to operate the Atomic Energy Commission are not included in this bill; they will be provided for later in the supplemental bill.

The Subcommittee on Public Works divided itself into 3 subcommittees. The one, which dealt with the Tennessee Valley Authority, and would have dealt with the Atomic Energy Commission funds, was headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The portion of the public works appropriation bill dealing with reclamation, the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior, was handled by my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Both Senators did noble work in obtaining all the evidence necessary to make certain that proper justifications were made for all the projects which are included in the bill.

Before marking up the bill, I myself studied not only the projects for which the Bureau of the Budget made estimates, but also other projects which were not budgeted. It often happens that many small projects are neglected for some time, and those who foster them sometimes cannot come to Washington and make their presentation to the Bureau of the Budget. So in order to balance the bill, and in order that it might take care of many worthy projects which were not considered by the Bureau of the Budget, I recommended to the subcommittee the inclusion of a number of projects which had been asked for by witnesses from all over the country, and some, also, which had been requested by Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I am glad that a substantial number of such projects were included. My hope is that it will be possible to retain all of them when the conferees meet.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I listened with interest to what the Senator said about meeting the requests of people throughout the country for these very important projects. I think the Senator is to be commended for the attention which he has given to them.

I have a question regarding a Department of the Interior project in the Missouri River Basin, namely, a powerline from Fort Randall, S. Dak., to Grand Island, Nebr., which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, recommended by the Department of the Interior as feasible, and requested by the President. A rather sizable delegation appeared before the committee and spoke for the project. To the best of my knowledge, no witness appeared against it. Yet I find that it was not included in the bill. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee could enlighten me as to the reason for the action of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator who handled that matter is the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. However, I shall be glad to give some of the reasons why that project was not included.

It seems there was fear on the part of some of the Senators and Representatives from the area concerned that if that line was built there might be an inequitable distribution of the electricity. It was stated that in Nebraska all the power would be distributed through a publicly-owned system, and fear was expressed that because of the unique situation in Nebraska, where every consumer would be a preference customer, there would be an inequitable distribution of the electricity between the Missouri River States.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator says that fear was expressed. Was that expression given by anyone who appeared before the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it was an expression by Members of Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. By Members of the House of Representatives?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and also by Members of the Senate. As a matter of fact, one member of our committee expressed such fear.

The thought was that if some method could be worked out whereby the electricity would be properly distributed, whereby the States north of Nebraska, including Minnesota, which might be entitled to the electricity, would get their just share of the power, and if an equitable formula could be devised, we might in the near future consider the inclusion in a bill of sufficient funds to take care of the problem about which the Senator from Nebraska is now speaking.

It was further said that a year's delay would not be harmful, for the simple reason that it would be probably 3 years before electricity from the dams would be available. Since the transmission line could be built within the space of 18 to 24 months, it was thought that we might wait until next year. In the meantime an agreement could be reached as to the distribution of the electricity. Then it would be likely that the line to which the Senator referred would be completed when the power was available.

Mr. CURTIS. I am interested in what the distinguished chairman has said about the fears which were expressed. Was any evidence submitted to the committee indicating that the allocation of power in the Missouri River Basin States up to date has been unfair?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, there was none.

Mr. CURTIS. Was any evidence received by the committee indicating that the Bureau of Reclamation contemplated any unfair allocation of power among the States?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, there was no such evidence submitted. But before we finally decided upon the position we took, it was suggested that consultation be had with the Bureau of Reclamation, and that some language be included in the report, or that assurance be obtained from the Bureau, relative to the distribution of the electricity. I do not believe that such assurance was obtained. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Arizona can enlighten us on that subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. The matter was considered at length by both the subcommittee and the full committee. The action taken in the committee was based upon two factors.

First, at the present time, under existing firm power contracts this facility is not economically feasible under present allotments to customers in Nebraska. That is to say, at the present time a 115-kilovolt line is feasible; a 230-kilovolt line is not feasible.

Mr. CURTIS. To which finding is the Senator referring?

Mr. HAYDEN. To the finding of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. CURTIS. But the Bureau recommended a 230-kilovolt line and said that it was feasible over the period of its life; did it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; there is no question about that; but not now.

Second, a unique situation exists in Nebraska, in that every consumer is a preference customer. The committee considered for inclusion in the bill provisions to overcome this situation. However, the problem is so involved that the committee felt the matter should be handled by the proper legislative committee. The preference clause could not be

amended in an appropriation bill. Every customer in Nebraska is a preference customer.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very grateful to the Senator from Arizona, who granted us such a fine hearing.

Was any evidence submitted to the Senator's subcommittee or to the full committee indicating that the Department of the Interior had been unfair in the allocation of power up to date?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. CURTIS. Was any evidence submitted to the committee indicating that the Department of the Interior anticipated the allocation of power unfairly among the States?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, there were no allegations of unfairness at all on the part of anyone.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana was speaking about the fears which had been expressed. That is why I asked my questions.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. The question that bothers me is not whether there has been any spirit of favoritism toward Nebraska, Wyoming, South Dakota, or any other State in that area, but whether, under existing law, the Bureau of Reclamation might be required to deliver power to Nebraska in preference to people in Wyoming or South Dakota.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the crux of the question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I think perhaps I can give an illustration which supports these fears. One afternoon about a year ago, two gentlemen came to my office in the Senate Office Building. One was an official of the Milwaukee Railroad and the other was an industrial representative. They said that one of the large companies producing aluminum was interested in utilizing the town of Pickstown. Pickstown was built by the Corps of Army Engineers, at a cost of between $6 million and $7 million. It was built for the purpose of housing construction workers on the Randall Dam on the Missouri River in South Dakota. The Government is through with Pickstown. The dam has been built. While a few of the houses will be needed for the operators of the dam, the larger part of the construction was declared surplusage.

The industrial firm, which is in the business of making aluminum, was interested in the possibility of building on that town site and taking it off the Government's hands and erecting an aluminum production plant. But when they approached the Department of the Interior they were told they could be given no assurance of getting electricity from the Government dam.

As I ran the matter down with them and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Aandahl, we learned that since the State of Nebraska is served entirely by public power, consequently every distributor in the State of Nebraska has preference and can get power in preference to anyone in South Dakota, unless he is served by a public body. If the aluminum company had gone 70 or 80 miles south and located itself in the State of Nebraska, it could have bought power developed on the Missouri River through one of the suppliers in the State of Nebraska. But Pickstown could not be moved into Nebraska. Consequently, the Government had no opportunity to dispose of this construction town, because it could not be moved into Nebraska, where the aluminum company could qualify to get power through preference distributors. Therefore, the aluminum industry was not located there, and the Government still has Pickstown on its hands.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to give another illustration, which is even worse than the South Dakota illustration.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield without losing the floor.

Mr. BARRETT. The power site at Glendo will be coming into production in about a year. It is within 40 miles of the Nebraska State line. Under existing law, a good many citizens of Wyoming have been getting power indirectly from the Bureau of Reclamation, through a private power company, for many years. When Glendo comes into production preference customers in Wyoming, I assume, will be taken care of by the Bureau of Reclamation. After preference customers are taken care of the rest of the power from Glendo can be preempted from the people of Wyoming who are not preference customers.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the distinguished Senator from Arizona are rendering a great service in bringing this matter up. It seems to me we shall need legislation to guarantee to our people a fair share of the power produced in their own States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that I am not unaware of the fact that a very good case was made for use of the peak load during the summer when water was released for irrigation purposes. If it were possible to do that, I do not think there would be objection on the part of the States of North and South Dakota.

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to hear the chairman say that, because, as a matter of fact, this summer power available when water is released can be sold in South Dakota at "dump" rates, and the Nebraska farmers are anxious to pay regular rates. That would enhance the Treasury by from $175,000 to $300,000 in additional revenues a year.

I should like to ask a further question. Was there any evidence submitted to the committee in support of the fears about which we have just heard? I think the fears are based on an entirely erroneous idea of the power situation in Nebraska. In Nebraska many of the public bodies have outstanding bonds. Their business is to produce power. They want to produce all the power they can. The second largest public power body in the State is Omaha Public Power. It is located on the Missouri River. It is not getting 1 kilowatt of electricity from the Missouri River system, and none is currently planned. Right now additional steam systems are being built in my State. Two of the important hydro plants are serving irrigation districts. The minute they stop producing power, the cost of irrigation goes up tremendously. Nebraska has no desire to draw from other States power which they should rightly have, or which would be uneconomic. We have shown every desire to cooperate with them.

We would accept any limitation which would be reasonable. I think the figures will show that at the present time we are getting only about 15 percent of our power revenues from the Bureau of Reclamation, and that in 1958 we shall get only 12.8 percent.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if it is not true that both North and South Dakota are served by 230-kilovolt lines from Bureau of Reclamation Missouri River plants.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. And the bill provides for the construction of a 230-kilovolt line into Minnesota.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true, but there was a load factor in each case which justified that line.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand. I thank the Senator for giving us this time. I do not mean to be critical. I want the answers in the RECORD. Is it not true that Nebraska is the only Missouri River State which does not have a 230-kilovolt line?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true. There is no question that once the question of how in the future the area will be developed is decided, and the need for a 230-kilovolt line is established, such a line will be constructed; but until that question is determined, there would be justification only for a 215-kilovolt line, because there does not exist the market for the larger one.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will recall that we received evidence, as I remember, that even though the building of the line were to be delayed for a year, no time would be lost, because it would be 3 years before electricity could be fed into the line. In the meantime, it was suggested that some agreement be entered into with the Reclamation Bureau whereby peak load electricity could be utilized and there would be no interference with the just share of the interested people who were entitled to have the electricity. If this could be worked out, I do not believe any trouble at all would be encountered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am aware of the widespread opposition in certain States in the Missouri River Basin to the preference clause which applies to the distribution of electricity. I remind the Senate that the preference clause was not written by Nebraska. It is a general law which Congress enacted. Those who are opposed to it should make some attempt to change it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think Nebraska happens to be the only State in the Union in which almost all the electricity is distributed by publicly owned power systems.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say that I think the decision announced by the two distinguished Senators, and made by the full committee, was wise when it was made, and that its wisdom is even more apparent now, in view of recent developments.

In the first place, as regards the older developments, the Senator from Louisiana has just referred to the fact, which I think is known to all of us, that Nebraska is the greatest beneficiary of national generosity in connection with public power, of any State in the Union. In the first place, Nebraska is the only State to which all the water resources within it have been granted or released, for its own development; and, second, as an additional ground for gratitude to the Nation, which I am sure the State of Nebraska feels, the construction of several of the large structures built there was made possible through grants or Federal loans. However, that is neither here nor there.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, let me say that the structures referred to are not in Nebraska; instead, they are in South Dakota.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to complete my point, please.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Nebraska is in the very fortunate position of being able to wait until due judgment can be exercised in connection with this matter, so that injustice will not be done to States only a small part of whose electric power is being used by distributors who fall within the preference clause, whereas in his own State—primarily because of the generosity of Congress, and under laws passed by Congress—all the electricity distributed which is produced from water power does fall within the preference clause.

The second point is that it seems to me that what has happened at this particular session indicates very clearly the wisdom of the decision made, because in the Niagara power case the Senate recently decided that the preference clause had such sacrosanct standing that the Senate would not even permit the sovereign State of New York to operate under its own water-power development policies, but in granting to that State a small part of what the Senate has already granted to Nebraska—that is to say, the right to develop a small part of its water power—the Senate held that the preference clause was sacrosanct and could not be touched and must prevail even over another method of distribution, as prescribed by a New York State law.

So it seems to me that the distinguished chairman of the committee and the chairman of the Reclamations Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works are on such strong ground that even the Senator from Nebraska—who, as I say, represents a State which, as compared with all the other States in this field, should have the most gratitude to the Federal Government—would have to realize, or should realize, that the course of wisdom is being followed and that a little time should be taken to reach a just solution.

I believe that it will be possible to devise a formula under which, on the basis of the percentage of power distributed, let us say, to other States in general in the Missouri River Valley—both power which comes under the preference clause and power which does not come under it—equal treatment may be given by subsequent legislation to the State of Nebraska. I would strongly favor that, in connection with this matter, the State of Nebraska be accorded treatment equal to that given her neighboring States. But, inasmuch as Nebraska has received preferred treatment up to this time, I feel that the Senator from Nebraska can scarcely complain if a Senate committee wishes to take due time to find out what would be the fair solution of this particular problem.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has referred to the generous treatment of the State of Nebraska by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Nebraska does not deny that, does he?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. None of the power developed in the State of Nebraska is Federal power. Most of it is developed by municipal bodies with private financing. In Nebraska we have practically no Federal power production at all. We have three hydroelectric projects which were built under the PWA; but other than those, all the others were financed privately. Therefore, I do not like to have any record to the contrary stand without being challenged as to accuracy.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that this is the case—and if I am in error about it, I hope my friend will correct me: The Federal Power Commission, acting under Federal law, had to give to the State of Nebraska licenses and permission for the development of the hydroelectric projects in Nebraska——

Mr. CURTIS. Is that generosity?

Mr. HOLLAND. Just as the Federal Government did in the case of the State of South Carolina, for the development of two great projects there; and just as the Federal Government did in the case of the State of Oklahoma, for one great project there. The Congress followed the course laid down by the Federal Power Commission, in the case of the State of Oklahoma, by passing another law in the same field, last year. We did so because in that instance, flood-control water, as well as power water, was involved. The Markham Ferry Dam is the one to which I am referring. I understand that the Federal Government had a great deal to do with giving the original permission and consent for the development of waters in the State of Nebraska in which the Federal Government certainly had an interest. If that is not true, and if the Federal Government had no right to intervene in the handling of those waters, then the Federal Government has been proceeding very unwisely in the case of many reclamation projects in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In Nebraska there are practically no Federal reclamation projects that are producing power.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the question is as to the right of the Federal Government to exercise Federal powers in connection with the running waters which happen to traverse the State of Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not accept the view that the Federal Government owns that water.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ELLENDER] and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN] have covered this question so ably, as has also the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], that there is little left to be said about it.

However, I wish to call attention to this fact: In view of the Federal preference clause or act, and in view of the public-power laws of Nebraska, as members of the Appropriations Committee, we could not authorize the transmission line to be built into Nebraska, because the moment the line was built in Nebraska, the transmission line would become the preferred customer, with a perfect right to draw on all current generated in that area.

So long as the laws of Nebraska remain as they are, and the Federal preference clause remains as it is, we are compelled to ask that the Reclamation Bureau make a finding and establish a policy before the construction of a transmission line can be authorized.

Other Senators have very ably covered the question. Any further debate on it will be only so many words spoken.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to commend the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a moment ago. However, I do not think he has stated the solution quite accurately. It seems to me that, instead of asking the Bureau of Reclamation to adopt some rule or regulation, we must take jurisdiction over that subject, probably in a legislative committee.

I am sure the people of the great State of Nebraska do not intend to be unfair. They have not been unkind in demanding this power. But, as I see it, at the present time, the Bureau of Reclamation is helpless. If some REA or other power agency in Nebraska asks for all the power developed in my State over and above the needs of preference customers, we have no choice except to deliver it to them. So it seems to me that we must have some legislation on

this subject, and develop the preference clause somewhat.

I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I believe that, approaching this question in the spirit in which we are approaching it today, Nebraska, Wyoming, South Dakota, and the other States involved can arrive at a fair and just division of the power. But certainly the people of Wyoming, in which State the water which flows into the State of Nebraska arises, should not now find themselves in a position in which the people of Nebraska would have greater use of Wyoming water for irrigating their own lands, and be in a position to have the big end of the power, merely because Nebraska is a public-power State.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] certainly knows the history of the Missouri River development, because at one time he was a member of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives. He was one of those who introduced proposed legislation looking toward the Missouri River power development. In 1944, when the Senator from Nebraska was a Member of the House and introduced his proposal, the justification for building the structures was flood control.

The Nation has been generous to Nebraska. The State of South Dakota has been generous to Nebraska. Under the authority of the Flood Control Act of 1944, the so-called Pick-Sloan plan was authorized, and the Government authorized the building of several structures in the State of South Dakota, and one in North Dakota. It authorized 4 or 5 structures in South Dakota and 1 in North Dakota, to create gigantic reservoirs in which to park the flood waters of the Missouri River and keep them off Nebraska.

When Nebraska was asking for this project and this program on the Missouri River back in 1944, the purpose at that time was to prevent the Missouri River from flooding Omaha and the farmlands between Sioux City and Omaha, and to the south. Nebraska did not ask then for power. Nebraska asked for places to park the floodwater. So South Dakota joined in the request, and gave up 450,000 acres of river bottom land, so that flood waters on the Missouri River could be parked in South Dakota and kept off Nebraska.

After the structures were built, the State of Nebraska, which is served to the extent of 100 percent by public power bodies, said, "Now build a 230-kilovolt line into Nebraska, to siphon the power from South Dakota into Nebraska, and we will use the power, and all the people of Nebraska can get some of the power, because of the preference laws, and because the State of Nebraska is a public-power State."

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not at the moment. I should like to make a connected statement.

Today the city of Omaha advertises to industry, "Come to a city where you can build on the waterfront and have a guaranty that floods will not destroy your buildings. Come to Omaha. Great industrial opportunity awaits you here. No longer will the Missouri River flood you out."

The city of Omaha, whose sewage plants, water-intake lines, and other facilities were affected by floods, now gets the benefit, because South Dakota was generous and said, "Park the water in South Dakota." The Federal Government said, "Park the floodwaters in South Dakota, and keep them off Nebraska."

We have done all that. We would like to see the people of South Dakota afforded an opportunity to have access to this power. That is why we are not enthusiastic about building a 230-kilovolt line which would establish priority of use and siphon the power down into Nebraska, making it impossible for our REA's 10 years from now, to get the power they may need. Today our public bodies in South Dakota can contract only for the power for which they have immediate prospective use. They could not protect themselves for 10 years in the future if this 230-kilovolt line were built, because the pattern of use would be carried down to the preference customers in Nebraska.

We heartily applaud the decision of the committee that, until a formula is devised which will insure a fair and equitable distribution of the power, we should not permit lines to be built which would deny to South Dakota, which already provides the land upon which to park the water, the opportunity to obtain a fair distribution of the power.

I am in favor of the preference law. I have never voted to repeal the preference law. I believe that in the case cited by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Niagara case, we could well have allowed the State of New York to apply its preference law if the State of New York was to finance the building of the Niagara dam and the hydroelectric project in connection therewith.

However, I am reminded of the fact that in 1944, when Congress authorized the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, it provided specifically that the people of Montana should have the primary use of the power developed by the Hungry Horse Dam, and that it should also be available to the other States, but that the people of Montana and the State of Montana should have consideration. The water was there, the dam was there, and the people of Montana were to have a fair share of the power.

In connection with the Denison Dam in Oklahoma, I understand that a policy decision was made which made it possible for the people of Oklahoma to have some of the power developed there. I hope that before we are through there will be provided a formula which will allow some of the power to remain in South Dakota. In South Dakota we have the Gavin's Point Dam, the Randall Dam, the Oahe Dam, and the Big Bend Dam. The four dams will have a generating capacity of more than 1 billion kilowatts. I hope there will be devised some formula which will allow some of that power to remain in South Dakota; and I hope there will be devised a formula by which the people of Wyoming can get some of the power in Wyoming from the Glendo Dam in Wyoming, close to the Nebraska line.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, may I ask one question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from South Dakota is not intimating, is he, that we ought to settle this question on a dam-by-dam basis?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; although perhaps we shall have to do that. That has been done in the past. But possibly there should be general legislation.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that my good friend from Nebraska will consult with the Interior Department to determine whether or not the Interior Department has the right, under the law, to make proper and equitable distribution of this power. If not, it strikes me that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has suggested a method by which it could be done, namely, by legislation. My fear is that if the conditions which exist next year are the same as the conditions which now exist, we shall again be forced to leave dangling in the air the question as to whether or not Nebraska can get all this power. It may be that again we shall have to defer construction of this line.

If the Bureau of Reclamation cannot make a proper and equitable distribution of this power under the law as it now stands, it strikes me, as the Senator from Wyoming has stated, that some legislation ought to be enacted in order to give the Bureau the authority to do it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senator has been very generous in yielding to me. I wonder whether he would be kind enough to yield to me for 1 more minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator for yielding in response to my inquiry. When I examined the record I found that the contentions of Nebraska were not disputed; that there was nothing in the record in opposition to its request for this line, and that its position was supported by the Bureau of the Budget. The answer has been developed now as to why the committee took its action. I wish to point out that in 1955 South Dakota received 67 percent of all its load requirements from the Bureau of Reclamation and that Nebraska received 16½ percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the Senator is not intimating that in South Dakota all of the 67 percent of the load was received. I am sure the Senator

is referring to the preference customers.

Mr. CURTIS. No; the preference customers were taken care of. I do not believe that there is any justification for the belief that in the future the power will be allocated to the disadvantage of any other State. It has not been in the past. Our own belief is that while we are getting 16½ percent of our power requirements in 1955, by 1958 it will be down to 12.8 percent, but that we will need the 230-kilovolt line to get even that much. I thank the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Arizona for the consideration they gave this matter in committee.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. For the purpose of my question I read from page 7 of the committee report, as follows:

> Provo River project, Utah: The committee has approved the use of $300,000 of prior-year funds for the acquisition of additional rights-of-way easements for the diversions of water into the Provo River and Deer Creek Reservoir. Recent floods in the area have made it essential that these additional right-of-way be acquired.

I call attention to that language of the report in light of what we thought was intended in our emergency request filed with the committee, namely, that in order to get some relief for that situation it was not intended that the relief be limited to additional easements, but that the relief could include necessary river channel revision and other improvements. Many times relief can be obtained by river channel revision or by the construction of what we in the West call riprap, which would be more economical under certain conditions and just as effective as the acquisition of easements.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly that was the intention of the committee. We wanted to accomplish it in the most practical way possible. We want the most feasible method used. If it can be done by a levee or an easement, or in some other way, that is what we feel should be done.

Mr. WATKINS. Or perhaps by revising the river channel?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; whatever is the most economical way of doing it certainly should be the method used. It should be done in the most economical and in the best manner possible, and the method should not be confined to an easement. We do not want to stand on any technicality.

Mr. WATKINS. Whatever needs to be done to relieve the situation to which we have called attention. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. I thought that was the Senator's understanding, but some people in the field who must do the work were a little worried about the language, in that it might restrict them to the acquisition of easements and that they would be prohibited from making necessary river-channel rectification or repairs.

Mr. HAYDEN. Some legally minded person might look at it that way, but no practical minded person, I am sure, would go along with that thinking. We want to do what is necessary to take care of the situation.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; and it could be done by making the improvements in the ways I have mentioned.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

GRANDFATHER WILLIAM KNOWLAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me, I should like the attention of Members on both sides of the aisle for a bipartisan announcement of considerable importance. It involves the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

For many years, I have been closely associated with the Senator from California. Like every Member of this Chamber—on either side of the aisle—I have found him to be able, patriotic, courteous, and thoughtful.

But I wonder how many of my colleagues know that he is also a five-time winner in the contest for the proudest granddaddy in the Senate?

His fifth victory was chalked up last Monday when Harold W. Jewett II discovered America. Anybody who has found buttons lying on the floor in front of the minority leader's desk in the past 2 days can know now that they popped right off BILL KNOWLAND's shirt.

The Senator from California is one of the youngest leaders in Senate history. He is also one of the youngest grandfathers I know.

I have been busy trying to get a little girl out of junior high school while BILL KNOWLAND has had five grandchildren.

As I said in the beginning, this is a bipartisan announcement and for my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I want to congratulate the minority leader, Mr. and Mrs. Harold W. Jewett, and the new addition to the family.

The very best thing I can hope for Harold W. Jewett II is that he will grow up to be as fine a man, as thoughtful a man and as able a man as his grandfather. [Applause.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his very kind and gracious remarks. I was in attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations when he asked me to come to the floor of the Senate. Needless to say both Mrs. Knowland and I are highly pleased at the arrival of our fifth grandchild and second grandson.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would also like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. While speaking of grandchildren, I should also like to say something about myself. [Laughter.] I have an only son. While he was in the service he asked consent to marry. I told him it was all right provided the first six children would be boys and the seventh a girl. He failed me, in that the first five are boys and the sixth is a girl and the seventh is a boy. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to say, in a serious vein, what a marvelous country this is. We have been debating very serious matters relating to the whole Nation. The distinguished minority leader has been discussing matters relating to the whole world. The distinguished majority leader has been working out a program of legislation so that we may conclude our business in order to do other things in various parts of the country. Then we come on the floor of the Senate and there is a good feeling shown. America is indeed fortunate to have a man like LYNDON JOHNSON as the majority leader of the Senate and a man like BILL KNOWLAND as the minority leader.

So long as America has men of that kind, Mr. President, we can all carry on and know that we shall have a great and successful America.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I should like to join with the majority leader and my other distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to Grandfather KNOWLAND. [Laughter.]

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that it is expected on tomorrow to call up the conference report on the very important Department of Commerce appropriation bill.

Also, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. BYRD] intends to call up the conference report on H. R. 7247.

In addition to the bills previously scheduled, the following bills may be considered tomorrow or soon thereafter:

Calendar No. 2135, Senate bill 374, to provide for the extension and suspension in certain cases of statutes of limitation on false swearing by Government employees with respect to subversive activities and connections;

Calendar No. 2140, S. 3617, to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities;

Calendar No. 2141, S. 782, to prevent citizens of questionable loyalty to the United States from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2170, H. R. 9052, to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports;

Calendar No. 2194, S. 3866, to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2214, S. 3195, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of

Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.;

Calendar No. 2215, S. 3768, to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2216, H. R. 7896, to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville;

Calendar No. 2217, H. R. 8404, to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2218, H. R. 9377, to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles, Calif.;

Calendar No. 2219, H. R. 10417, to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States;

Calendar No. 2220, S. 2654, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

Calendar No. 2221, S. 3843, to adjust the application of section 322 of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 to premises leased for Government purposes;

Calendar No. 2222, H. R. 7855, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until June 30, 1956, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation; and

Calendar No. 2223, S. 3316, authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

Furthermore, it is intended to have the Senate consider the contempt citation resolution probably tomorrow, because, since it is now almost 4 o'clock, it is not planned to have the Senate continue in session late into the evening.

I give notice to all Senators that it is likely that the leadership will call up all of these measures tomorrow.

I am hopeful that action on the public works appropriation bill may be concluded today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope so.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I rise to pay my tribute to the senior Senator from Louisiana for the very wonderful job that he has done this year as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works. It has been my privilege to serve with him on that subcommittee and I say that it has truly been an education on efficient and effective leadership on legislation.

This is not said in the superficiality of flattery. It is said in genuine sincerity, for I saw with my own eyes and heard with my own ears day after day in serving on the subcommittee. His was a superlative demonstration of a man dedicated to his duty—of a man who had an unusual balance between a sense of efficiency and economy on the one hand and of the vital public works needs of every section of our country on the other hand.

Performance such as that displayed by the senior Senator from Louisiana is not easily achieved. It takes not only his unusual ability and keen mind but his years of experience in handling these matters for the Senate. Not only the Senate but the entire country owes him a debt of gratitude for what he has done.

I want to also commend Mr. Kenneth Bousquet, of the subcommittee staff. We just could not have done the job without him, without his remarkable ability, without his patience, and without the many, many long hours he put in. We are certainly lucky to have him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for her kind remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wish to invite the distinguished Senator's attention to page 18 of the report, with reference to the Delaware River project, an interim 35-foot project. It was authorized for a 40-foot project. As I understand, it is something which does not interfere with the authorization in 1954 of a 40-foot channel.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. The money which we are now appropriating and which will be appropriated in the future will complete the project to a 35-foot depth.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As I understand, if the next session of Congress appropriates for a 40-foot channel, that will be done?

Mr. ELLENDER. The appropriation for the interim 35-foot project does not change the existing authorization for the 40-foot project.

(The following statement by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, made during the morning hour, is, in accordance with his request, printed at this point in the RECORD:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, inasmuch as I shall be engaged in the deliberations of the Committee on Foreign Relations this afternoon during the time that the public-works appropriation bill will be debated in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the approximate place in the debate on the appropriation bill a statement which I have prepared on the deepening of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton, and on other public-works projects included in the Senate bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

We are today considering a public works appropriation bill of great interest to New Jersey.

The news contained in this bill is excellent news for many people in my State.

Many of us in New Jersey and in our neighboring State of Pennsylvania have for some time been urging the appropriation of much needed funds for the deepening of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton. My colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I urged approval of this appropriation in a joint letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, on March 23 of this year. On May 9 we wrote a similar joint letter to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The House and the Senate committee have approved the $6 million request for this project.

I am also gratified to note that the Senate committee has approved the provision in the House bill for a $500,000 special study of flood conditions and water resources of the Delaware River.

On May 9 my colleague and I wrote the distinguished Senator from Louisiana urging approval of this sum.

The bill before us contains other projects of special interest to my constituents.

The Senate committee has approved the appropriation of $4,500,000 for the deepening of the New York-New Jersey channels, the so-called Arthur Kill project. This is $1 million more than the House appropriated.

For my colleague, Senator CASE, and for the two Senators from New York, I testified before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee urging these funds for the Arthur Kill project and also urging approval of a $200,000 appropriation for a study of the serious, shocking condition in the Hudson River in the Weehawken-Edgewater section.

The House unfortunately did not approve this request, but I am most gratified to note that the Senate committee is asking for $100,000 for this important study.

The bill before us also contains $1,060,000 for construction in the Marcus Hook and Mantua Creek anchorages, and $1,800,000 for the Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge project.

I wish to pay tribute to the Senate Appropriations Committee, and especially to its subcommittee chairman, the able Senator from Louisiana, for their sympathetic action on the portions of this bill affecting the State of New Jersey.

The future of those whose livelihood depends on these various waterways has been greatly enhanced by the work of this committee.

My State, and indirectly the Nation as a whole, will be better off as a result of the action we are taking today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I wish to join with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] in the commendation she has made of the chairman of the subcommittee. Also the full membership of the committee is entitled to the thanks of the committee for a job well done. I also wish to join the Senator from Maine in expressing the appreciation not only of myself but of my entire office for the complete cooperation we received from Mr. Bousquet and the other members of the staff of the committee which has served the Senator from Louisiana so ably in his chairmanship of the subcommittee. As the Senator knows, we have had some very difficult problems in my State last year as the result of the disastrous flood which we suffered. I am sure that at times we must have seemed to the Senator from Louisiana to be somewhat of a nuisance, and not only to him, but to Mr. Bousquet and to the members of his staff as well.

I know the people of my State would want me to say this afternoon that not on a single occasion have we ever received anything but the most sympathetic attention from the chairman, the other members of the committee, and the committee staff. I am sure, also, that the people of my State would think I had failed them if I did not express in their behalf their thanks, because I know they are going to be deeply thankful for what the Senator's committee under his understanding leadership has done for the Pacific Northwest through this bill.

I think it is the soundest conservation appropriation bill that has come out of the committee in my 12 years of service in the Senate. I do not think we can begin fully to understand the implications of the bill until we experienced the flood-control benefits that are bound to flow from it in the years ahead. The Senator from Louisiana, working in teamwork fashion with that great man from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is chairman of the full committee, has again demonstrated that we have an appropriations committee with a leadership that understands the importance of our conserving and developing to the maximum potentiality the natural resources of this country.

I wish Members of the Senate would take a look for a moment, as I use examples in my own State, at some of the conservation implications of the bill which is before us.

Here is a bill which nationally, according to my figures, shows some $410,000 increases for surveys in the field of navigation and some $690,000 increases for surveys in the field of flood control.

If we wish to look at it from the standpoint of an incentive to the economy of the country or from the standpoint of soundly conserving of our natural resources, I do not care from what angle we look at it, the committee has done a magnificent job.

Too frequently in the Senate, I think, as we fight over appropriation issues for our States, as we try to get all we can for our States, we are not sufficiently cognizant of the problems confronting the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee.

I know the benefits of sound flood control could not have come to pass if he had not had understanding members on the appropriation committee who have brought forth, I repeat, the greatest conservation appropriation bill that I have observed since I have been a Member of the Senate.

I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], not from the standpoint of the selfish interest of my State, but because I think this bill is a sound natural resource conservation bill which is going to bring a great many benefits in the form of intangibles as well as tangibles to the people of the country. How can we evaluate saving people from the disaster of a flood? We cannot do it. We know that when we pass this bill today we are going to reduce materially flood disasters in the years immediately ahead. We are going to reduce the losses and costs of flood disasters.

I want the Senator from Louisiana to know, Mr. President, that I am grateful, and I want the committee to know that I am grateful. I think we should express in the Senate appreciation when we are as deeply moved as I am deeply moved in behalf of the people of my State with reference to this bill.

I have only a question or two, and I wish to ask them only for the purpose of legislative history.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, I appeared before his committee and made a plea for the earmarking of some projects for surveys, and the Senator very rightly told me it was not the policy of the committee to earmark funds for surveys. He told me in the very beginning that the Pacific Northwest projects were not going to be earmarked, but that he would be very glad to have my testimony concerning particular projects. As he knows, I testified in behalf of studies for the Umpqua River, the Silvies River, Coos Bay, Coquille River and tributaries, Crooked River, Klamath River, lower Columbia River, Luckiamute River and Rickreall Creek, Rogue River and tributaries, Yamhill River, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, and Powder River and tributaries. The President's original budget made no provision for any of these except Umpqua River (Winchester Bay) and Silvies River.

The Senator from Louisiana made it very clear to me that he wanted my testimony to be in the record, but that he thought I should know that the specific projects would not be earmarked, because it is not the policy of the committee and it has not been the policy of the committee to earmark them. But in view of the fact that there is an increase of $690,000 in the Senate committee bill for flood control surveys, I am asking if, in connection with the flood survey projects, we might assume, in view of the record which was made in the committee, that the Army engineers would seek to carry out these proposed Oregon surveys if they are deemed to be feasible, unless some good cause could be shown why any of those surveys should not be carried out.

Mr. ELLENDER. My good friend from Oregon has correctly stated that the Senate Committee on Appropriations does not earmark funds for any particular project, so far as general investigations are concerned, but the increase in funds for flood control studies—$690,000 over and above what the House provided—is intended to take care of the projects he mentioned, as well as others that have been gone into by the subcommittee and which are a part of the record. I direct the Senator's attention to the language at the bottom of page 10 of the report:

> The committee prefers not to make specific allocations to individual investigations. It desires, however, to call to the attention of the Corps of Engineers the testimony presented to the committee with respect to the need for increased amounts for surveys contained in its tentative allocation of the budget recommendations and expects that increased amounts will be applied to those surveys wherever feasible. In the allocation of the balance of the increases recommended it is desired that careful consideration be given to the needs of those areas for which testimony was presented to the committee. The allocation of the funds recommended by the committee is shown on the following table:

Then follow the specific amounts.

The Senator from Oregon can readily see that the testimony he presented, as well as that presented by many other Senators, related to various projects, and it was from the amounts sought by the Senators and by other witnesses for flood control study purposes that the committee reached its conclusion as to the amount of the increase it should recommend for this work.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator will note, there is no question in my mind that the Corps of Engineers will consider the projects which were presented to the committee, and for which the money is really being provided. But, as I said, many projects are presented which the Corps of Engineers considers but finds to be not feasible, and so it does not look into them further. But the final decision is, of course, left to the Corps of Engineers.

If the Senator's projects are worthy, as I believe them to be, from the testimony, the bill contains ample funds to take care of them, provided, of course, we can convince the House that the increase voted by the Senate is desirable.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for the statement he has made. I understand the Senator's position, but he knows very well that sometimes these things are not understood back home. I wanted the record to show that although we presented testimony in behalf of the Oregon specific projects which I enumerated a few minutes ago, the long-standing policy of the committee is that the committee does not earmark the funds for specific surveys, but makes a record on each project, and the Army Engineers, on the basis of the record, have the discretionary right to

decide which ones they believe are most worthy.

We are dealing here with the particular streams which caused us so much flood damage in Oregon last year. I wanted the people of my State to understand why the projects are not earmarked, and why they must take their chances under a general appropriation for survey purposes, with the Army Engineers having at their discretion money for the specific purpose of surveying the projects which they think most meritorious.

I express once more a word of thanks, because we have in the appropriation special references to some drainage districts on the Lower Columbia River, namely, the Beaver, John, Midland, Multnomah No. 1, Peninsula No. 1, Peninsula No. 2, Rainier, and Sauvies Island.

I know that the people who have suffered great flood losses in the area of those districts would want me to say this to the chairman of the committee, and also to the other members of the committee: We deeply appreciate the favorable consideration which these items have received in the bill, because those people have "had it." They have gone through the disaster of floods. When we deal with this section of my State, we are dealing with a section where the water has been over the banks and where tremendous damage has been suffered.

Mr. ELLENDER. This matter was taken up by me with the Corps of Engineers. The proponents of the surveys unquestionably made a splendid case. The subcommittee allowed all the money which could possibly be used in that area.

There are 2, 3, or 4 other projects which will receive attention next year, but the Corps of Engineers have stated to the committee emphatically that the numbers of projects for which we have provided is all that the corps could economically take care of this year.

It is a great pity that projects of this kind, and projects in Connecticut—and, in fact, the entire Northeast— for which we had to provide funds had to await congressional action until a great disaster occurred in that region.

The Senator will remember that back in 1928 a flood occurred along the Mississippi River which resulted in damage of more than $2 billion. It was because of the tremendous losses which were suffered by the people in the Mississippi Valley that the Flood Control Act of 1928 was passed.

By the same token, a great many worthy projects in the Northeast, from Maine down through the New England States, have been lying dormant for many years. It required a tropical hurricane and the tremendous floods of last year to make the people of that area realize that the projects which had been authorized urgently need to be built. The record shows that if the projects which had been authorized had been built, the floods would not have occurred, and the losses from storm and flood damages were greater than the entire cost of the projects for which we are now planning.

Mr. MORSE. That is going to be true in my State. I think it will be found that the cost of the projects, many times over, will be saved.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what prompted the subcommittee, as well as the full committee, to study all the projects, and authorize amounts over and above the budget requests.

Mr. MORSE. The last thing I want to say is that not only do I want the chairman of the committee to know of my appreciation for what he has done, and to give him thanks on behalf of my State, but I also want to pay tribute to the committee for its nonpartisanship in this matter. I talked to Republican members of the committee. I want to say, to their everlasting credit, they did not hesitate a moment on the merits of any of my proposals in these flood-control projects, because they, too, recognize, as we all should, that when we are dealing with flood control we are dealing with a nonpartisan matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator well knows that floods do not distinguish between Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our subcommittee and the full committee work for the country as a whole. It strikes me that if all the projects which have been authorized were built soon we could prevent the tremendous losses, not only in lives and physical improvements, but in precious topsoil that occur every time there is a flood. That is one reason I have taken so much interest in this bill, as well as in other legislation pertaining to conservation of our resources.

It strikes me that if the Senate will stand behind the appropriations contained in the pending bill and can get the House to agree to what the Senate may recommend, then within the next 5 or 6 years we shall be able to prevent a great proportion of the loss of life and property that occurs during floods and save billions of tons of topsoil which is washed down to the sea.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a request on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I read the following provision, beginning on line 12, page 13, of the bill:

> Funds made available herein and hereafter to the Trinity division, Central Valley project, shall be available for the design and construction of power and hydraulic facilities totaling not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts.

The original authorization was for 233,000 kilowatts, but storage on Clear Creek was not contemplated at that time. Since that is now contemplated, the committee authorized 400,000 kilowatts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I addressed to the Secretary of the Interior in regard to the matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 11, 1956.

The Honorable FRED SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Committee on Appropriations recommended the inclusion of the following amendment in the Public Works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957 (H. R. 11319):

"Funds made available herein and hereafter to the Trinity Division, Central Valley project, shall be available for the design and construction of power facilities totaling not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts."

In explaining this action the committee stated in its report:

"The authorizing act for the Trinity Division provided for a power development of not to exceed 233,000 kilowatts, which was based on the plan of development that did not include storage on Clear Creek. In order to have a full development of the resource the power capacity will have to be increased. The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize the development of power facilities not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts."

A question has arisen as to the intent of the committee in recommending this provision. The purpose of this letter is to answer these questions.

The provision recommended by the committee has only one purpose, which is to increase the authorized power development from that of 233,000 kilowatts contained in the authorizing act (Public Law 386, 83d Cong.) to not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts.

It was not the intent of the committee to in any way effect the provisions of the authorizing act set out in the proviso in section 1, pertaining to the negotiations with a private utility in the area for the development of the power facilities of the project.

With respect to funds appropriated in the bill for the Central Valley Project, the schedule presented in the budget justifications shall not be considered as being amended by this provision.

Yours very sincerely,

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to join the senior Senator from Oregon in expressing appreciation to the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the very careful consideration which the worthwhile projects in our State, and in the Pacific Northwest generally, have received. In the comparatively short time I have been a Member of the Senate, I have been impressed extremely favorably by the way in which the senior Senator from Louisiana has put the welfare of our country ahead of any other considerations when the public works appropriation bills are reported to the Senate.

I shall not repeat what the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, other than to add that, as the Senator from Louisiana pointed out, to have ignored these fine projects would have been extremely penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The Pacific Northwest appears to be that part of the country which has perhaps the greatest rainfall on its seacoast, and unless the floods of its vast rivers are controlled, those waters are lost. If those floods are controlled, it is to the country's lasting benefit. The economy of our region is strengthened.

I wish to join the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in expressing gratitude for what the Senate committee has done. I am sure the people of my State and the people of the whole Pacific

Northwest will appreciate the faithful service of the senior Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues on the committee.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his stalwart leadership as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. He has been most courteous and gracious to the people of the Great Lakes area whose representatives have appeared before the committee. I wish him to know that the people of the Great Lakes region are appreciative of his sympathetic view of their problems. I also wish to extend my commendation to the very able clerk, Mr. Bousquet.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. I, too, want to commend the senior Senator from Louisiana for his fine work on the bill. In it he has brought before the Senate very worthwhile recommendations.

I should like to call his attention to a couple of items affecting my own State. In the first place, I may say the $400,000 item for the Snake River in the Jackson Hole area will permit some permanent work on one of the bad streams of the West. This spring there were very bad flood conditions on the river. I am glad a permanent program is being started there. I am hopeful that the work can be carried to a conclusion, so the expenditure of so much money on a temporary basis can be avoided.

I am also interested in another item, the one with respect to Goose Creek in the Sheridan area. I appreciate the fact that the committee has authorized an item of $25,000 for plans for that project. There have been bad flood conditions in that area—even within the past 10 days. I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Sheridan Press under date of May 29, 1956, which newspaper also contains pictures showing some of the great damage done to the city of Sheridan by the flood on Goose Creek.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Sheridan Press dealing with this subject matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FLOOD WATERS RECEDE AFTER CAUSING DAMAGE—CROPS, GARDENS, AND BASEMENTS ARE HIT AS GOOSE CREEK OVERFLOWS

Menacing flood waters in the Sheridan area resulting from the 2.22 inches of rain were dropping today but not without some damages left behind.

Crops and gardens near the rampaging creeks were flooded with shrubs and flowers being floated out in some instances, and there were many flooded basements in homes located near the areas where water broke over the banks.

The Big Goose, which did its darndest but not quite its bestest, crested last night at 11:15 o'clock at a gage high of 6.94 feet, according to the USGS here.

But the creek is falling steadily, as is Little Goose. According to USGS measurements of Big Goose at 7:30 a. m. today the gage height was 6.83 feet, and the discharge 3.170 second feet. At 10 a. m. today, the gage height was 6.75 feet.

It has been a busy and somewhat worrisome 24 hours, however.

Water at city park broke the banks flooding the nearby shorelands about the middle of the afternoon yesterday. The park was closed to traffic last night.

Yesterday morning city crews managed to loosen driftwood at the millrace dam with a dragline, and then the dragline hooked on the dam. It was later freed.

Water was reported in yards of residences near the creeks in the city. But probably the worst flooding took place in the Thorne-Rider ball park area where streets and yards were under water.

Out along the Big Goose west of town low-lying pastures were under water, and ranch buildings and ranch equipment looked rather strange isolated by creek-made lakes.

Help was called to the Maverick south of town yesterday afternoon and banks were built up to hold back the water. Mrs. L. W. McEwan reported this morning that they got along fine, and that there is just a little water in their basement.

George L. Haynes, engineer in charge of the Sheridan USGS office, reported that Piney Creek was running bankfull at Ucross about 3:30 yesterday afternoon and was still rising.

At Ranchester, the Tongue River was reported down 8 inches this morning after cresting about midnight.

Principal concern was the pump which serves the town's water system but the water receded after flowing into the pumphouse pit and rising within 6 inches of the pump. Had the pump been flooded the water system would have been out of operation.

The Ranchester park was under water, and at the crest the road near the river bridge was inundated.

Damage was believed slight to farms and ranches although lowlands were flooded.

Along the Little Tongue River at Dayton water was reported in several basements.

Swollen by mountain snow runoff and rains, both North Piney and South Piney were high at Story where a hard rain fell about 8 o'clock this morning.

Story reported that North Piney is down about 2½ feet this morning.

Water was reported in the George Vuylsteke basement, and in yards on Pinedale Avenue. The Teunis Clark place was damaged on North Piney Road. Flower beds were washed out and a section of patio damaged. Gravel placed on roads in Story has been somewhat washed away by the rain. The creek partly diverted into the old channel near the Anita Barton cabins.

Mervin Champion and Gaskill were unable to cross over to their places by car due to high water. A number of privately owned small bridges were washed away when driftwood piled up near the structures.

The United States Weather Bureau at Sheridan predicts considerable cloudiness this afternoon and tonight with scattered thundershowers this evening and a few afternoon showers Wednesday. Warmer temperatures are expected, however, with a high of 70 to 75 degrees.

The 2.2? inches recorded for the storm brings the May amount to 4.92 inches or 2.28 above average for the entire month. Total moisture since January 1 now measures 9.78 inches or 2.30 above normal.

Barring heavy rains in the mountains which would again bring the Goose Creek, Tongue River and others in the vicinity to flood stage, the waters are expected to continue dropping until the normal high for this period of spring when snows are melting is reached, officials believe.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I may say, the amount allowed is completely inadequate. I have taken the matter up with the Army engineers. I have in my hand a letter signed by E. C. Itschner, major general, United States Army, in which he says additional funds should be supplied if the necessary investigation is to be made this year and the river brought under control by flood-control construction next year.

I have discussed this matter with my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, and he has told me he would be glad to consider the item in the supplemental bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to say to my good friend from Wyoming that the estimated cost of the project is $2,470,000. Up to now no money has been provided for planning. The appropriation of $25,000 recommended is for planning. If a case can be made before the committee, in considering the supplemental bill, that the project should be constructed during the next fiscal year, I am sure the committee will be glad to consider the project in its study of the supplemental bill—provided the project is warranted. The Senator has submitted for the RECORD a letter from the Corps of Engineers. That has not before come to my attention, but I give assurance to my friend that I shall be glad to present it to the committee in its consideration of the next supplemental appropriation bill, before the present session ends.

Mr. BARRETT. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter which I received from General Itschner.

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

JUNE 12, 1956.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARRETT: Reference is made to your recent request for information, concerning the possibility of expediting the planning with a view toward early initiation of construction of the Sheridan, Wyo., flood-control project.

As you know, no funds have been appropriated for this project. The amount of $25,000 was included in the President's budget estimate for fiscal year 1957 for the initiation of preconstruction planning work. However, no funds were included in the Public Works Appropriation Bill for fiscal year 1957 as recently passed by the House of Representatives. The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee (Report No. 2169) on this appropriation bill included a recommendation for an allocation of the budget estimate, $25,000, to this project.

In answer to your inquiry as to whether, in view of recent damaging floods along Goose Creek in the Sheridan area, it would be practicable to utilize funds in addition to this amount, the following information is furnished. The amount of $25,000 included for this project in the fiscal year 1957 budget represents the best allocation for this project after consideration of this project in relation to the total budgetary requirements of all projects in the civil works program now before the Congress, and the relationship of these requirements to those for all Federal programs. While it would be practicable to expend an additional $35,000 for planning work on this

project in fiscal year 1957, considering this project by itself without relation to the overall program, we cannot at this time recommend that any additional funds be made available in fiscal year 1957.

You also asked for advice as to what specific work could be accomplished with any additional amount which might be utilized in fiscal year 1957. The additional amount of $35,000 would permit completion of the general design of the overall project and initiation of detailed design including plans and specifications for one of the three units tentatively set up for the project. This would permit initiation of construction at an earlier date.

I trust that the information furnished will be adequate for your needs.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Major General, United States Army,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relating to the Goose Creek in the Sheridan area.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARRETT

The town of Sheridan in my State is located on Goose Creek at the foot of Big Horn Mountains. It is a town of 12,000 people. When the snow melts in the spring of the year the danger of floods is always imminent and a matter of great concern to the people of that community. Since 1883 there have been a total of 22 floods or an average of 1 every 3 years, some of which were worse than others and a couple that were disastrous in character and all of which were extremely destructive to many of the citizens along the stream. These floods cause extensive damage to residential, business, and industrial areas as well as public buildings, streets, bridges, highways, railroad facilities, and utilities systems.

The communities at the base of these great mountains near the Continental Divide in the mountainous West are subject to attack from these vicious floods caused by the heavy runoff from the terrific snow packs of the previous winter.

While the floods in the Sheridan area are not normally the worst in our State, nevertheless they have been very bad at times and flood loss over the years is estimated somewhat in excess of a half million dollars.

The Sheridan project was authorized by Congress in 1950 and it is estimated that the total cost of the project will be $2,470,000. Since the authorization of the project, however, no funds have been made available to complete the planning phase of the work.

This year the Army engineers submitted a budget request for $25,000 to initiate planning on the Sheridan project. I am advised that the engineers could wisely utilize an additional $35,000 for planning this year and with that amount the planning can be pretty well completed.

I am today in receipt of a letter from Gen. E. C. Itschner, the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for the great care which he has given to this entire matter.

The hearings which I hold in my hand apparently weigh some four or five pounds, and comprise some 3,200 pages.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say that we heard 683 witnesses in 2½ months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, imagination almost fails at the contemplation of that number.

When we reflect on the days and months the Senator from Louisiana spent on the farm bill, then to have this task in addition was a crushing burden. So the thanks of the Senate should go to the Senator from Louisiana. I only hope he has not endangered his health, despite his strong constitution. I sincerely hope he will not overdo and that he will take care of himself.

Mr. President, I wish to make a general statement on the whole matter of river and harbor appropriations and to some degree upon the reclamation items as well.

As the Senators know, when I first came to this body, I became somewhat alarmed at the tendency of localities and business interests to demand appropriations, at the public expense, for projects which, although partially justified, did not justify the full amount of expenditures by the general taxpayers. I worked hard on individual items, and carried my objections to the floor of the Senate. Although I was treated very courteously and in a friendly fashion by the other Members of the Senate, I think that on almost every occasion I was turned down. On 1 or 2 bills I had some success which up to date has saved large amounts of money. So on these river and harbor bills I felt as if I were butting my head against a rubber wall, and rebounding at every effort. I do not claim to have been correct on every objection I raised. Undoubtedly I made mistakes.

I think we all know some of the difficulties which are involved in these bills. They are not the fault of the Members of the Senate or the fault of the Members of the House of Representatives. Instead, they are primarily the fault of the pressures from the home communities. When the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the cost of a given improvement, which also will be of benefit to local individuals and local industrial groups, then there is an incentive for local groups and private business interests to feed out of the public trough.

One of the ironic and extraordinary features about this situation is that such claims for local improvements frequently are made by groups and citizens who also are vociferous in their demands for overall governmental economy. On the one hand, they demand governmental economy; and on the other hand, they demand large appropriations for their particular interests. Unless a Senator or Representative complies, and tries to get the Congress to make such appropriations for his home groups or his home State, he is quickly attacked by the local groups, local newspapers, and others, and speedily finds his way to the political graveyard. So a tremendous pressure—almost more than flesh and blood can stand or can permanently resist—is placed on Members of Congress.

I wish to refer to some of the projects to which I take exception. Some of them result from requests that the Government deepen a channel or a river, although the full or major share benefit of the project will go to a group of private business men, or in some cases to private speculators, or in other cases to big business, which will not contribute anything to the cost of the project, but will reap great rewards as a result of lower freight rates or reduced shipping costs.

Mr. President, I am not always a diplomatic fellow; so I hope the Senators from Pennsylvania will not take it amiss if I say that I feel that the project to deepen to 41 feet the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton, which will serve only one mill—the Fairless mill, of the United States Steel Corp.—is a project of that type. In my opinion, the United States Steel Corp. is abundantly able to pay for the cost of the project, and certainly is able to pay for half of the cost.

Some years ago we had a similar appropriation for deepening the Detroit River—which would have benefited only the Detroit Edison Co. I think I have detected in the pending bill 2 or 3 appropriations of a somewhat similar nature.

Very frankly, Mr. President, I should like to state what has happened. I present myself as a case, not because I, myself, am important, but because my case illustrates the difficulties of the democratic process. I fought these appropriations for 6 years, but with little effect upon legislation. I am sure that almost all I have done has been to make, not enemies, but opponents on the floor of this body. It was not a way to make friends. So far as my own State is concerned, I am now overwhelmed by demands from localities and business interests to have further appropriations made. The very groups which demand governmental economy will also demand projects costing $100 million or lesser amounts, and all at the public expense; and those groups are unwilling to contribute much if anything to the cost of the projects themselves, although they will benefit very greatly from them.

Mr. President, I shall very frankly confess that I have been somewhat worn out by this struggle, both by my ultimate lack of success on the floor of the Senate and by lack of support in my own State. Therefore I am temporarily retiring from the wars on this subject. I do not promise that I am permanently retiring from the wars; but at the moment I am exhausted not only by opposition from in front but also by sorties from the rear. So I am going to pause, and recapture my breath, and hope that a little deeper sense of responsibility will develop in the Nation as a whole.

Let me make just a few general observations: I think it is almost hopeless for any Senator to try to do what I tried to do when I first came to this body, namely, to consider these projects one by one. This bill is built up out of a whole system of mutual accommodations, in which the favors are widely distributed, with the implicit promise that no one will kick over the applecart;

that if Senators do not object to the bill as a whole, they will "get theirs." It is a process, if I may use an inelegant expression, of mutual backscratching and mutual logrolling. Any Member who tries to buck the system is only confronted with an impossible amount of work in trying to ascertain the relative merits of a given project; and any Member who does ascertain them, and who feels convinced that he is correct, is unable to get an individual project turned down because the Senators from the State in which the project is located, and which thus is benefiting, naturally will oppose any objection to the project; and the other Members of the Senate will feel that they must support the Senators in question, because if they do not do so, similar appropriations for their own States at some time likely will be called into question.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to finish my apologia, and then I shall yield.

So, Mr. President, I think it will be hopeless to attack this problem item by item. Any Senator who does will get worn out and exhausted by it. The steamroller will go over any Senator who attempts to do so. I hasten to state that I certainly do not mean to say that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] or the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are steamroller engineers. But any Senator who attempts to attack this problem item by item will find that the sheer processes of life will go over him, and he will have to retire from the war.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, I announce that, for the time being, at least, I am taking a vacation from this struggle, until there is a deeper public appreciation of what is involved.

However, I should like to make some general suggestions. While I think it is hopeless to attack these projects individually, we could help clear up the situation if we were to require the communities and industries which benefit to pay an appreciable share of the costs. If the local communities or businesses have to foot a part of the bill they will not be as eager to get both feet and their snouts in the public trough. They will scrutinize the worthwhileness of the projects more carefully, and generally cut down their requests for appropriations, because they will have to pay a portion of the bill.

I hope, therefore, that we can arrive at a formula which, in connection with river and harbor appropriations, will assess a portion of the cost against the localities and the individuals benefited. The poorer communities should pay less than those that are well to do.

In the case of river improvements, I think we should bear in mind that in the narrowing of the channels a great deal of land is reclaimed. On occasion the Army engineers have boasted that they have reclaimed more land than has the Bureau of Reclamation. They reclaim it at almost 100-percent cost to the Federal Government. Speculators can buy up the swampland at a small cost, turn bulldozers onto it, and convert it into very rich land, worth many times the cost, because of the rich deposits of soil which have accumulated over the course of centuries.

I believe that the land thus reclaimed should be assessed for a portion of the cost. I certainly think that companies which benefit directly, as United States Steel will benefit from the deepening of the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton, should pay a portion of the cost.

We must also rethink the question of tolls on the benefited waterways. Suppose we reduce shipping costs 50 cents a ton to an individual company, at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States. Is it not proper that the individual company should pay at least 10 or 20 cents a ton in increased toll charges, to pay for the cost of the improvement which has thus benefited it?

We have made a beginning in this direction in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway. I am very happy that we have done so. The cost of the St. Lawrence Seaway is to be met by tolls imposed on shipping which goes through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I was very glad that the principle was introduced, because it will tend to make the St. Lawrence seaway self-supporting. I should be perfectly willing to apply the same principle to the connecting channels on the Great Lakes, including the Mackinac and Detroit Rivers. It could be applied in many other areas.

So I hope that we may consider this subject and try to devise automatic safeguards which will lessen the terrific pressure which now operates upon each Senator and Member of the House, resulting in a great waste of public funds. Under the present circumstances, it is virtually impossible for any one Senator or any group of Senators to correct the situation. So, as I say, I am sure I will gladden the hearts of many of my colleagues if I say that I am temporarily "retiring from the wars," but I hope to return some day, not with an attack on specific projects, but with some specific proposals which will lessen the general pressure.

Before I take my seat I wish to congratulate again the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for the extraordinarily faithful work he has done. When I first came here I heard him speak for 15 hours, and saw him as fresh at the end of the 15 hours as he was at the beginning. Until that record was beaten by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I thought it was the most amazing display of physical and mental vitality I had ever seen. I disagreed with what he said, but his manner of saying it was an extraordinary performance. But this year the Senator from Louisiana has outdistanced them all—with continuous hearings on the farm bill and continuous hearings on what I still persist in calling the rivers and harbors bill. I do not see how he stands it. We are very grateful to him for his work; and I know the conscientiousness with which he has approached his task.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. A few years ago I expressed the hope that the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois would obtain a seat on the Appropriations Committee, in order that he might work with us on the Appropriations Committee rather than work on us as members of that committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say to my good friend from Minnesota that I have never tried to work on members of the committee. However, I feel that in addition to the functions and responsibilities of individual members of the committees, the Senate, as a deliberative body, has also a function to perform. I believe that a member of the Senate ought not to feel that he has fully discharged his duty unless he speaks his mind on points on which he feels strongly, and on which he feels somewhat informed. Perhaps if I improve my strength a little, I may be back in the future, and the Senator from Minnesota may not be quite as happy.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana a question. I refer to page 11 of the report. I think I understand the situation; but for the purpose of clarifying the RECORD—and I am quite sure that what I have in mind is taken care of—under the title of "General Investigations, Fiscal Year 1957," I note that the committee increased the amount allowed by the House from $8,122,000 to $9,322,000. Am I to understand that this increase is available for the making of surveys in cases in which the respective legislative committees may adopt resolutions ordering that such surveys be made?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I refer him to the language at the bottom of page 10 of the report, which I read into the RECORD earlier, and which serves notice on the Corps of Engineers as to why these increases were made. As I pointed out a while ago, we have received many requests from Senators and Members of the House, as well as from others throughout the country, for such surveys.

As a result of such requests we have increased the sum involved. Although we are not directing the engineers to undertake surveys of specific projects, yet we ask them to bear in mind those projects which have been brought to their attention, either in the record or by way of resolutions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether, in making this increase in allowance for surveys by the Corps of Engineers, it was the desire of the committee to provide for a number of surveys on which testimony had been presented?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the review of a project come within the definition of a survey of a project? Is the review of an

already authorized project included within that definition?

Mr. ELLENDER. There are several projects which have been deferred for restudy. In those circumstances we have earmarked money for such programs.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to exactly what I have in mind.

A situation has developed concerning the authorized navigation project on the Ouachita River in Arkansas. It should be reviewed. To this end I have introduced the necessary review resolution. I am hopeful that the Public Works Committee will approve the resolution.

The cost of this review survey is estimated by the Corps of Army Engineers to be about $10,000. It is expected that the Corps of Engineers will initiate this survey to determine the feasibility of relocating the existing dam No. 8 near Calion, Ark., with the funds provided for the general investigation. Is that authority contained in this appropriation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; generally. The Senator is referring to an authorized project, I assume.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is not only authorized, but physically in existence. The possibility is that it needs relocating.

Mr. ELLENDER. Any funds appropriated for a project can be used for that purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not want to submit an amendment on that point if I understood that the kind of project I have referred to is included in the bill. It is a small project which needs to be resurveyed and reviewed with a view to relocating it.

Mr. ELLENDER. All these surveys are made of unauthorized projects to determine whether Congress should authorize them. However, in the case the Senator from Arkansas has mentioned, when Congress appropriates money for a project it has authorized, that money can be used for resurveying it, and that could be done in the case the Senator has in mind.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator very much. I wish to associate myself with the fine compliments which have been paid to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill before the Senate and to the distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I work with both Senators and I know of their devotion to duty in connection with appropriation bills, particularly the bill now pending before the Senate. Therefore I wish to associate myself with the fine compliments which have been paid to the Senators this afternoon, because I know how richly the compliments are deserved.

I desire to say, although not necessarily by way of answering the distinguished Senator from Illinois, that in many places, as Senators know, the local people have paid and paid, have bonded their homes and have mortgaged their properties to initiate projects, and in practically all of them, particularly with reference to levees and so forth, they still pay by giving rights-of-way and by paying maintenance costs after the projects are built. Therefore it is not a case entirely of merely legislating benefits to some particular individuals or some particular business.

Beyond all that, as we build these projects and as we develop our country and provide opportunities for people to have homes and have farms and to have their businesses, we preserve and advance the economy of the Nation and that in turn makes it possible for the people affected to pay their income taxes. Those income taxes become quite an important item not only from the standpoint of our Government, but from the standpoint of the economy of the whole country and the economy of the people who earn the money.

Therefore our country and our Government lose nothing by these projects. There might be, now and then, a project here or there which is not economically justified, but in the overall and in the general program, and in the light of what is accomplished, the economy of an area is enhanced, and in time additional revenue is realized through taxation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not want to debate the matter with my good friend from Illinois, but I could cite a project in his own State, the so-called Calumet Sag Channel which I believe is a good answer to his objection. That project cost about $90 million, and it is estimated that the contribution that will be made by the local people will amount to more than $18 million. A project of that kind protects business in a locality and helps the whole country. Let us also consider, for example, a project of the kind that we are building along the Ohio River in order to provide better navigation and better transportation. As a rule the rivers are used to carry bulk material. However, on the banks of the rivers a great many factories are built; they bring more people to the area and, as a result, more taxes are collected. I would give assurance to my good friend from Illinois that, so far as I know, every project in the bill has been carefully scrutinized by the committee and has been justified by the Army Corps of Engineers.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I wish to join my colleagues in commending the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the other members of the full committee and of the subcommittee for the work they have done in preparing the pending bill and making it ready for action on the floor of the Senate.

They have demonstrated in a very remarkable way a grasp of the problems and situations involved and of the opportunities afforded to improve the general welfare of our country. I appreciate the remarks made a little while ago by the Senator who referred to the nonpartisan attitude or element of conservation. I regard it as bipartisan. It is one of the most important functions of government. If I am not mistaken, the first bill passed by the first Congress of the United States provided for the payment of salaries of Members of Congress. The second bill provided for governmental assistance in the building of a canal to bring about transportation between certain areas of the Original Thirteen States.

Transportation facilities have always been regarded as being connected with the public welfare and the responsibility of the General Government. We are in the process of approving a highway construction bill which will cost tens of billions of dollars. It will improve our transportation facilities, reinforce the national defense, and increase the vitality and productivity of our country. I know of nothing in that bill which requires adjacent property owners to pay for the roads which are to be built.

I am not sure but that the information the distinguished Senator from Illinois—for whom I have great respect and affection—gave us a little while ago was good news. For many years I was under the impression that either the Appropriations Committee ought to take him in as a member or abdicate in deference to him, or that he should remove from his own shoulders the heavy burden of responsibility which he seemed to try to assume in attempting to rewrite appropriation bills on the floor of the Senate.

I think he is a great man, a fine man, a sincere man, and a good man. However, I have always felt that he had undertaken a burden under which no Senator could stand up and survive, and I watched him undertake it with great concern for his physical health and endurance.

Therefore it is good news to the Senate and to the fine constituency of our friend from Illinois that he will now sidestep the assumption of that great burden and tremendous responsibility.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to thank the committee for the very fine job it has done. I remember the evidence of the Chief of Engineers before the Public Works Subcommittee a few months ago in which he advised that all the flood-control projects now in operation had, during the period since their construction, produced economic benefits at the rate of at least four times their cost, as estimated at the time of their authorization and construction. In other words, all the flood-control projects constructed and operated by the Federal Government, none of which had been authorized unless it was in excess of 1 to 1 of benefits to cost, had produced in the period of their operation more than 4 times the economic benefits which it had been estimated they would produce.

The distinguished Chief of Engineers made another statement, Mr. President, which I think is of profound significance to every Senator and to every citizen. He said that unless we develop a more aggressive program of soil and water conservation, within the next 50 years vast areas of our country will become so dry and arid that they will resemble the Gobi Desert.

It has been most amazing to note the enormous increase in the per capita consumption of water and the per capita requirements of water, the greatly increased degree of pollution in our rivers

and streams, and the increasing evidence that we have not developed and conserved our water resources at a rate proportionate to the increased use we have made of them and the demands we have exacted.

I think the bill now before the Senate, Mr. President, is the most forward-looking step which the committee has ever taken and the Senate has ever taken more nearly to meet the requirements for the future welfare of our country in the matter of flood control, conservation, and use of water. If we are to avoid the terrible catastrophe so dramatically described by the Chief of Engineers as the impending possibility of vast areas becoming a Gobi Desert, we must not only put into effect the provisions of this bill but we must, in the future, develop an even more aggressive program of conservation of water and conservation of our soil and natural resources.

The work of the great Senator from Louisiana and his subcommittee will be one of the finest monuments ever erected in any session of the Congress to their dedication to the public welfare and their ability efficiently and properly to serve the Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry about and to express my interest in the last item on page 17 of the report. But before I do that, Mr. President, I should like to make an observation or two with reference to the discussion which occurred earlier on the floor, not with the idea of revising it, but out of justice and fairness, and perhaps for the information of the Senate, to make clear the position of Omaha in connection with the works on the upper reaches of the Missouri River.

We are grateful for the generosity of the Federal Government in doing whatever it can for us, whether directly or indirectly. We are also grateful to the State of South Dakota. On the other hand, I do not think Senators or anyone else should be under the impression that any part of the State of Nebraska or the State as a whole has been overreaching in connection with power from the dams which are on the upstream reaches of the Missouri River. The Omaha Public Power District embraces not only the county in which Omaha is located, but likewise several adjoining counties. It does not get any power from the Bureau of Reclamation. It supplies its own needs and has enough for export beyond the confines of its municipal corporate limits.

It seemed to me that those facts should be in the RECORD for the purpose of negativing any idea that we are overreaching.

Mr. President, I should at this time like to associate myself with the commendation of the chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Even on the sore point of the 230 kilovolts line, he has shown himself to be fair. I hope that as time progresses we shall be able to work in cooperation with our neighbor States and arrive at a solution which will be mutually satisfactory.

With reference to the final item on page 17 of the report, it has been my understanding that the Corps of Engineers is about ready to do construction work on that project. I am wondering if we could have a statement in the RECORD in explanation of why there should be a sum for planning rather than an allowance for construction.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will note on page 1595 of part 2 of the hearings that the entire cost of the project is $113,000, and that the benefit ratio is 2.85 to 1, which is a very good ratio. The Budget Bureau took the position when the survey report was submitted to Congress, that before proceeding with the construction of the project a further study should be made by way of planning to see whether a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio could be obtained and still give greater flood protection. If the cost of the project remains within $150,000 I can give assurance to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that, under the law as it stands, the Corps of Engineers will be able to construct the project without having to come back to Congress for the full amount, for the simple reason that it comes within the category of small projects costing under $150,000, and such projects are authorized.

Mr. HRUSKA. So that if the study for the purpose of increasing the degree of protection should result in estimates under $150,000, the project would still fall within the category to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. We have provided extra money for projects of this character.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to express my appreciation of the work of the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana in connection with this bill. The bill presents a well-rounded program treating all sections of the country equitably and fairly. It represents, I believe, the greatest forward step I have seen in the development of public works, and, particularly, the water resource program in all sections of the Nation.

I wish to thank, also, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and other Senators for their consideration of the projects which are of vital importance to the State of Oklahoma. They have been patient with our testimony, and their decision, while perhaps not representing the amount we should like to have, is most satisfactory and certainly will produce a great forward stride in the comprehensive and effective development of the water resources of the great southwestern area. We feel that with the consideration accorded by the bill, it will be possible to continue the development of our natural resources. We do not consider this as an expenditure; rather, it is an investment in American water resources. Considering the life of these projects over 75 years, they will prove to be among the finest investments which we are capable of making.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. First, I wish to join in the many commendations of the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and also of the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I particularly direct my attention to the problems which have been taken care of in the bill, and express my appreciation of the fact that the committee saw fit to allow the construction of 2 dams to go forward at the same time. If the chairman of the subcommittee will recall the testimony before the subcommittee concerning Matthews Canyon and Pine Canyon, in my State, it was shown that they were only the short distance of 3 or 4 miles apart.

During the testimony, it was developed by a question asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] that there would be a saving if both dams were constructed at the same time; if both dams could begin their advance together through the planning and survey stage in order to be ready for simultaneous construction.

The testimony of the Army engineers was to the effect that if both dams went forward at the same time, there would be a saving of approximately $100,000. Therefore, I am grateful to the committee and to the distinguished chairman for securing the advancement of primary construction funds for both dams, so that they may go forward together. They are properly joined together as a unit, and they work together in solving the flood-control problem in this particular eastern area of my State.

I sincerely thank the Senator for the kind consideration which was given to the witnesses from my State who spoke on behalf of these projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Nevada has correctly stated the facts. The committee thought that the saving of $100,000 was worth making. That is why both projects, since they are so close together, were included in the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. It seems to me that that is sound business practice, and I appreciate it.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have already expressed privately, and many times to our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee my very great appreciation for the careful and, I think, highly patriotic way in which he has handled the whole subject. His efforts cannot be measured only in terms of the many witnesses who were examined and the 2,723 pages of testimony contained in the hearings.

I wish to call attention to certain things in connection with his very mag-

nificent performance which have made the greatest impression on me.

The first was the completely national approach which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana made to the subject. In the first meeting of our subcommittee, he brought out the fact that because of some oversight or because of the fact that Senators from particular areas had not been assigned to the committees handling this type of work, or for some other reason, perhaps, some areas of the country were scarcely represented in the agenda of work which was carried in the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. The Senator from Louisiana, therefore, set out to look for meritorious projects in those areas, so that the program might be on a more national basis. I myself thought that that was extremely fair, and that the results accomplished gave to the bill a national aspect, which it had failed to have prior to the time the Senator from Louisiana gave it that attention. So, first I wish to compliment him on that achievement.

Second, I compliment him for having brought about what I think is sound economy in connection with so many specific projects. For instance, I have in mind the type of project in which, by hastening the work a little more than the Bureau of the Budget had scheduled it, and in which the benefit-cost ratio was very, very high, the benefits would start to pour in from the investment much more quickly and in a larger proportion in comparison to the size of the investment. On such projects the Senator would recommend and strongly insist upon hurrying the work to completion, so that the benefits might begin to accrue earlier, and the total investment might begin to pay the very real dividends which would be received from its completion at an earlier date.

I thought that was a fine way in which to approach a public work, and I certainly commend the Senator most heartily because he followed that method in numerous instances in this measure.

The third thing I thought was very good economy was that the Senator looked for projects, the development of which had been allowed to be discontinued, so that their completion was long deferred, or even lost sight of—projects which were very, very much worthwhile.

In several instances in this particular bill, as in the bill last year, that kind of project was brought back into action, so that it might speedily be made alive again, and benefits from it soon received.

In my own State, two projects such as the ones in the general classes I have just mentioned have had their own merits recognized by the committee. I think this would not have been possible without the sympathy of the chairman.

One of the projects is the harbor of Tampa, the largest harbor in the State of Florida, a State which has some 1,200 miles of coastline and many harbors. At Tampa the work had been going on slowly, but by the addition of $1,500,000 to this year's appropriation, as recommended by the committee, certain phases of the work are expected to be completed this year, instead of in 2 years. The harbor will be completed to the degree that the larger ships, ships which require deeper water, can begin to go to the port fully loaded a year earlier, simply by the use of $1,500,000 more money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to be interrupted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only will that channel be used sooner; but if the committee had not provided money to complete it, more advertising would have been necessary, and probably another contractor would have had to take over the work, all of which might have cost as much as will now be saved.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct. As is the case in the great many projects of this kind, someone had lost sight of that fact. The Senator from Louisiana picked up that project and insisted that it be handled as private business would have handled it. The two great dredges which have been working there will be kept there instead of having work on the harbor cease in the middle of the fiscal year 1957. By continuing the work through fiscal year 1957 that part of the work will be completed, and the entire channel up to the main port of Tampa will be opened up.

I cite that as one example in expressing my great gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana, because I think it is an example of good government operating efficiently, as private business would operate in a similar case. It is simply one of the many cases of this kind in which the Senator has in connection with the bill acted more efficiently and in the public interest.

The second instance I wish to mention in my own State relates to a project which serves the people of the country throughout almost every mile of its length, but which cannot serve to the maximum degree until it has been completed. I refer to the intracoastal canal from Trenton, N. J., to Miami. This waterway serves to great advantage in its upper reaches, but it will serve to even greater advantage when it has been completed from Trenton to Miami. It had been partially completed before World War II, but there are great needs which will be served by the completion of the canal all the way to Miami, which I hardly need to state for the RECORD.

During the military operations in the Korean war, the Government insisted on extending the canal to its full authorized depth below Jacksonville to the guided-missile base at Cocoa for military reasons, but the lower half of the mileage in Florida was still left incomplete. Between Eau Gallie and Miami it operates at a depth of 9 feet, and in limited width, but the huge barges which come all the way down from Trenton, N. J., to Cocoa, Fla., have to transship there, so their cargoes can be carried in much smaller vessels on down to West Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale, and Miami—a very active area, now containing about a million and a quarter people, and with tremendous construction projects, both private and public, under way. Both civilian and military needs require completion of that final mileage.

If somebody had not come along and picked it up, the Nation probably would have been satisfied with the good values—and they are good values—being received from the operation in the upper part of the mileage of that great waterway. But the Senator from Louisiana, and I thank him for it, is willing to begin now the construction of that additional mileage so the canal can operate in its entirety, and so everybody along the canal and all business in the Nation will be better served by the completion of the canal.

I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Louisiana. I wanted to express gratitude not only for myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMATHERS], who asked me to express it for him, but also for the people of Florida.

There was one further subject which I wanted to mention and which has already been discussed several times. I refer to the fact that individual survey items do not appear in the bill. I approve of the policy which the distinguished Senator has followed, of leaving the matter, in the last analysis, to the discretion of the technical group, the engineers. In the event funds are insufficient to cover the whole program, they should pick out those places where the funds can best be used.

There are three Florida survey items which are very, very important, two of which will fall in the ordinary classification, the Bakers Haulover item, and the survey for the Chipola River cutoff on the Apalachicola, for which we shall have a particular need right now because the bill contains the funds by the use of which the channel in the river will be opened. The question is, of course, whether or not the channel will follow the old main river or the Chipola River cutoff which, traditionally for 100 years, has been the avenue of commerce in that area.

I have discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and I understand from him that these two items, on which a good showing was made, are among those which are to be recommended to the engineers, and the engineers have stated that the funds allocated will permit them to carry those projects on. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. They both fall within the language appearing at the bottom of page 10 of the report, which I put into the RECORD several times, to the effect that consideration should be given to the surveys which have been mentioned and brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the reply of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The third of the survey matters falls in a little different classification because it, in effect, calls for an adjustment of an authorization made long ago upon a survey then acceptable, so that a new and greater port may be built at the city of Miami. The distinguished Senator will remember the testimony of the city manager. I quote from his testimony.

The total project will cost in the neighborhood of $18 million. The cost by the Federal

Government will be in the neighborhood of $5 million.

That refers to the channel work. The city and county stand ready to meet the other expenses.

The problem is to adjust speedily the old authorization to the new conditions now to be met, which are that they do not want to leave the port on the principal waterfront of the city, which abuts Bay Front Park, one of the most beautiful parks in the State, but, instead, wish to move it to an island which can be made accessible through the joint efforts of the local bodies and of the Federal Government by the dredging of the channel.

As I understand, that project falls in a perhaps little different classification, because it calls for an adjustment rather than anything original, and also comes within a classification which, as I recall, the engineers regarded as of such importance that, in order to handle it this year, they probably would have to hire a firm of engineers to do the work, rather than handle it themselves.

Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. After the hearing and following the presentation made by the distinguished Senator from Florida, I asked the engineers how much money could economically be spent this year for the survey, and they said $45,000. I believe the Senator asked for $50,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; and I was glad they could do the work for $45,000. My understanding is that, if granted that sum—and that sum may certainly be granted in view of the amount provided by the bill—the engineers intend to procure the services of a well-qualified firm to proceed to the adjustment of the old authorization to the present conditions, so that they can move ahead to the actual construction work next year. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, the amount is not specifically earmarked for that purpose, but we are providing the money for it. It is because of that project and other projects that we have increased the amount for surveys. I believe if the engineers comply with the language I read a while ago, which appears at the bottom of page 10 of the report, that project will be surveyed this year, without question.

Mr. HOLLAND. And they will be enabled to give to that project the high priority which they stated to the committee they felt it should be given?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. One of the reasons why we do not earmark funds is that we leave it to the engineers to select the projects which are of high priority. This project was one of high priority. If the House agrees with the amounts of money we have provided, I have no doubt the project will be surveyed this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join my colleagues in extending my thanks personally to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who handled the bill, and also to the chairman of the full committee, because both Senators have proved to be of inestimable value insofar as the development of the State of Montana is concerned. I know I certainly speak in behalf of the senior Senator from my State [Mr. MURRAY], as well as for my colleague in the House, Representative METCALF. We are indebted to this committee for the restoration of funds for the Helena Valley Unit, which is important to the area surrounding the capital of our State.

Even though the President vetoed the Yellowtail Dam bill on last Friday, we certainly are indebted to the committee and to the chairman of the subcommittee for the great interest he has taken and for the restoration of funds to that project, and also for the continuation of funds last year for the Helena Valley project and the Yellowtail project.

We are also happy to note that the Senator from Louisiana has taken an interest in the Bitter Root irrigation district; and that under the provisions of the pending bill, $225,000 in excess of the Budget estimate and the appropriation made by the House of Representatives is allowed for rehabilitation of the facilities of this district in Montana.

We are also glad to note that the Senator from Louisiana has done us a service by recommending the appropriation of funds for construction of the second powerplant at the Fort Peck Dam project.

Despite the fact that no funds were allowed, I also wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for the personal interest he has taken in the Libby project and for the inquiries directed to the Corps of Engineers.

I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana only one question: Can he tell the Senate what the report of the Corps of Engineers was on the low-dam proposal by Representative METCALF for the Libby project, in the northwestern part of Montana?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, if the low dam were built with provision for raising the benefit-to-cost ratio would be, I believe, 0.64 to 1, which would not justify construction of the project. Instead, it would be necessary to build the entire project. But in order to build the dam as a whole, it would be necessary for the United States to enter into a compact with Canada. Unless that were done, it would be necessary to build the project at the height which some desire.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, the low dam?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, the so-called two-stage dam, which would not be a justified project.

So we are very hopeful that in the near future a compact with Canada can be signed, and that the high dam can be built.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana; and again I express the thanks of my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MURRAY] and the Representative in Congress from the Western District, and all the other people of Montana, for the personal consideration the Senator from Louisiana has shown us. If we have not fared as well as we would have liked, at least I assure the Senator from Louisiana that is not his fault. I am only sorry that the President saw fit to veto the measure providing for the settlement with the Indians for the right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam project, which is one of the important projects in the West. As a result, I think we shall have to wait for many years for the fruits which would have been possible if the committee's recommendation had been followed.

Again I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to go hurriedly over the various items we have considered.

As I said at the beginning of my statement, we provided for funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for reclamation projects—all of which have been discussed this afternoon—and also for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects.

Title I of the bill deals with the funds to be appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority. In that case, the committee followed the House of Representatives in suggesting an appropriation of $5,357,000 of new money.

I ask unanimous consent that the applicable portion of the committee's report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2169) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE I

Tennessee Valley Authority

Appropriation, 1956	$27,053,000
Estimate, 1957 (and rescission of $6,500,000)	5,357,000
House allowance (and rescission of $6,500,000)	5,357,000
Senate recommendation (and rescission of $6,500,000)	5,357,000

The committee recommends the approval of the budget estimate of $5,357,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, without amendment to the bill as it passed the House.

The committee believes it is unwise for the Tennessee Valley Authority to continue a policy whereby units can be added at existing plants without coming to the Congress for authorization and funds. The committee urges the appropriate legislative committee to act on this matter in order to clarify this situation before the next appropriation request is submitted to the Congress. So long as the prevailing interpretation of the law permits TVA to continue placing new units in existing plants, it means that the Congress cannot authorize a new plant in this area without losing all control over its continuing expansion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the side slips, showing the justification for the entire amount of appropriated and financed obligations, as well as those paid out of proceeds from the TVA funds.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Summary of regular appropriation-financed budget (for fiscal years ending June 30, 1955, 1956, and 1957)

Page reference		1955 actual	1956 estimate	1957 estimate
	APPROPRIATION FINANCED OBLIGATIONS			
	ACQUISITION OF ASSETS			
	Fertilizer and munitions program:			
30	Chemical facilities	$937,382	$556,000	$1,249,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	28,981	27,000	40,000
	Total fertilizer and munitions program	966,363	583,000	1,289,000
	General service activities:			
37	General facilities	548,871	325,921	54,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	3,755	8,000	8,000
	Total general service activities	552,626	333,921	62,000
	Total acquisition of assets, appropriation financed	101,658,916	63,667,921	15,955,000
	EXPENSES			
	Navigation, flood control, and power program:			
42	Navigation operations	263,216	246,000	253,000
46	Flood control operations	175,543	175,000	211,000
58	Multipurpose reservoir operations	2,170,690	2,066,000	2,200,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	184,437	197,000	225,000
	Total navigation, flood control, and power program	2,793,886	2,684,000	2,949,000
	Fertilizer and munitions program:			
68	Fertilizer and munitions development	2,269,484	2,201,000	2,446,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	87,069	100,000	110,000
	Total fertilizer and munitions program	2,356,553	2,301,000	2,556,000
	APPROPRIATION FINANCED OBLIGATIONS—continued			
	EXPENSES—continued			
	Resource development program:			
87	Resource development	$336,370	$400,000	$400,000
	Distribution of administrative and general expenses	43,869	44,000	50,000
	Total resource development program	380,239	444,000	450,000
	General service activities: Maintenance of bridges financed by others on TVA dams	1,900	4,000	7,000
	Total expenses, appropriation financed	5,532,578	5,433,000	5,962,000
	CHANGES IN WORKING CAPITAL			
	Inventories and property transfers:			
125	General inventories	−30,086		
	Property transfers	−3,273		
	Total changes in working capital, appropriation financed	−33,359		
	Total regular appropriation financed budget	107,158,135	69,100,921	21,917,000
	SOURCES OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS			
	Appropriation	120,000,000	27,053,000	5,357,000
	Balance from prior year	52,266,056	65,107,921	16,560,000
	Balance carried forward to subsequent year	−65,107,921	−16,560,000	
	Unobligated balance (amount provided by Public Law 163 for transmission connections with Mississippi Valley Generating Co.):			
	Brought forward			6,500,000
	Carried forward		−6,500,000	
	Rescinded			−6,500,000
	Total appropriated funds	107,158,135	69,100,921	21,917,000

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the budget estimate for title II, which includes the Bureau of Reclamation, was $224,267,000. This appropriation would be used for the programs and activities of the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation. For all these purposes, the House allowed $196,090,000; and the Senate committee has recommended $217,328,000, or an increase of $21,238,000. This amount is $6,939,000 below the budget estimate.

The first item is the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary, including the funds for operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration. The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House of Representatives allowance of $1,378,000—the amount of the budget estimate—for expenses of operation and maintenance of the Southeastern Power Administration. Of the total amount recommended, $1,134,000 is for the purchase of energy and the payment of wheeling charges for the delivery of energy to preference customers in the area, through the facilities of the private utilities serving the area.

For operation and maintenance of the Southwestern Power Administration, the budget estimate was $1 million. The committee recommends the amount allowed by the House of Representatives, which is the same as the amount of the budget estimate.

For the continuing fund, the committee recommends $6,400,000, the amount of the budget estimate, and also the amount approved by the House of Representatives.

The committee also authorized the use of $290,000 of available construction funds for the construction of transmission facilities to serve the city of Bentonville, Ark.

The next item is the Bonneville Power Administration. The committee has approved the construction program presented in the justification submitted in support of the budget item. This program totals $23,122,000, of which $4,422,000 is based on utilization of prior year funds, and the balance—namely, $18,700,000—is for new appropriations. The committee recommends the amount of the budget estimate, namely, $18,700,000, which is the amount allowed by the House of Representatives.

For operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system, the committee recommends $7,400,000, the amount of the budget estimate, and also the amount allowed by the House of Representatives.

For general investigations, Bureau of Reclamation, the committee recommends the amount of the budget estimate, or $5,680,000, being an increase of $410,000 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives. The House reduction was applied to investigations scheduled in the Columbia Basin of Washington and the Central Valley of California. The committee felt that the full amount of the budget estimate is required in order to maintain an adequate investigations program in these areas.

For construction and rehabilitation, the committee recommends $138,961,000, or an increase of $13,061,000 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives, and $11,939,000 below the amount of the budget estimate.

In addition, the committee approved the application of $20,336,642 of prior-year funds to certain projects.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the applicable portion of the report be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2169) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General investigations

Appropriation, 1956	$5,104,000
Budget estimate, 1957	5,680,000
House allowance	5,270,000
Committee recommendation	5,680,000

The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $5,680,000 for general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation. This amount is an increase of $410,000 over the House allowance.

The House reduction was applied to investigations scheduled in the Columbia Basin of Washington and the Central Valley of California. It is the view of the committee

the full budget estimate is required to maintain an adequate investigations program in these areas.

The committee urges the Department to expedite its report on the Palisades reregulating reservoir, and forward its findings to the Congress in order that authorizing legislation might be considered early in the next session of the Congress.

Construction and rehabilitation

Appropriation, 1956	$146,041,000
Budget estimate, 1957	150,900,000
House allowance	125,900,000
Committee recommendation	138,961,000

The committee recommends a construction program totaling $163,956,442 for the Bureau of Reclamation. This program is to be financed as follows:

Appropriation (new funds)	$138,961,000
Prior-year funds	4,425,000
Application of prior-year funds to projects	20,570,442
Total program	163,956,442

The allocation of the appropriation recommended is set out in the following tabulation:

Project or unit	Allocation of appropriated funds		
	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate committee recommendation
Gila project, Arizona	$1,077,000	$1,077,000	$1,077,000
Palo Verde, auxiliary division, Arizona	3,702,000	3,702,000	3,702,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	130,000	130,000	130,000
Boulder City municipal office, Nevada	20,000	20,000	20,000
Parker Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	312,000	312,000	312,000
Central Valley project, California	19,393,000	19,393,000	19,393,000
Santa Maria project, California	6,171,000	6,171,000	6,171,000
Solano project, California	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
Ventura project, California	250,000	250,000	2,250,000
Collbran project, Colorado	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	530,000	530,000	530,000
Michaud Flats project, Idaho	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000
Minidoka project, North Side pumping division, Idaho	2,768,000	2,768,000	2,768,000
Palisades project, Idaho	5,787,000	5,787,000	5,787,000
Fort Peck project, Montana and North Dakota	118,000	118,000	118,000
Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Washita Basin project, Oklahoma	500,000	375,000	500,000
Deschutes project, North unit, Oregon	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000
Rogue River project, Talent division, Oregon	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Savage Rapids Dam, fish protective facilities, Oregon	----------	208,000	208,000
Provo River project, Utah	659,000	659,000	659,000
Weber Bains project, Utah	10,066,000	10,066,000	10,066,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	13,850,000	13,850,000	13,850,000
Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington	1,288,000	1,288,000	1,288,000
Yakima project, Roza division, Washington	1,720,000	1,720,000	1,720,000
Eden project, Wyoming	$869,000	$869,000	$869,000
Shoshone project, Wyoming	554,000	554,000	554,000
Drainage and minor construction	984,000	984,000	984,000
Rehabilitation and betterment	3,305,000	3,305,000	3,530,000
Missouri River Basin project:			
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	4,690,000	4,690,000	4,690,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	3,151,000	3,151,000	3,151,000
Glendo unit, Wyoming	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Hanover-Bluff unit, Wyoming	600,000	600,000	600,000
Helena Valley unit, Montana	2,500,000	----------	1,750,000
Kirwin unit, Kansas	2,055,000	2,055,000	2,055,007
Lower Marias unit, Montana	155,000	115,000	115,000
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming	1,397,000	1,397,000	1,397,000
Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota	55,000	55,000	55,000
Sargent unit, Nebraska	728,000	728,000	728,000
St. Francis unit, Colorado-Kansas	317,000	----------	----------
Transmission division	8,255,000	2,755,000	2,755,000
Webster unit, Kansas	540,000	540,000	540,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	10,850,000	----------	7,510,000
Drainage and minor construction	634,000	634,000	634,000
Investigations	3,105,000	2,654,000	3,105,000
Other Interior agencies	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
Total Missouri River Basin project	52,732,000	33,074,000	42,785,000
Total construction and rehabilitation	150,900,000	130,325,000	143,386,000
Less available funds from prior years	----------	4,425,000	4,425,000
Total appropriation	150,900,000	125,900,000	138,961,000

In addition to the recommended appropriation of $138,961,000, the committee approves of the application of $20,336,642 of prior-year funds to the following projects:

Project or unit:	*Amount*
Gila project, Arizona	$250,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	966,999
Cachuma project, California	35,769
Central Valley project, California	2,000,000
Ventura project, California	4,150,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	100,000
Palisades project, Idaho	220,000
Rathdrum Prairie project, Hayden Lake unit, Idaho	520,000
Carlsbad project, Alamogordo Dam, N. Mex	20,000
Buford-Trenton project, North Dakota	123,074
Provo River project, Utah	300,000
Chief Joseph Dam project Washington	31,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	733,800
Eden project, Wyoming	208,000
Drainage and minor construction	6,000
Rehabilitation and betterment	9,800
Missouri River Basin project:	
Dickinson unit, North Dakota	25,000
Helena Valley unit, Montana	2,250,000
Transmission division	5,031,000
Webster unit, Kansas	250,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	3,340,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	10,896,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	20,570,442

Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada: The committee has been informed that certain accounting adjustments are required on the Boulder Canyon project to properly reflect in its repayment certain construction expenditures made from operation and maintenance funds and revenue receipts. The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to correct this situation and insure full repayment of the project.

Central Valley project, California: The authorizing act for the Trinity division provided for a power development of not to exceed 233,000 kilowatts, which was based on the plan of development that did not include storage on Clear Creek. However, the authorizing act did provide for the Clear Creek storage. In order to have a full development of the resource the power capacity will have to be increased. The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize the development of power facilities not to exceed approximately 400,000 kilowatts.

Ventura project, California: The committee recommends a construction program of $6,400,000 for the Ventura project, an increase of $2 million over the program proposed in the budget. This increase will expedite the construction of the project to allow for storage of water in the spring of 1959. The program recommended by the committee is to be financed as follows:

Allocation of appropriation	$2,250,000
Prior year funds	4,150,000

Collbran project, Colorado: The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $1 million for the initiation of construction of the Collbran project in Colorado.

The House committee takes the position that no funds should be allowed for this project until a repayment contract has been executed. The committee is not in agreement with the position of the House committee on this point. It is the view of the committee that construction should proceed immediately on the project. The committee expects strict compliance with the existing provisions of law that prohibit the delivery of water to lands prior to the execution of a repayment contract. The view of the committee on this matter is not to be confined to the Collbran project. This view is applicable to any project authorized under the reclamation laws.

Rathdrum Prairie project, Hayden Lake unit, Idaho: The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to provide for the emergency rehabilitation of the Hayden Lake unit of the Rathdrum Prairie project in Idaho. The committee approves of the use of $520,000 of prior-year funds to carry out this work. The total amount is to be fully repaid by the water users under terms satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

Carlsbad project, Alamogordo Dam, N. Mex.: The committee approves the use of $20,000 of prior-year funds for the construction of recreational facilities at the Alamogordo Dam in New Mexico. To clear up any question of the Bureau of Reclamation's legal authority to carry out this work the committee has recommended the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize such expenditures.

Washita Basin project, Oklahoma: The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $500,000 for the initiation of construction of the Washita Basin project in Oklahoma. The amount recommended is an increase of $125,000 over the House allowance. It is the view of the committee that the full budget estimate of $500,000 will be required for this project.

Provo River project, Utah: The committee has approved the use of $300,000 of prior-year funds for the acquisition of additional rights-of-way easements for the diversions of

water into the Provo River and Deer Creek Reservoir. Recent floods in the area have made it essential that these additional rights-of-way be acquired.

Columbia Basin project, Washington: It has come to the attention of the committee that part of the lands to be served by the Wahluke siphon are held by the Atomic Energy Commission. Inasmuch as these lands will ultimately be brought under irrigation, the committee feels that the siphon should be constructed to provide adequate capacity to serve all the lands. However, the committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to defer repayment of the costs of construction and operation and maintenance on that portion of the siphon properly allocable to the lands presently held by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to take the necessary steps for the emergency protection of Soap Lake. The costs involved are to be repaid from the water users of the Columbia Basin project and the power revenues of the Grand Coulee Dam.

The committee approves the use of $233,800 of prior-year funds for this work.

Rehabilitation and betterment: The committee recommends an appropriation of $3,530,000 for rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects. The increase of $225,000 over the budget estimate and House allowance is for the rehabilitation of the facilities of the Bitter Root Irrigation District in Montana.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Dickinson unit, North Dakota: The committee approves of the use of $25,000 of prior year funds for the construction of recreational facilities at the Dickinson Dam in North Dakota. The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize this type of expenditure.

Helena Valley unit, Montana: The committee recommends the allowance of $1,750,000 for the Helena Valley unit. This amount in addition to $2,250,000 of prior year funds approved for this unit will provide for the budget program of $4 million.

It is the view of the committee that construction should proceed immediately on this unit. However, the committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its negotiations with the supplemental water users and the city of Helena to provide for additional repayment on the unit.

Lower Marias unit, Montana: The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House allowance of $115,000 for this unit. The reduction of $40,000 below the budget estimate was programed for preconstruction work on irrigation facilities. It is the view of the committee that no funds should be expended for irrigation facilities on this unit until the farmers in the area express a greater interest in irrigation.

St. Francis unit, Colorado: The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the action of the House in disallowing funds for the St. Francis unit in Colorado. The budget estimate of $317,000 was for preconstruction work on the irrigation feature of the unit. It is the view of the committee that no funds should be expended for irrigation facilities on this unit until the farmers in the area express an increased interest in irrigation.

Transmission division: The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House allowance of $2,755,000 for the transmission division. In addition to this amount the committee approves of the use of $5,031,000 of prior year funds for this purpose.

The reduction of $5,500,000 has been applied to the proposed Fort Randall to Grand Island 230-kilovolt transmission line.

Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming: The committee recommends the allowance of $7,510,000 for the Yellowtail unit. In addition to this amount the committee has approved the use of $3,340,000 of prior year funds for this unit, to provide for a total program of $10,850,000—the budget estimate.

It is the hope of the committee that the problems pertaining to the acquisition of the site will be resolved at an early date.

Investigations: The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $3,105,000 for investigations in the Missouri River Basin. The House allowed $2,654,000, and applied the reduction of $451,000 to investigations of the Oahe unit. It is the view of the committee that the budget estimate is required to finance the investigations program.

Operation and maintenance

Appropriation, 1956	$24,750,000
Budget estimate, 1957	27,267,000
House allowance	26,500,000
Committee recommendation	27,267,000

The committee recommends the allowance of the budget estimate of $27,267,000 for operation and maintenance of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. The amount recommended is an increase of $767,000 over the House allowance of $26,500,000.

The committee is in complete agreement with House committee with regard to the transfer of projects to the water users. However, the committee does not agree with the House that a reduction in operation and maintenance funds will hasten the transfer of projects.

In recommending the allowance of the budget estimate for this purpose the committee has taken into consideration the fact that of the total appropriation over $24 million will be returned to the Treasury in the form of payments from water users and power revenues.

Within the amount recomemnded an additional $60,000 is to be applied to the Colorado River front work and levee system for studies with regard to the drainage problems that have developed in the Yuma area on the lower Colorado River. Such studies were authorized by the act of June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 338). The committee expects additional funds for this purpose to be included in the budget for fiscal year 1958.

General administrative expenses

Appropriation, 1956	$3,760,000
Budget estimate, 1957	3,942,000
House allowance	3,942,000
Committee recommendation	3,942,000

The committee recommends that the Senate concur in the House allowance of $3,942,000, the budget estimate, for the general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Reclamation. These funds are required to assure the proper administration of the expanded construction program of the Bureau.

Colorado River storage project

Appropriation, 1956	None
Budget estimate, 1957	$8,000,000
House allowance	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	13,000,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $13 million for the initiation of construction of the Colorado River storage project. It is the view of the committee that construction should be initiated in fiscal year 1957 on the following units of the project: Glen Canyon unit, Arizona; Flaming Gorge unit, Utah and Wyoming; and the Navaho unit, New Mexico.

The funds recommended are allocated to the following units:

Flaming Gorge, Utah-Wyo	$1,300,000
Glen Canyon, Ariz	9,325,000
Navaho, N. Mex	800,000
Advanced planning on authorized participating projects	1,575,000
Total	13,000,000

In the construction of the Glen Canyon unit it will be necessary to construct a bridge across the river below the dam site. The estimated cost of such a bridge is $1,800,000. During the course of the hearings it was developed that the State of Arizona is going to extend its highway system into the area of the Glen Canyon Dam and desires to have this bridge constructed to meet the minimum standards for a primary highway bridge. It is estimated that the additional cost will be approximately $1,200,000. It is the view of the committee that the bridge should be constructed so as to meet the standards of a primary highway bridge, provided the Bureau of Reclamation can reach agreements with the Highway Commission of the State of Arizona and other Federal agencies covering the additional costs of approximately $1,200,000.

It is the view of the committee that the Bureau of Reclamation should employ, where practical, and urge its contractors to employ, Indians in the construction of this project.

The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to transfer the funds appropriated for the Colorado River storage project from the separate appropriation to the appropriation entitled "Construction and Rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation." In the future funds for this project should be submitted under the "Construction and rehabilitation" appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the next is title III.

The first appropriation under that title is for cemeterial expenses. While the House allowed the full budget estimate of $6,500,000 the report directed the allocation of an additional $265,000 for the purchase of headstones and the deletion of a like amount from personal services. The committee concurred in the increase for the purchase of headstones but not in the reduction of personal services which means a reduction in maintenance. The committee therefore recommends an increase of $265,000 or a total of $6,765,000.

For general investigations the committee accepted the House version and added $1,200,000 of which $410,000 was for navigation studies, $690,000 for flood-control studies, and $100,000 for special studies, namely the Hudson River siltation study. The committee did not allocate the increases for the navigation and flood-control studies. It is however calling to the attention of the Department the testimony received showing the need for additional funds for individual studies.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the applicable portion of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2169) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

General investigations, fiscal year 1957

Item	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957	House allowance	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
1. Examinations and surveys:			
(a) Navigation studies	$450,000	$487,000	$897,000
(b) Flood control studies	2,050,000	2,140,000	2,830,000
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies	100,000	100,000	100,000
(d) Special studies:			
(1) San Francisco Bay area survey	400,000	400,000	400,000
(2) Survey Great Lakes water levels			
(3) Ohio River Basin survey	100,000	100,000	100,000
(4) Great Lakes harbors survey	160,000	160,000	160,000
(5) Columbia River review	250,000	250,000	250,000
(6) Delaware River review	100,000	500,000	500,000
(7) Watershed Protection Act studies	50,000	50,000	50,000
(8) Hurricane studies	1,000,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(9) Hudson River (siltation) study			100,000
Subtotal, examinations and surveys	4,660,000	5,587,000	6,787,000
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—continued			
2. Collection and study of basic data:			
(a) Stream gaging (U. S. Geological Survey)	$188,000	$188,000	$188,000
(b) Precipitation studies (U. S. Weather Bureau)	244,000	244,000	244,000
(c) Fish and wildlife studies (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	43,000	43,000	43,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	475,000	475,000	475,000
3. Research and development:			
(a) Beach erosion development studies	150,000	150,000	150,000
(b) Hydrologic studies	100,000	100,000	100,000
(c) Civil works investigations	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
(d) Mississippi basin model	400,000	400,000	400,000
Subtotal, research and development	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
4. Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway restudy		160,000	160,000
Total, general investigations	7,035,000	8,122,000	9,322,000

Construction, general

Appropriation, 1956	$441,160,014
Budget estimate, 1957	422,687,000
House allowance	422,034,000
Committee recommendation	463,373,000

The recommendations of the committee include the initiation of a number of well-justified projects and increases in other projects included in the bill as passed the House where it was indicated that additional funds could be efficiently and economically used. In view of the unobligated balance that the Corps of Engineers estimates it will carry forward into fiscal year 1957 the committee concurs in the action of the House in taking an overall reduction of $10 million in arriving at the appropriation required to carry out the approved program during fiscal year 1957.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for construction, general, the committee recommends $463,373,000 an increase of $41,339,000 over the amount allowed by the House. Of this increase $6,187,000 is accounted for by the restoration of the budget estimate on 8 construction items and 4 planning items; $20,245,000 represents new starts on 33 construction projects and 31 new starts on planning; $15,657,000 represents increases in amounts allowed by the House on 26 construction projects and 6 planning projects. The committee also reduced the House allowance on one construction project and two planning projects for a total reduction of $750,000. The details of the committee recommendations are shown in the report.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a summary indicating the increases under title 3; also a summary which indicates the new starts for planning as well as for construction.

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

Increases, title III

Cemeterial expense (replace maintenance funds diverted by House for purchase of headstones)		$265,000
General investigations:		
Navigation studies	+$410,000	
Flood control studies	+690,000	
Special studies, Hudson River siltation	100,000	
	1,200,000	
Construction, general		41,339,000

	Construction	Planning
Restoration of budget estimate	$5,722,000	$465,000
Increases to items in House bill	19,645,000	600,000
New starts added by Senate	13,897,000	1,760,000
Reductions from House allowance	−400,000	−350,000
Net increase	+38,864,000	+2,475,000

Operation and maintenance (to start reduction of backlog of deferred maintenance)	$10,000,000
General expenses:	
Increase due to expanded program—	
Office, Chief of Engineers	93,000
Division offices	206,000
River and Harbor Board	25,000
Beach Erosion Board	1,000
Total	325,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries:	
Planning, increase	10,000
Construction, new starts	600,000
Construction, increases	5,276,000
Maintenance, increase	875,000
Total increase	6,761,000
Increases, title III	59,890,000

New starts added by Senate committee

	Construction	Planning	Purpose
Alaska:			
Craig Harbor	$365,000		Fishing harbor and shelter.
Elfin Cove	173,000		Do.
Kodiak Harbor	500,000		Do.
Pelican Harbor	362,000		Do.
Sitka Harbor		$31,000	Do.
Alabama: Jackson lock and dam.	750,000		Replace 3 obsolete dams on the Tombigbee River.
Arkansas:			
De Gray Reservoir		20,000	To develop water supply features of project.
Walnut Bayou		25,000	Flood control for agricultural land.
California: Santa Maria River		50,000	Levees for urban and rural area.
Connecticut: New Haven Harbor.	536,000		Deepening from 18 to 22 feet.
Idaho: Columbia River justification reports.		102,000	Local flood protection.
Illinois: Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri.	200,000		Regulating works for reduction of maintenance.
Kansas:			
Council Grove Reservation		150,000	Flood control, Grand (Neosho) River.
Elk City Reservoir		75,000	Flood control, Verdigris River.
Milford Reservoir		90,000	Flood control, Kansas River.
Kentucky: Dam 41	1,000,000		Replace existing obsolete lock.
Louisiana:			
Bayou Segnette		$435,000	Interim connection to intracoastal waterway.
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the gulf.		260,000	40-foot channel in southwest pass.
Maine: Rockland Harbor	$810,000		18-foot channel.
Massachusetts:			
Boston Harbor	1,000,000		Anchorage area for safety.
Cape Cod Canal	157,000		Harbor of refuge.
Nantucket Harbor	162,000		Do.
Michigan:			
Au Sable Harbor		10,000	Do.
Cheboygan River and Harbor.	110,000		Anchorage and deepening for safety and U. S. Coast Guard.
Harrisville Harbor	260,000		Harbor of refuge.
Whitefish Point Harbor	100,000		Do.
Montana: Billings	200,000		Urban flood control.
Nevada: Pine Canyon Reservoir.	200,000		Flood control for urban and railroad property.
New York:			
Black Rock and Tonawanda Harbor.		6,000	Work out local cooperation.
Buffalo Harbor	250,000		Deepening north entrance.
Genegantslet Reservoir		100,000	Flood control for urban area.
South Plymouth Reservoir		100,000	Do.
Ohio: Dillon Reservoir	1,500,000		Flood control for Zanesville.

New starts added by Senate committee—Continued

	Construction	Planning	Purpose
Oklahoma:			
Enid		$38,000	Flood control for urban area.
Keystone Reservoir	$1,500,000		Flood control, water supply and silt control.
Oregon:			
Chetco River	225,000		Fishing and shelter.
Holley Reservoir		100,000	Flood control, irrigation and pollution control.
Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works.		226,000	Increased protection for organized drainage districts.
Skipanon Channel	185,000		Mooring basin for small craft.
Rhode Island:			
Sand Hill Cove Beach	40,000		Shore protection.
Sakonnet Harbor	600,000		Harbor of refuge.
South Dakota: Big Bend Reservoir.		150,000	Power site selection controls installation at Oahe.
Texas:			
Denison Dam:			
Recreational facilities	250,000		Opening additional areas for public use.
Willis site bridge	800,000		Wartime restrictions prevented crossing at time of construction.
Texas—Continued			
Gulf intracoastal waterway, Colorado River.		$20,000	Channel to Bay City.
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Channel to La Quinta.	$500,000		32 foot channel started by local interests.
Proctor Reservoir		75,000	Flood control and water supply.
Utah: Salt Lake City		53,000	Urban flood control.
Virginia: Chesapeake Bay to Chincoteague Bay.	300,000		Fishing and shelter.
Virgin Islands:			
Christiansted Harbor		2,000	Deep draft harbor economic study.
St. Thomas Harbor		2,000	Do.
Washington:			
Blaine Harbor	116,000		Fishing and shelter.
Columbia River at Baker Bay.		70,000	Do.
Everett Harbor	120,000		Moorage for commercial and pleasure craft.
Grays Harbor	61,000		Fishing and shelter, U. S. Coast Guard.
Stillaguamish River		5,000	Economic report.
Willapa River and Harbor	130,000		Fishing and shelter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for operation and maintenance the committee has recommended an increase of $10 million to be used for deferred maintenance. The Corps of Engineers testified that there is a backlog of $65 million of deferred maintenance.

In the past it has been my feeling that the Bureau of the Budget and, in fact, the Congress itself have been very niggardly in providing funds for the operation and maintenance of projects which the Federal Government is spending huge sums of money to construct. I believe the Congress has not provided sufficient funds to operate and maintain these facilities properly.

I obtained the facts from the Corps of Engineers. There is a backlog of more than $65 million of operation and maintenance that should be taken care of. Many important projects were completed at great cost; and today many of those projects cannot be utilized to the full extent. I wish to cite two in particular, both located in the small State of Delaware. I refer to the Delaware City branch channel, and the Lewes-Rehoboth Canal. These two projects were completed quite a few years ago, but because sufficient funds were not provided to maintain them, the projects are now useless.

What the committee has done is to recommend a 5-year program, and to provide $10 million each year, so that this backlog of operation and maintenance can be attended to, in order that projects such as the ones I have just mentioned can be utilized to the full extent.

There is another such project in Michigan, namely, the Pentwater Harbor. That harbor was completed not very long ago, and because insufficient sums of money were provided for the maintenance of the harbor, it is now useless, although it cost millions of dollars when it was originally constructed.

Those are only a few of the projects to which I refer. There are many others in the same category.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not hear all the Senator said about the failure of the projects by reason of the fact that they did not have operation and maintenance money. I wonder if the committee has ever considered the question of seeing to it that the beneficiaries of the projects of various kinds and types under the head of public works at least take care of the cost of operation and maintenance.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are not now discussing reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. I know. I am talking about ordinary flood control and river and harbor improvements.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are talking about river and harbor projects. Harbor projects are built for the benefit of the people as a whole. They are usually maintained and operated for the public, by the Federal Government. That was the policy in mind from the inception.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand all that; but the shipping companies receive a large benefit from such developments. They have their piers there where they are able to dock their ships.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we were to follow that theory, we would have to revise our policy. In the past our policy has been to build these great projects with public funds, and to maintain them with public funds, because they are for the benefit of all the people.

Mr. WATKINS. In a general way they are for the benefit of all the people; but some of the coastal canals, for example, costing $85 million or more, are used only by shipping companies. I find that they do not pay any tolls, or any operation and maintenance costs. My contention is that some day those who receive the benefits ought to pay for the operation and maintenance. That is the rule with respect to all reclamation projects. Those who receive the benefits pay the operation and maintenance. The appropriations for operation and maintenance in connection with river and harbor and flood control projects are almost as high as, if not higher than, the entire reclamation program appropriations, for construction and everything else combined.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to get into an argument with my good friend on this subject, but he well remembers that several years ago the Congress enacted a law for rehabilitation and betterment of projects which had already been completed in the reclamation States of the Midwest.

The bill pending provides $3,530,000 for rehabilitation and betterment, which should have been taken care of by those who own and operate these projects.

Mr. WATKINS. That money will all be repaid by those people.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. It will be repaid over a period of 40 years, without interest.

I do not wish to enter into an argument with my good friend from Utah. I believe that the way the program works, it is for the benefit of the country as a whole. I refer in particular to the great projects which are built in cities such as New York, New Orleans, Buffalo, and other cities throughout the country. Freight from all over the world comes there.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand; but there are certain private groups which receive tremendous benefits, and they ought to pay something. At least they should pay for operation and maintenance. We pay the cost of construction, principal, and interest on practically all of our projects, and then we pay operation and maintenance. Why is there such discrimination?

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be that the entire program should be revised.

Mr. WATKINS. I agree very strongly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only with respect to flood control, but also with respect to reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. I vote for flood control projects. I think they are in the interest of the entire country, and I have contended that reclamation is likewise in the interest of the entire country. However, we receive different treatment. We are discriminated against. Members stand on the floor of the Senate and criticize us at various times. I note that one of our critics has retired from the wars temporarily. We receive such criticism all the time.

Now we must make up a sum of $10 million, in two installments, I understand——

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It is something the Congress neglected to do. It is something for which the Budget Bureau failed to provide.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, those who receive the benefits are not paying any part of the cost.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It was incumbent upon the Federal Government to pay that cost. However, the Budget Bureau was niggardly in providing sufficient operation and maintenance funds in order to maintain the projects.

Mr. WATKINS. They should have followed our rule. We maintain the projects ourselves. Why should not those who benefit from other projects maintain them?

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the Senator's question?

Mr. WATKINS. Why should not those who receive benefits from other projects follow the reclamation rule, and pay for their maintenance and operation?

Mr. ELLENDER. The beneficiaries of reclamation projects do pay to a certain extent. However, as I stated a moment ago, in many instances the Federal Government has had to provide the money. Of course, it is repayable over a period of 40 years, without interest.

Mr. WATKINS. Why not lend the money to the other people, and let them repay it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps the entire program should be revised.

Mr. WATKINS. I agree with the Senator. It should be revised in order that there may be no discrimination against reclamation.

Mr. ELLENDER. In view of the increased program recommended, the committee approved an increase of $325,000 for general expenses. It is essential that there be adequate funds for supervision and administration of this important program.

For Mississippi River and tributaries the committee recommended $62,791,000, an increase of $6,761,000 over the amount allowed by the House.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the applicable portion of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2169) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries

Appropriation 1956	$51,962,500
Budget estimate 1957	56,030,000
House allowance	56,030,000
Committee recommendation	62,791,000

The details of the committee's recommendation are shown on the following table:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1957

Projects	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957	House allowance	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. General investigations:			
(a) Examinations and surveys	$560,000	$560,000	$560,000
(b) Collection and study of basic data	86,000	86,000	86,000
Subtotal, general investigations	646,000	646,000	646,000
2. Advance engineering and design:			
(a) New Madrid, Mo.	40,000	40,000	50,000
(b) Baton Rouge Harbor	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, advance engineering and design	90,000	90,000	100,000
3. Construction:			
Mississippi River levees	1,960,000	1,960,000	2,250,000
Channel improvement	18,750,000	18,750,000	21,500,000
Sec. 6 levees			
Mapping			
Memphis Harbor	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Vicksburg Harbor			400,000
Morganza structure			
Old River control	6,700,000	6,700,000	7,700,000
St. Francis Basin	2,954,000	2,954,000	3,250,000
Lower White River	350,000	350,000	350,000
Reelfoot Lake	325,000	325,000	325,000
Cache Basin			
L'Anguille Basin			
West Tennessee tributaries			
Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto			
Lower Arkansas	500,000	500,000	700,000
Tensas Basin	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc.	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Red River backwater	100,000	100,000	100,000
3. Construction—Continued			
Yazoo Basin	($3,320,000)	($3,320,000)	($3,720,000)
Sardis Reservoir			
Enid Reservoir			
Arkabutla Reservoir			100,000
Grenada Reservoir			
Greenwood			
Belzoni	243,000	243,000	243,000
Yazoo City	102,000	102,000	102,000
Auxiliary channels	1,800,000	1,800,000	2,000,000
Main stem			100,000
Tributaries	300,000	300,000	300,000
Big Sunflower River, etc.	875,000	875,000	875,000
Yazoo backwater			
Lower Red River			
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries			
Atchafalaya Basin	(3,460,000)	(3,460,000)	(4,000,000)
Atchafalaya Basin Floodway	3,460,000	3,460,000	4,000,000
Atchafalaya River navigation			
Amite River			
Lake Pontchartrain	350,000	350,000	350,000
Completed separable units			
Subtotal, construction	41,169,000	41,169,000	47,045,000
4. Maintenance	14,125,000	14,125,000	15,000,000
5. Flood-control-emergencies			
Grand total, Mississippi River and tributaries	56,030,000	56,030,000	62,791,000

Mr. ELLENDER. For Niagara remedial works the committee recommended the budget estimate, $500,000, the amount allowed by the House.

The committee approved the budget estimate of $150,000 for the United States section of the St. Lawrence River, Joint Board of Engineers.

(The following statement was ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD:)

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH REGARDING FLOOD CONTROL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEW ENGLAND FOR FISCAL YEAR 1957

Flood control in Connecticut and other New England States, sorely afflicted by the flood disasters of 1955 and earlier years, will be given great impetus by enactment of the public works appropriations bill for 1957.

I am particularly pleased by the increase to $1 million in funds for the Thomaston, Conn., dam and reservoir, essential for the protection of the lower Naugatuck Valley, and by the provision of adequate funds for upstream flood-control reservoirs in the Connecticut and Thames Rivers Basins.

Also gratifying is the increase to $1,400,000 in funds for continuation of the hurricane survey authorized by the Bush Act (Public Law 71, 84th Cong.), which aims at eventual protection against the coastal flooding associated with hurricanes which caused such great damage in 1954 and prior years.

An orderly continuation of harbor improvement in Connecticut will be made possible by the $536,000 in the Senate bill for the Quinnipiac River project in New Haven and by the $57,000 earmarked for the Eight-Mile River project in the Connecticut River. Also important are harbor maintenance funds of $560,000 for New Haven, $115,000 for Bridgeport, and $84,000 for Stamford.

Looking at the bill from a regional standpoint, its enactment will mean the provision this year of almost $20 million in flood-control funds for New England, the largest amount ever made available by the Congress in a single session.

The $2 million in planning and construction funds already provided by this Congress in the urgent deficiency bill for 1956 has made possible an early start on the accelerated flood control program for my State and region which was recommended by President Eisenhower. By adding more than $17,500,000 in such funds, the present bill contemplates that this essential work will continue during the 12 months beginning on July 1 at the fastest pace within the capabilities of the Corps of Engineers.

The total estimated cost to the Federal Government of the New England projects included in the bill is more than $150 million. And $150 million by no means represents the total amount which must be spent if Connecticut and New England are to have the flood protection they so urgently need.

The 1955 floods disclosed many gaps in the flood protective system which previously had been recommended for New England. Surveys now underway, authorized by a resolution of the Senate Committee on Public Works at my request on September 14, 1955, and for which funds are provided in the urgent deficiency bill and in the present bill, will, undoubtedly, result in recommendations for additional projects.

These surveys already have resulted in recommendations by the New England division engineer, Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., for two flood-control dams above Torrington, Conn., and a third above Winsted, Conn. It is my hope that the Corps of Engineers will submit its final reports on these projects in time for their authorization later in the present session. Other project

recommendations will result from surveys of the Connecticut, Merrimack, Thames, Housatonic, and Blackstone River Basins and the coastal streams in Connecticut and other New England States, although it is probable that the pressure of time will prevent these from being authorized until the next Congress.

In addition, there is a crying need in Connecticut and New England generally, as well as in other areas of the Nation, for small, but vital local flood protective works. In this connection, it is disappointing that the House of Representatives has not yet taken action on S. 3272, to expedite such projects, or on a companion bill sponsored by the House majority leader, Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. I had hoped this legislation would be finally enacted in time for an appropriation to be included in the present bill. Unfortunately, although the Senate approved S. 3272 many weeks ago, on April 18, 1956, the bill has yet to be reported to the House floor by the Committee on Public Works of that body. If the House should approve this needed legislation in the near future, it may yet be possible to make provision of funds in a later supplemental bill.

This was a matter which, of course, was beyond the control of the Appropriations Committee. And I would be remiss if I did not express my appreciation to the members of that committee, and particularly to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for their generous response to New England's needs. I am sure that I express the sentiments of the people of Connecticut and of New England generally, in extending a heartfelt thanks.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for all the kind things they have said about me.

I do not deserve them all. I am only doing my duty as a Senator. I am very much interested in this work, and I hope to be able to continue it.

I am one who believes that unless we protect our greatest resource, namely, water, and unless we keep it inland and do not let it flow to the sea, some day our great country may become as barren as the Gobi Desert, or as lands which I have seen in old Persia. It was my privilege to travel throughout Persia. 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia could sustain the livelihood of 115 million people. Now it can sustain only 14 million.

Consider the great Valley of Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. At one time that area could take care of 15 million people. Today that great valley can hardly take care of 2 million people. Why? Because of the neglect of the great natural resource of water. If it had been possible to retain the waters upstream on those great rivers, and not permit them to carry down the rich topsoils, the chances are that that great valley would still be very productive.

The fact is that those rivers carried millions of tons of earth down the stream and clogged the small tributaries and rivers in Mesopotamia. Today that land is not suitable for any cultivation. It is sour. It cannot be used. Certainly we do not want that to happen to our great country. That is why I am so anxious to see to it that sufficient funds are appropriated.

As I pointed out earlier this afternoon, it is a great pity that it requires a calamity like the one that happened last year in Connecticut and in Massachusetts to awaken the people in those areas to the necessity of providing funds for projects which had been authorized for a long time. I have been a member of the committee for quite a number of years, and at no time before last year and the year before did the people of that area come to us and request funds. It required a calamity like hurricanes Hazel and Diane to make them realize the necessity of getting those projects built.

The record is replete with evidence that the great losses sustained in the last year in those areas are in an amount which would have more than paid for the completion of the program which was authorized 15 years ago.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that what the Senator from Louisiana has said about flood control and erosion control is music to my ears. The major premise of his remarks outlines the basic conservation philosophy of the senior Senator from Oregon. When the Senator speaks about what has happened to Persia and to other countries and to other fallen civilizations, I would simply apply those remarks to China.

Mr. ELLENDER. And India.

Mr. MORSE. And India. However, let us consider China for a moment. What is done to protect natural resources is directly related to what happens to political systems.

A study of the history of what happened to natural resources and what happened to the political systems of the nations in which there was a failure to protect natural resources will disclose that what I have said is true. Of course, there are many other factors, but the fact remains that when China was a great civilization, she was a China rich in natural resources. She was not the China of thousands of square miles of lost topsoil. She was not a deforested China. She was not a flood-ridden China. She was a China rich in topsoil, and she was also rich in governmental systems.

We had better keep in mind the fact that as we destroy natural resources, we also destroy good government, because political turmoil is created, as well as political upheavals. We cannot let people lose their surplus food supplies and have them politically contented. When we are making the fight that we are making for a sound conservation program in our country, we are also fighting to strengthen our democratic processes. I say that because if the time ever comes when the American people have lost their rich heritage in their topsoil and in their forests and in their natural resources generally, then we will also have political chaos in America.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I agree with what he says.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the communication which I addressed to him, and which is reproduced at page 2151 of the hearings. It refers to the subject I discussed with him informally a few minutes ago, namely, local protection projects not requiring specific authorization.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my letter of April 20, 1956, addressed to the Senator from Louisiana.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, the Senate has passed S. 3272 which would increase to $500,000 from $150,000 the amount which the Army engineers may expend on a flood-control project without specific congressional authorization, under section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950.

The bill as it passed the Senate authorizes an increase to $15 million from $3 million the amount that may be appropriated in any single year.

I was particularly interested in seeing this bill reported out from the Committee on Public Works and passed by the Senate because it is my observation that many relatively small projects have a maximum of benefit for smaller communities and suburban areas that are lost sight of in the drive for the big spectacular projects.

I respectfully and earnestly urge that your subcommittee take note of the provisions of S. 3272 and increase the appropriation for these projects under section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I again ask the Senator whether he would not feel warranted in allowing an additional amount for this item. I notice that the amount recommended by the committee is $1,200,000. This is for projects which come under so-called section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, under which the Corps of Army Engineers can, on their own initiative, in the case of a project their investigation determines to be feasible, provide allocations up to $150,000 for the accomplishment of local protective works. It has the usual requirements of local cooperation on rights-of-way, and things of that sort.

I invite the chairman's attention to the fact that the Senate Committee on Public Works already this year has reported and the Senate has passed S. 2372, which increases the amount which Congress may appropriate in any one year. Present law, as the Senator knows, authorizes appropriations up to $3 million annually and allocations not in excess of $150,000.

The bill which the Senate passed, and which came from the Committee on Public Works, proposed to increase the $3 million total authorization to $15 million, and the size of the project allocations to $250,000.

I have in my hand the report of the Committee on Public Works on S. 3272. It is report No. 1732. At page 9 of the report there is a comment which I should like to read. I shall read merely the last sentence:

Accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget would not object to amending section 212 to

increase the limit on individual projects to $250,000 and the annual limit on appropriations for projects in this category to $5 million.

The Committee on Public Works held extensive hearings on this subject, reported the bill, and the Senate passed the bill, to increase the total limit of appropriations to $15 million. Yet here we are considering the report of the committee which refers to $1,400,000, which is considerably less even than the current authorization of $3 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Bureau of the Budget would do what it recommends. If the Senator will look at the record he will see that the Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate of $1 million for this item. The House provided that amount. The committee of the Senate increased it by $200,000.

I wish to say to my good friend that I would not be inclined to increase it to as much as $3 million, for the reason that the evidence the subcommittee developed from the Corps of Army Engineers was to the effect that they could not spend economically this year more than $1,500,000. However, if the Senator desires to increase it from $1,200,000 to $1,500,000, which is the amount the Corps of Engineers said they could economically spend this year, I would have no objection to such an amendment, and I would gladly take it to conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, Mr. President, I move to amend the bill on page 17, line 8, by striking out "$463,373,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$463,673,000". That would increase the amount by $300,000, and it would be used for the purposes which we have just discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$463,373,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$463,673,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that this additional amount is to be used at the discretion of the Corps of Army Engineers, without in any manner earmarking it for any particular project.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I certainly agree. I do not believe in the practice of earmarking on the floor, a general appropriation. However, I wish to insert in the RECORD, following action on this matter, some correspondence I have had with the Corps of Engineers with respect to two projects of this type in my own State. I may say to the chairman that one of them is on Moccasin Creek, at Aberdeen, S. Dak., and the other is at Red Dale Gulch, Rapid City, S. Dak. The Corps of Engineers have indicated that they are feasible projects and can be completed for between $100,000 and $150,000. In one case the flood loss in 1 year was $82,000, and in the other $112,000, if I remember correctly. In both cases it is proposed that there be local cost sharing.

I am not suggesting that by asking permission to put it in the RECORD we are earmarking the money, but by requesting $1,500,000 for local projects instead of $1,200,000, we are providing as much as the engineers have indicated to the committee they could process with their available engineering staff at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I would raise no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 27, 1956.*

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: In response to the inquiry in your letter of April 20, 1956, I am pleased to furnish you the following information concerning the flood-control projects we are studying on Moccasin Creek near Aberdeen and in the Red Dale Gulch area of Rapid City, with particular reference to the probable qualification of these projects as small flood-control projects under the provisions of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act.

MOCCASIN CREEK, ABERDEEN

The Omaha District's studies of Moccasin Creek are well advanced. The flood problem on Moccasin Creek, as you know, is due primarily to Elm River floodwaters which overtop the very low divide separating the Elm River from the headwaters of Moccasin Creek and flow southward down the Moccasin Creek valley. Consideration is being given to the construction of levees in the divide area to prevent such overflow.

The district is currently engaged in some further studies to determine whether any additional improvements are needed on Moccasin Creek or its tributary, Foote Creek, in the immediate vicinity of Aberdeen to achieve a desirable degree of flood control.

Although our studies are not completed, present indications are that an economically justified project can be developed with Federal costs below the curent $150,000 limitation for section 212 projects.

If these expectations prove correct, local interests will be required to furnish the normal local cooperation for projects of this nature including the furnishing of rights-of-way, accomplishment of any necessary alterations of roads, bridges, and utilities, and maintenance of the project after completion.

The district expects to complete its studies, discuss the project with local interests, and, barring unforeseen circumstances, submit a report to this office by June 30. I anticipate that 2 or 3 weeks will be required for review in this office, after which the report will be forwarded to the Chief of Engineers for consideration of project authorization.

RED DALE GULCH, RAPID CITY

The Omaha District's studies of a flood-control project for the Red Dale Gulch area of Rapid City are also well advanced, and a report thereon is expected in this office within the very near future. The principal source of floodwaters affecting the Red Dale Gulch area is in Cedar Canyon, and the district tentatively proposed construction of a dam and reservoir in Cedar Canyon which would control the major part of its drainage area. The estimated cost substantially exceeds the current $150,000 limitation for section 212 projects, but the project might nevertheless be considered for construction as a section 212 project, even under existing limitations, if local interests would be willing to assume costs in excess of $150,000. The estimated cost is well below the increased limitation of $500,000 in S. 3272 as passed by the Senate.

There are some complicating factors in our study of this project. First, in order to limit costs to a level commensurate with the benefits of this small project, the design of the dam incorporates some unusual features. Secondly, the dam and reservoir would not completely overcome the flood threat since storm drainage facilities in the Red Dale Gulch area itself are not adequate, and consideration must be given to the need for complementary improvements by local intests. Finally, the benefits of the project would be entirely of a very local nature; and, in accordance with current Federal policy, consideration must be given to requiring local interests to participate in the cost of the project even if the existing limitation on the Federal cost of section 212 projects is raised. Normally, projects of this nature would be discussed with local interests before a report is submitted to this office and to the Chief of Engineers. In this instance, because of the complicating factors present, I consider it desirable that preliminary review of the project be accomplished in this office and in the office of the Chief of Engineers before the district discusses the project with local interests. I assure you that preliminary review in this office will be expedited and that the report will be forwarded to the Chief of Engineers as soon as practicable.

Please write me further if you have any additional questions regarding these projects.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. POTTER,
Brigadier General, USA,
Division Engineer.

PRELIMINARY, MOCCASIN CREEK
CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Omaha, Nebr., August 23, 1955.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator,
Custer, S. Dak.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Reference is made to your letter of July 18, 1955, in regard to the flood problem on Moccasin Creek near Aberdeen, S. Dak., and to my interim reply of July 22, 1955. I now have Colonel Hayes' report on his preliminary investigation of the problem area, and I am pleased to furnish you the data which you requested.

Moccasin Creek is a small, right-bank tributary of the James River, draining an area of about 533 square miles of very flat terrain. The stream rises about 7 miles north of Aberdeen, flows generally southward traversing the southeast portion of the town, and joins the James River some 15 miles below Aberdeen. Only a very small portion of the total drainage area lies upstream from Aberdeen, and this area is not in itself large enough to generate damaging flood flows. However, the Moccasin Creek drainage area at its northern end is separated from the much larger Elm River drainage area by a very low divide which has occasionally been overtopped by flood flows on the Elm River and caused flooding on Moccasin Creek. Foote Creek, which joins Moccasin Creek about 2 miles below Aberdeen is reported to have aggravated and prolonged flooding on Moccasin Creek at Aberdeen on some occasions when Moccasin Creek flows were blocked by high discharges on Foote Creek.

The channel of Moccasin Creek through Aberdeen is at present obstructed in two places. At Eighth Street, a former bridge has been replaced by a low earth fill through which two 42-inch diameter pipes have been installed to pass normal flows. Just above the south city limits a low earth dam has been constructed. The city engineer advises, however, that it is planned to remove

these obstructions at such time as flooding on Moccasin Creek appears imminent.

Detailed information regarding floods on Moccasin Creek is available only for the floods of March-April 1943 and April 1952. Residents of the area report that floods occurred also in 1922 and in 1928. All of these floods occurred in the early spring, during the period of snow melt runoff, and in each case the bulk of the floodwaters came from the Elm River drainage area over the low divide previously described.

During the flood of April 1952, the greatest for which data are available, about 240 acres of land within the city of Aberdeen were flooded to depths ranging from 1 to 8 feet. In this area, 72 homes with an aggregate value of about $725,000 suffered damages estimated at $68,000. In addition, three business establishments, a public school ground, the city park, and numerous streets and alleys were flooded and damaged. U. S. Highway 12 was overtopped and closed to traffic for several days. A total of 204 persons were forced to leave their homes for periods of from 1 to 5 days. Total damages in Aberdeen during this flood were estimated to be about $80,000.

Since the 1952 flood, some 25 additional homes have been built in the area subject to flooding and other improvements have been made. Recurrence of the 1952 flood at this time would undoubtedly cause somewhat greater damage than that actually experienced in 1952.

On the basis of the limited data available, it appears that Moccasin Creek is subject to damaging floods about once in 10 years, on the average. Based on very preliminary studies, it appears that average annual damages in Aberdeen total about $6,000.

Following the flood of April 1952, the Brown County highway department constructed an earth levee along the divide between the Elm River and Moccasin Creek drainage areas with a view to preventing future flow of Elm River floodwaters across this divide. However, the levee is vulnerable to flanking since neither end is tied to high ground. It is understood that landowners in the area prevented extension of the levee to provide adequate ties to high ground.

Local interests have suggested several alternate methods for correction of the Moccasin Creek flood problem including extension and possible raising of the existing divide levee, diversion of Moccasin Creek flows eastward to the Elm River from a point near the Highway 12 crossing, and channel improvement and levees along Moccasin and Foote Creeks. It appears that the first of these methods would be the most practicable and most economical.

Based upon our preliminary damage estimates, elimination of most of these damages would justify expenditure of something over $100,000 for corrective measures. It appears, therefore, that a project for protection of Aberdeen against floods on Moccasin Creek would be eligible for construction under the provisions of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act providing that a desirable project can be constructed for this amount. Field surveys and additional studies will be required before we can develop an estimate of the cost of improvement.

The flood problem on Moccasin Creek would be corrected, of course, by construction of the Westport Reservoir which we have proposed for construction on the Elm River. Continued local opposition to the Westport Reservoir, however, makes relief from this source a somewhat remote possibility. I feel, therefore, that a local flood protection project on Moccasin Creek would be warranted if it can be economically justified.

Accordingly, I propose to undertake, in connection with our James River investigation, additional studies of sufficient scope to determine the probable cost and economic justification of a project for flood control on Moccasin Creek. A decision can then be reached, if economic justification is present, whether project authorization should be sought for a section 212 project if the estimated Federal cost is less than $150,000, or through the medium of an interim report if the estimated Federal Cost is greater than $150,000.

I hope that the above information is sufficient for your current needs. I shall write you further when the studies described in the preceding paragraph are completed.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. POTTER,
Bridagier General, USA,
Division Engineer.

PRELIMINARY RED DALE GULCH
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington D. C., August 3, 1955.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Please refer to your letter of July 16, 1955, concerning the flood problem at Rapid City, S. Dak. A report on this matter has now been received from the division engineer of our Missouri River division, and I am pleased to furnish you the following information.

The flood of July 9, 1955, which had its source in the Cedar Canyon, Red Dale Gulch, and Yucca Gulch areas, inundated about 40 acres in west Rapid City to depths ranging from 6 inches to 2 feet. Affected in varying degrees were 101 residences, 2 motels, a drive-in cafe, and numerous city streets and alleys. Total flood damages were estimated at $26,000, and resulted from rainfall of about 2.5 inches.

It had been previously estimated that a flood of major proportions could cause damages amounting to $131,000 in the concerned area, since the natural stream channels traversing the damage zone have been so encroached upon by recent improvements in the area, that they now have little value as floodways. It is apparent, therefore, that a severe flood threat exists at Rapid City.

The plan of protection for Rapid City developed several years ago by the Corps of Engineers, will require a complete reanalysis because of the further developments in the area. It is very probable, however, that both the benefits and costs of flood protection for the area may be increased.

Local interests have proposed a plan of protection that would involve construction of two small reservoirs located in Cedar Canyon and in Red Dale Gulch, supplemented by a storm water disposal system, in the flood plain area. However, they have indicated that they do not feel they are able or willing, to bear the entire cost of the necessary improvements. Full consideration will be given to the plans as well as the desires of the local people in any further Corps of Engineers studies of the problem area.

Emergency-repair authorities presently available to the Corps are not applicable to this case since there are no existing flood-control works in the area; and highways, bridges, or public works appear to be involved only in a very minor degree, if at all.

Although this area is included in the report on the Cheyenne River Basin, the restudy of which is shortly to be resumed, it is considered that the feasibility of providing a small local protection project under the authority of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act should be investigated. Accordingly, I am pleased to inform you that the district engineer at Omaha is being authorized to make a reconnaissance study of the problem to determine whether an economically feasible solution can be found under the section 212 authority.

Should this study indicate the possibility of developing a feasible project pursuant to section 212 authority, you may be assured that prompt consideration will be given to authorization of the necessary detailed engineering and economic studies. However, a backlog of such projects for which detailed studies have already been completed prevents earmarking of any of the limited funds provided for that purpose, at this time.

I trust that the above information is sufficient for your present needs. I would be pleased to discuss the matter further with you, Senator MUNDT, and Representative BERRY, should you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Brigadier General, USA, Assistant Chief of Engineers, for Civil Works.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the public works appropriations bill for 1957 contains one item of great importance not only to my State of Michigan but to all the Great Lakes States and the entire economy.

I am referring to the allocation of $5 million to begin long-awaited construction to deepen the connecting channels between the Great Lakes.

Mr. President, this is a new chapter in the dramatic story of how our Great Lakes are being opened to the commerce of the world.

Work is already underway to make the St. Lawrence Seaway an accomplished fact. When this work is completed, as well as the necessary deepening of the channels, Great Lakes ports will rival those elsewhere throughout the world for their activity.

But even without the St. Lawrence Seaway, the deepening of the channels will have an extremely beneficial effect on Great Lakes transportation. The Corps of Engineers estimates that, exclusive of the seaway—commerce between Great Lakes ports will benefit by more than 88 million tons annually.

I do not think I need emphasize what this will mean eventually to the economy of the Great Lakes States when the channels are completed and the ports are improved.

More than 12 million people live and work in 5 of the port areas—Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, Toledo, Cleveland, and Buffalo. They will reap great economic gains from the anticipated increase in Great Lakes activity.

But the economic gains will not stop there, Mr. President. They will spread over the entire Middle West and the Nation.

The Great Lakes area, long the heartland of America, will finally be utilized to the fullest extent.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, as the senior minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Works, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee on the fine service they have performed for their country. As a member of the Public Works Committee, during the past 10 years I know we have tried to authorize projects all over the Nation which would strengthen

not only localities but the entire country by tying the country together to the extent it could be tied by water transportation and by the preservation of our natural resources.

For example, Mr. President, Pittsburgh receives oil by water from Houston, Tex. It is an economical way to transport that very important commodity.

So, Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for the fine work he has done. He has been tireless in hearing various witnesses from all over the Nation, and has rendered a service which is most commendable and most helpful.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to be associated with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania with reference to the great work of the chairman of the subcommittee. I may argue with him sometimes with reference to some discriminations which have occurred, but I wish to commend him for the great service he has rendered.

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

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. KERR conferees on the part of the Senate.

REVIVAL OF INTEREST IN CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is gratifying to me that the spokesmen for organized conservation groups are now taking renewed interest in the principles of conservation as advanced by two great pioneers of the movement President Theodore Roosevelt and his Forestry Chief, Gifford Pinchot.

One reason for this new interest in the founders of the American conservation movement is the approaching 50th anniversary of the calling in Washington by President Theodore Roosevelt of the historic Conference of Governors in 1908. This conference dealt with the problems of conservation and wise utilization of our natural resources and marks a significant milestone in the history of conservation in this country.

One reason I am pleased with this revival of interest in the conservation philosophy of Roosevelt and Pinchot, is that these two great men realized and repetitively stressed that the Nation's water supply is the No. 1 priority in our natural resource conservation planning. The 1908 conference of governors, in fact, had its genesis in the efforts of the Roosevelt administration to preserve the forest watersheds and to develop the Nation's waterways.

At the recent Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee hearings on a Senate resolution to provide for the commemoration of the golden anniversary of that historic Conference of Governors, one of the outstanding witnesses was the widow of Gifford Pinchot. Her statement was so infused with the true conservation spirit of Gifford Pinchot, that I believe it is eminently worthy of the consideration of the Members of this body at this time. Hence I hereby request unanimous consent to have her statement printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it also happened that a statement I made at the Senate committee hearing also stressed the comprehensive scope of the conservation principles as practiced by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. In view of the similarities of the general subject matter in the two statements, I hereby request unanimous consent to have my statement printed in the RECORD following the statement of Mrs. Pinchot.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, these two statements will, I believe, direct the attention of conservationists to the origins of the movement to conserve and wisely utilize the Nation's natural resources. In any conservation program, as President Theodore Roosevelt pointed out, the conservation of water is essential, frequently basic to other accompanying conservation objectives.

I deeply appreciate the efforts made by the distinguished widow of an esteemed Governor of Pennsylvania and one of the most distinguished men in forestry and conservation, to come before a Senate committee and give her views on some of the problems faced by our pioneering conservationists a half century ago. Gifford Pinchot was a great American and an eminent conservationist, and after hearing Mrs. Pinchot testify, I am sure that her own interest and enthusiasm did much to inspire him to keep steadfastly to his difficult task of persuading America to give heed to the still-urgent necessity of conserving our water and our soil resources, and wisely utilizing all of our natural resources. In the semiarid West we especially appreciate the courage and foresight of Roosevelt and Pinchot.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF MRS. GIFFORD PINCHOT, WIDOW OF FORMER GOV. GIFFORD PINCHOT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mrs. PINCHOT. Mr. Chairman, I feel highly honored by your invitation to address this meeting in support of your joint resolution for commemoration of the Governors Conservation Conference in 1908. This conference was, as you know, the highly original and imaginative vehicle devised by Theodore Roosevelt for officially launching and presenting the science of conservation to the American people.

You see, he was after nothing less than a full understanding and approval by the entire Nation for what was then not only a revolutionary science, but a basic and urgent necessity for the welfare of America.

But all this you know already, and, of course, Senator MURRAY, I am glad to comply with your three directives:

First. To tell something of the early history of conservation;

Second. To speak with special emphasis on the background of this governors' conference of 1908—the 50th anniversary of which you are planning to celebrate in 1958;

And your third directive indicated that you wanted me to make recommendations for some specific activities your Commission might later want to take up on behalf of conservation. That, too, I will be most happy to attempt.

But here I must warn you that there is a danger that you may not like some of the things I am going to say. For you see, conservation is not an easy mistress—on the contrary, it is a fighting creed—and a worker in the field must be astute enough to realize that some who are loudest and most vociferous in their support of a particular measure of conservation may actually be an enemy of the philosophy and an opponent of most of the other disciplines.

Now, to being with the history of conservation, that should not be difficult for me, since you probably know that this early history can and must be told largely in terms of the life history of one man—that man, Gifford Pinchot, my husband.

Or rather, I should say, told in the terms of the history of two men: one President Roosevelt—of course, I mean Theodore Roosevelt—and the other, Gifford Pinchot. As you probably know, T. R. put the entire power of his administration behind the conservation movement as spelled out, organized, and brought to birth by Pinchot.

Now, as to the start of this necessary Pinchot history, he was the son of well-to-do New York parents of a French ancestry, his education more or less typical of that of the privileged young man of his day, school and college, Exeter, Yale, and so on.

After graduation, Pinchot cast about, as young people must, for what to do with his life. The law had no attraction for him; neither did the opportunity of a real estate job offered by a very rich old uncle. At this point, James Pinchot, his father, asked "What would you think of becoming a forester?" Now that rang a bell.

Pinchot was an out-of-doors man; he had always been interested in the natural sciences. Even as a boy he had done considerable work collecting for and with a number of distinguished French scientists from the Sorbonne.

So off he started to find how and where to get the necessary education, only then to discover there were no forestry schools in America, and what was even worse, not so much as a single professionally trained American forester.

After much consultation both here and abroad, plus a personal survey of many of the established schools in France, England, Germany, and Switzerland, he decided upon the L'Ecole Nationale Forestiere at Nancy in eastern France.

On his return to America 3 years later, Pinchot realized he had the field entirely to himself. However, he found that there did exist a certain meager amount of concern about the appalling devastation of the forests throughout the country; unfortunately, such concern being expressed mainly by a few feeble old men who sat in comfortable leather chairs in their Fifth Avenue club-

houses grumbling to each other about the situation.

Never, however, did it occur to any one of them so much as to lift a finger to do anything practical about the problem, and young Pinchot understood that if he didn't tackle the job no one else was likely so to do, and that if something effective were ever to be done, the first job must be to get forestry out of urban Fifth Avenue and into the western woods.

Furthermore, that since forest devastation was on a nationwide scale, largely on forests owned by the Nation, any concerted action would have to be developed on a nationwide basis, and that consequently it was necessary to get a toehold in the National Government somewhere, if possible in Washington, preferably through the President.

However, a different kind of opportunity opened up just at that moment. George Vanderbilt, a sensationally rich and idle young man, was at this time building himself an enormous estate in North Carolina which included some 7,000 acres of forestland, and amazingly enough, this rather bumbling youth was somehow intelligent enough to sound Pinchot out about taking charge of his Biltmore Forest in terms of applied forestry.

Here was Pinchot's chance, a real chance, to prove what America did not then know—that trees could be scientifically lumbered, that forests could be sustained in terms of annual growth and yield, and that a satisfactory income could be produced all at one and the same time. In fact, as far as forest ownership was concerned, that it was almost possible to have your cake and eat it, too.

Pinchot's immediate acceptance of Vanderbilt's offer amazed the old fuddy-duddies in New York, the chief of whom wrote saying, "If you can make forestry profitable under the conditions at Biltmore within the next 10 years, I shall consider you the wisest forester and financier of the age."

Not too encouraging a sendoff for a young man on his first professional job. However, Biltmore Forest did prove a complete and brilliant success; it did demonstrate that forestry was not only necessary, but was a practical, scientific, and financial possibility.

The Biltmore Forest—now the Pisgah National Forest—is still in operation today, I believe in better shape, producing more and more valuable types of trees, giving more salable lumber and, I assume, also producing bigger income than in the last decade of the 19th century.

But significant as this was, it still did not furnish the Government toehold Pinchot needed. Since the forests were a national resource and forest devastation was actually operating on a nationwide scale, this new knowledge must be applied right across the country with no time lost. This must be sought in Washington and preferably through the influence of the Presidency.

Benjamin Harrison was President at that time and he was openly concerned about forest devastation and inclined to favor some kind of protection.

In 1891, Congress authorized the President to withdraw parts of the public domain for forest reserves; and so President Harrison promptly set aside 13 million acres, the nucleus of our present national forests. These reserves, however, were totally withdrawn from every kind of use, and they aroused strong opposition in the West, where they were located. The idea of using the reserves as productive timber resources did not come in until after Pinchot had introduced it the following year at Biltmore.

Cleveland's second term then had 2 years more to run. He was not an out-of-doors man, but he was a wise and intelligent President, one who knew men, was never afraid of ideas, nor reluctant to break new ground. With his help, a bill was introduced into the Congress in 1893 which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to "establish immediately such services as shall be required" on the forest reserves. This bill was unfortunately defeated but, Pinchot says, "the forest laws we have today were largely built upon it."

Then Pinchot was sent to talk to Hoke Smith, the then Secretary of the Interior who, as I understand, was told to do what he could to back up these Pinchot ideas for forest preservation. Pinchot quite understood that as a very far-down-the-line underling young bureaucrat, which he was then, nothing he said or did could be expected to get a hearing, still less produce much of an impression, to which end he decided it would be advantageous to enlist the aid of some well-known and well-established Government agency.

So he suggested to the Secretary that a consultation with the National Academy of Sciences might be helpful. But Hoke Smith, realizing how little he knew about forests, was puzzled even how to formulate the questions whose answers he needed for public backing, and asked Pinchot to draft the proper and pregnant questions.

The final result, amusingly enough, was that the National Academy of Sciences, which itself knew less than nothing about practical forestry, had to come to Pinchot for help in answering the questions he had himself formulated, and so was brain-trusting born.

After Cleveland, came almost 5 years of McKinley, an Ohio man who was perhaps more interested in Wall Street than in the development of the West. However, he was in favor of forest preservation, and some months after he came in, the Pettigrew amendment was passed authorizing management of the reserves for timber production, thus ending the conflict over the absolute locking up of the timber in the national forests.

In 1898 he appointed Gifford Pinchot to be head of the Forestry Division in the Department of Agriculture. This is important; you will hear a great deal more about this later.

Then on September 14, 1901, President McKinley was assassinated in Buffalo, and on the same day Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States.

Roosevelt and Pinchot already were well known to each other. As a matter of fact, the latter had been consulted by T. R. when governor on questions of forestry and stream flow in New York.

Naturally, Pinchot was anxious that the new President's inaugural message should stress the conservation movement. T. R. was more than willing and authorized Pinchot to make a draft for this on the subject of forestry and conservation. Roosevelt accepted substantially everything Pinchot had written.

The Presidential message made forestry and irrigation into national issues of continental consequence and slated them toward the high degree of public acceptance they achieved in the next 10 years. The message said:

"The practical usefulness of the national forest reserves to the mining, grazing, irrigation and other interests of the regions in which the reserves lie has led to a widespread demand by the people of the West for their protection and extension. The forest reserves will inevitably be of still greater use in the future than in the past. Additions should be increased by a thoroughly businesslike management.

"Water supply itself depends upon the forest. In the arid region it is water, not land, that measures production. The western half of the United States would sustain a population greater than that of our whole country today if the waters that now run to waste were saved and used for irrigation. The forest and water problems are perhaps the most vital internal questions of the United States."

He further said:

"The fundamental idea of forestry is the perpetuation of forests by use. Forest protection is not an end in itself; it is a means to increase and sustain the resources of the country and the industries which depend upon them. The preservation of America's forests is an imperative business necessity.

"The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country, just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the entire Atlantic seaboard. Our people as a whole will profit, for successful homemaking is but another name for the upbuilding of the Nation.

"Nature has supplied America, and still supplies us, with more kinds of resources in a more lavish degree than has ever been the case at any time or with any other people. Our position in the world has been attained by the extent and thoroughness of the control we have achieved over nature; but we are more, not less, dependent upon what she furnishes than at any previous time of history since the days of primitive man.

"The conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem, it will avail us little to solve all others."

And that was that. This first message made it clear where T. R. stood on all the facets of conservation. By 1907 Pinchot was not only chief forester, but he had become Roosevelt's topflight adviser on the management of practically all domestic and conservation measures—water resources, erosion, soil conservation, land, minerals, oil, gas, iron, coal, and other features of the public domain that were controlled by various agencies of the Government.

I am somewhat embarrassed to be speaking so much about my husband, but it is history and there is no way of telling about the coming of conservation without telling it in terms of the man who was responsible for that. Then, too, the story is unique.

Here was a very young man, starting without Government contacts, without experience in Government, who single-handed, in 10 years, actually changed the political picture of America and in so doing, the history of a continent.

There is one point I am concerned to bring you, a point which is too rarely stressed by conservationists. This deals with the philosophy of conservation, the philosophy that was so truly born of Gifford Pinchot's mind and spirit, and from which he derives much of his temporal and earthly immortality.

Beyond the preservation of the forests, beyond reclamation of the soil, beyond the various techniques of land and flood control, over and above and back of all of these stands the philosophy of conservation, the philosophy that informs, polarizes and directs action throughout.

Conservation to Gifford Pinchot was never a vague, fuzzy aspiration. It was concrete, exact, dynamic—the application of science and technology to our material economy for the purpose of enhancing and elevating the life of the individual.

The conservation he preached dealt with protection of the forests in terms of wise use and sustained yield. It dealt with the relation of these forests to the fertility of the soil, to erosion and flood prevention, to inland waterways. It dealt with the relation of forests to industrial development.

But first, last, and all the time, conservation dealt with human beings, with sheepherders and homesteaders, whose livelihood depended on the measure of protection from exploitation that the Forest Service was prepared to give. It dealt with the economic and social problems of country life, with rural education, with the country church, with equality of opportunity. The list is a long one.

A conservation policy, Pinchot said, has three great purposes:

"(1) Wisely to use, protect, and renew the natural resources of the earth.

"(2) Scientifically to control the use of these resources and their products in the common interest, to the end of securing their distribution to the people at fair and reasonable charges for goods and services.

"(3) To make certain that the rights of the people to govern themselves should not be controlled by great monopolies through their power over natural resources."

In other words, the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time.

To Pinchot, you see, man himself is a natural resource. The basic and primary resource for whose material, moral, and spiritual welfare the conservation doctrine is invoked. Man, without whose energy, the energy of coal and oil, of electricity, yes, of atomic fission, itself is inert and meaningless.

Believing, as he did, that the planned and orderly development of the earth and all it contains is indispensable to the permanent prosperity of the human race, conservation in its widest sense became to him one of the guiding principles through which such prosperity might be achieved. A bold creative affirmation in ethical and spiritual terms of our faith in the dignity of man as a child of God.

Pinchot was trained as a forester; he thought as a forester; he felt like a forester. But before he had practiced forestry long, he realized that there were questions with which he as chief forester had been called upon to deal—questions that on the face of them might seem to have little to do with trees.

In his autobiography, he writes about going some 42 years ago "into the gathering gloom of an expiring day to ride in Rock Creek Park, and of taking with him on that ride the difficult problems upon which he was constantly at work."

He was thinking not only of the national forests, but of those in the hands of private lumbermen, of the overgrazing and forest fires, of blighted areas and dust bowls—in short, of all the misery and waste due to the wanton neglect of the most elementary measures of conservation.

But thinking also of the abuses and exploitation of mineral deposits on public lands, of the danger of monopoly control over our natural resources. He was thinking about rural electrification and the multiple benefits that would arise from a public water power policy developed in terms of social use and need, of effective regulation of public utilities, of giant power.

Looking a long way forward, he had already envisioned the possibility of great river developments and their relation not only to an improved agriculture, but to a sounder national economy.

Further, and most significantly, he was thinking of natural resources as an international problem, one that directly affects issues of war and peace. What had all these various issues to do with forestry, he asked himself, and what had forestry to do with them? What was the basic link, if any, between them all?

Suddenly the idea flashed through his mind, "Here are no longer a lot of different, independent, often antagonistic questions, each on its own separate little island," as he a forester had been in the habit of thinking.

"Instead, there is one central question—manysided, yes—but still a unit. All so closely connected as to make it imperative that they be coordinated and treated as part of a single coherent whole."

Seen in this new light, "these separate issues fitted each into the other to make up one central problem—the use of the earth for the good of man." To Pinchot, it was "like coming out of a dark tunnel." He "had been seeing one spot of light ahead, and all of a sudden the whole landscape rushed into visibility."

It was a new policy that was needed. One not merely domestic, but worldwide in its scope. One that involved not only the welfare of man, but his very existence on earth. Moreover, it was an international policy in which all nations must eventually cooperate for their fullest development, a policy to which, after much thought, he decided to give the name of conservation.

In these terms conservation became not solely, nor even primarily a matter of techniques, as some moderns seem to believe, but of Government policy on the highest level. There was never any doubt of that fact, nor of what it implied in the mind of Gifford Pinchot, and of T. R. and in the minds of the early foresters.

Now, to go back to that first governors' conference in 1908, called at the instigation of Pinchot by the then President Theodore Roosevelt, a meeting of the governors of the 47 States, held at the White House.

At the conference, for the first time in history, the idea of conservation was spelled out to the American people in terms so simple as to be understood by all. First, they were made to realize that our natural resources are not inexhaustible. That, on the contrary, these were being wasted and destroyed at a rate that was disastrous and might soon become fatal.

The point was then driven home that the natural resources of the country are a national heritage, to be made use of in establishing and promoting the welfare, the prosperity, and the happiness of the American people.

Hitherto, said Theodore Roosevelt, our national policy had been one of almost unrestricted destruction of these resources. It was a policy that had led and was leading to the exhaustion of many of them. Moreover, it was one that gave unequalled opportunity for exploitation by monopoly.

And "monopoly can no longer be tolerated," proclaimed the President. "In the past, we have admitted the right of the individual to injure the future of the Republic for his own present profit. The time has come to put an end to such exploitation."

Always, you see, the protection of the rights of the people marched side by side with the technology of forest management, the development of water power, extraction of minerals, et cetera.

Always the emphasis laid upon the social purpose of conservation—that purposes defined by Gifford Pinchot as "the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time." Always the conception stressed that conservation is not a series of independent issues, but one central problem to be faced and solved as such.

You may be interested to know that almost immediately following the governors' conference, a second conference, the North American Conservation Conference, met in Washington, with representatives of Mexico, Canada, Newfoundland and the United States participating. The declaration of principles adopted there said:

"We recognize the mutual interest of the nations on the Continent of North America and the dependence of the welfare of each upon its natural resources.

We agree that the conservation of these resources is undeniable for the continued prosperity of each nation. Natural resources are not confined by the boundary lines that separate nations. We agree that no nation acting alone can adequately conserve them and we recommend the adoption of concurrent measures for conserving the material foundation and welfare of all the nations concerned and for ascertaining their location."

Perhaps the greatest recommendation of this conference was the following:

"We recommend that any conservation program should become worldwide in its scope and therefore suggest to the President of the United States of America that all nations should be invited to join together in conference on the subject of world resources and their conservation and wide utilization."

As a matter of fact, Roosevelt had already been thinking that, and an invitation was sent out by the President to all the major nations of the world for such a conference. I think that 30 of them had accepted, among them Germany, England, France, and Russia and some others, when President Taft, who succeeded Theodore Roosevelt, decided to kill this conference and he voided the invitations.

Now, as to the directive you gave me about suggestions I might make for action when your Commission is organized, there is one item which, with your permission, I should like to bring to your attention. This deals with an issue Gifford Pinchot always referred to as "unfinished business," something he had not been able to get to before his death, but which was on his mind always.

I should like to lay this baby in your lap, for I feel strongly about its future importance. But before going into that, may I lay before you some facts which may not have been brought to your attention in their proper significance.

Today the national forests contain something like 126 million acres of forests, most of it reasonably well protected in the interest of the present and the future.

On the other hand, there are something over 358 million acres of forests, some in farmers' woodlots, privately held land and State forests. On the great majority of this acreage it is probably fair to say that little scientific forestry is being done and still less conservation practiced. Forest fires are only too often allowed to blaze unchecked. Lumbering may be destructive to reproduction.

We cannot dodge the fact that protection of these lands means a minimum form of control and that brings up the old question of control by whom?

I know something of the murky field between Federal and State action and realize that this is one of the hottest spots in American politics, one in which emotions run high.

These 358 million acres may be of untold value to the American people and I think you will agree with me that something must be done to see that it is protected for the benefit of our descendants; that if an end is put to the present situation, it will have to be done on the ground that there is no private right to public destruction.

You may not agree, but I believe the only possible or adequate protection lies in the hands of the National Government.

I am not presuming to outline any tentative legislation, nor to tell you in my opinion what ought or could be done. I merely want to say that this has been a problem for the last 40 years and in the absence of Federal action no effective controls have been set up in a majority of the States.

I am deeply concerned that this last loophole be closed and I beg of you gentlemen to inquire into the facts and decide what action should be taken. You see, some day America may need the trees on these 358 million acres, need the lumber badly. We are a growing Nation and more wood is being consumed each year.

The second suggestion concerns a frequently made attempt to transfer the Forest Service out of the Department of Agriculture, where it was placed by Pinchot and Roosevelt, into the Interior. Practically every President except Hoover has tried and failed to get this done. Such a transfer, of course, ignores the basic fact that forestry is a crop just as surely as corn, tobacco or cotton,

and crops are the concern of Agriculture—not Interior.

I shall not presume to bore you with recommendations at this point—only to beg of you if this does come up again to consider it seriously and with due protection to the interest of the farmer whose woodlot will be affected, and possibly allow me to testify as I feel strongly about this and would like to put before you the position that Pinchot took, and I want to concur with the recommendation by your committee.

Thank you very much.

EXHIBIT 2

STATEMENT BY SENATOR A. V. WATKINS, RELATIVE TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 139, PROVIDING FOR OBSERVANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSERVATION MOVEMENT

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity provided for me to appear before this committee to endorse the proposal to establish a commission to plan and direct a nationwide observance of the 50th anniversary of the conservation movement.

However, my purpose in appearing before you is not only to endorse the suggestion, but also to point out the comprehensive scope of the conservation movement set in motion by the conference of governors convened in 1908 by that great President, Theodore Roosevelt.

Conservation, as Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot visualized it, was not confined merely to the preservation of scenery. It involved the conservation and wise use of all our natural resources. It was a bipartisan program, involving the active participation of the States, as evidenced by the convening of the 1908 conference of governors, a historic event which this legislation will memorialize.

I not only believe that we should commemorate this occasion, which marked the real origin of the conservation movement, but also that we, as conservationists, should utilize this golden anniversary for some soul-searching and stocktaking to assure ourselves that our efforts in this direction are holding to the objectives and principles as laid down by the movement's founding fathers half a century ago.

To that end, I request you to review with me the origins and recommendations of that historic conference of governors of 1908.

In a preface to the official proceedings of the conference of governors, Secretary W. J. McGee makes this summation of the movement's origins:

"The idea of conserving the Nation's resources arose partly from the recent forestry movement, partly from the still more recent waterway movement."

In short, the conservation movement originated in part from the national-forest program, established by Teddy Roosevelt and the Congress primarily to preserve the Nation's watersheds, and the waterway movement, another great water resource program to develop the country's rivers and navigable lakes.

This disclosure may come as a distinct surprise to some modern-day conservationists, who apparently have become obsessed with the idea that the conservation and development of water resources is inimical to the aims of conservation. Actually, as the record shows, the water development program was responsible for the very genesis of this great natural resource conservation movement.

President Roosevelt is very specific on this subject in a quotation presented by Mr. McGee in that same preface. The germ of the idea for the conference of governors, he said, "took form in an address by President Roosevelt before the Society of American Foresters (of which he was and is an associate member), March 26, 1903. In expressions indicating perhaps more clearly than any of earlier date, the interdependence of our resources, he said to the forest students:

" 'Your attention must be directed to the preservation of the forests, not as an end in itself, but as a means of preserving the prosperity of the Nation. * * * In the arid region of the West agriculture depends first of all upon the available water supply. In such a region forest protection alone can maintain the stream flow necessary for irrigation and can prevent the great and destructive floods so ruinous to communities farther down the same streams. * * * The relation between forests and the whole mineral industry is an extremely intimate one. The very existence of lumbering * * * depends upon the success of our work as a nation in putting practical forestry into effective operation. As it is with mining and lumbering, so it is in only a less degree with transportation, manufactures, and commerce in general. The relation of all these industries to forestry is of the most intimate and dependent kind.' "

Later, in appointing the Inland Waterways Commission, an event of historic importance in the development of our great national waterways system, President Teddy Roosevelt made this comment, further attesting to the interdependence of our natural resources:

"It is becoming clear that our streams should be considered and conserved as great natural resources. * * * The time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the entire country. * * * It is not possible to properly frame so large a plan * * * without taking account of the orderly development of other natural resources. Therefore, I ask that the Inland Waterways Commission shall consider the relations of the streams to the use of all the great permanent natural resources and their conservation for the making and maintenance of prosperous homes."

In announcing his plans to convene the conference of governors, President Roosevelt made this comment in the course of an address before the Lakes-to-Gulf Deep Waterway Association meeting at Memphis on October 4, 1907:

"As I have said elsewhere, the conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem it will avail us little to solve all others. To solve it, the whole nation must undertake the task through their organizations and associations, through the men whom they have made specially responsible for the welfare of the several States, and finally through Congress and the Executive. As a preliminary step, the Inland Waterways Commission has asked me to call a conference on the conservation of natural resources, including, of course, the streams, to meet in Washington during the coming winter. I shall accordingly call such a conference. It ought to be among the most important gatherings in our history, for none have had a more vital question to consider."

When the historic Governors' Conference convened in 1908, it included not only the governors of the respective States, but also representatives or organizations concerned with preservation and wise use of our forest watersheds and timber, our streams, and our minerals. It was truly a conservation conference, in every sense of the word.

The comprehensive nature of this first national conservation conference was reflected in the declaration of views and recommendations which was submitted and approved at the fifth session of the 3-day Washington conference. The proceedings of this session, in respect to these recommendations, are so significant, that I hereby request that an extract of the proceedings of this session be introduced into the record as a part of my remarks. But, in summary, I present herewith some extracts from the declaration which emphasize the interdependence of natural resources in this movement:

"The great prosperity of our country rests upon the abundant resources of the land."

"We look upon these resources as a heritage to be made use of in establishing and promoting the comfort, prosperity, and happiness of the American people.

"We declare our firm conviction that this conservation of our natural resources is a subject of transcendent importance which should engage unremittingly the attention of the Nation, the States, and the people in earnest cooperation. These natural resources include the land on which we live and which yields our food; the living waters which fertilize the soil, supply power, and form great avenues of commerce; the forests which yield the materials for our homes, prevent erosion of the soil, and conserve the navigation and other uses of our streams; and the minerals which form the basis of our industrial life and supply us with heat, light, and power.

"We agree that the land should be so used that erosion and soil-wash shall cease; that there should be reclamation of arid and semi-arid regions by means of irrigation, and of swamp and overflowed regions by means of drainage; that the waters should be so conserved and used as to promote navigation, to enable the arid regions to be reclaimed by irrigation, and to develop power in the interests of the people; that the forests which regulate our rivers, support our industries, and promote the fertility and productiveness of the soil should be preserved and perpetuated; that the minerals found so abundantly beneath the surface should be so used as to prolong their utility; that the beauty, healthfulness, and habitability of our country should be preserved and increased; that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the people and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated.

"We urge the continuation and extension of forest policies.

"We recognize in our waters a most valuable asset of the people of the United States.

"Let us conserve the foundations of our prosperity."

That "declaration" of 1908 stamped that Conference of Governors as a real meeting of conservationists, vitally interested in all the natural resources of this great country.

As a part of the program for commemorating this half century of conservation, I recommend the convening of a similar Conference of Governors and representatives of all natural-resource organizations for the purpose of taking stock of our progress and re-evaluating our problems in terms of successes and failures during the past 50 years. Perhaps the convocation of such an assembly will serve to remind all who express interest in such a movement that all our natural resources are worthy of the attention of conservationists of the stature of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot.

Out of such a second Governors' Conference at the halfway point in the first century of organized conservation may come renewed cooperation and interest in the overall problems of conserving and utilizing our natural resources. Problems in this field are destined to get worse before they get better, and our success in conserving and wisely using our natural resources in the face of increasing pressures and increasing population will call for cooperative, far-sighted statesmanship of the type displayed by those eminent founders of the century's great bipartisan conservation movement.

MAINTENANCE OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes.

THE NATION WATCHES HELLS CANYON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had planned to deliver my speech earlier in the day, but, as is always my practice, I cooperated with the leadership of the Senate in agreeing to postpone my speech until the passage of the public works appropriation bill. I explained to the leadership that I was going to speak for the RECORD and that I wished only to make the speech so that it would be available for reference in connection with what I am satisfied will be one of the most important debates that will be held in this session of the Congress between now and adjournment. It will be a debate on the great power flood-control and conservation issues involved in Hells Canyon Dam. I shall discuss it briefly this afternoon under the title "A Nation Watches Hells Canyon."

Mr. President, when I wrote this speech yesterday it was my understanding that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs contemplated a meeting tomorrow, at which time the Hells Canyon Dam bill would be taken up in the committee.

I have been advised by the chairman of the committee that several members cannot be present tomorrow, with the result that the meeting will be postponed for a few days.

I call that to the attention of the press, because my speech is in the Press Gallery, and I want the representatives of the press to know that when I wrote this speech I was of the understanding that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would meet tomorrow. However, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the exceedingly able chairman of that committee, who has one of the finest records in the entire history of the Senate on the matter of conservation and power development, advises me, in fact, assures me, that there will be a meeting of the committee in the very near future, at which time the Hells Canyon bill, of which I am the author, with some 29 cosponsors, will be taken up by the committee.

The action of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this issue, when the meeting is held, will be of vital concern not only to the Pacific Northwest but also to the whole Nation.

At issue is whether the Nation's best and most economical dam site will be developed fully for flood control, low-cost power, navigation, aid to irrigation, and recreation or be sacrificed to underdevelopment with less flood control, less power at higher cost, negligible contributions to navigation and recreation, and no assistance to irrigation.

RECENT FLOOD PROVES PERIL

Only last week the Columbia and its tributaries flooded, causing great damage. It was the third worst flood in the basin. But for the flood-control storage of great multipurpose dams like Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse, the devastation would have been greater than it was. Luckily, the weather turned cold. If the thaw had continued, the flood might have equaled or exceeded the tragic floods of 1894 and 1948. The potential was there. It lay in the heavy snows that run into the Snake River above the Hells Canyon Dam site. The potential damage exceeded the cost of Hells Canyon.

We may not be so lucky again. The law of averages indicates we will not be that fortunate again. High Hells Canyon Dam should be built while there is still time to avert a major catastrophe.

SUPPOSED ALTERNATIVES INADEQUATE

On June 9, the Corps of Engineers announced hearings on its review of the historic 308 report which gave us the main control plan for the Columbia River Basin. Hells Canyon is a key part of that plan for flood control, power, and the other benefits of multipurpose, integrated river development.

The corps announcement states:

> Because the present outlook visualizes the early attainment of only 50 percent of the storage development contemplated by the 1948 Main Control Plan, the review study will include an examination of other apparently feasible and economic storage developments in the basin. Table I attached to this bulletin lists the storage projects which have been considered. Those projects which appear to be worthy of more detailed investigation and appraisals are underlined in the tabulation. Two additional projects, the Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs projects on the Clearwater River, which would provide 3,730,000 acre-feet of usable storage, already have been studied in detail and have been recommended for construction in a report submitted to Congress on June 1, 1955.

The flood storage and downstream benefits of these projects are less than those of Hells Canyon. They are bitterly opposed by conservationists, whereas Hells Canyon is not. With Hells Canyon's flood and power storage lost, these inadequate substitutes will be more strongly urged. These Clearwater dams would be good enough only to make up some of the difference between high Hells Canyon and the Idaho Power Co. projects, when and if they are built. The Clearwater crests far less frequently than the Snake at Hells Canyon. With Hells Canyon developed fully for flood control, the Clearwater crests would be far less serious than they have been.

INDUSTRY AND FERTILIZER

Hells Canyon's low-cost power means new taxpaying private enterprise for the Pacific Northwest. The whole Nation would gain from the new profits, wages, and purchasing power which the high dam would bring into being.

A whole new phosphate fertilizer industry would be opened up by low-cost Hells Canyon power. This means that the whole farm economy of the Nation would be improved, for phosphate fertilizer reserves are running low. Farmers in the Midwest and West would be able to save from $10 to $20 a ton on this new fertilizer output.

WATER RIGHTS

Idaho Power Co. propaganda has attempted to inject a false water rights issue into the controversy over Hells Canyon. The company and its partisans claim the high dam imperils upstream irrigation.

Expert witnesses from the Bureau of Reclamation and the Snake River watermaster testified before the FPC and congressional committees that there will be ample water for all foreseeable upstream irrigation and operation of the dam. The FPC examiner and the FPC found and stated in their decisions that this is clear.

The bill S. 1333 provides:

> SEC. 2. The operation of the Hells Canyon Dam shall be only such as does not conflict with present and future rights to the use of water for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses, whether now or hereafter existing, valid under State law, of the upstream waters of the Snake River and its tributaries.

This is an ironclad guaranty. It compares favorably indeed with the language proposed in a letter of January 31, 1956, to the FPC from Assistant Secretary of Interior Aandahl in connection with the partnership application for Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley Dams. This is what the administration's spokesman said in regard to a private utility application:

> The proposed developments are located downstream from extensive existing and potential water utilization projects in the upper Snake River Basin. To be feasible, the irrigation developments must have an assured water supply free from downstream encumbrances. It is recommended that any license that may be issued contain a provision somewhat similar to that contained in the FPC opinion and order issuing license in the matter of the Idaho Power Co. on project Nos. 1971, 2132, and 2133 (Oxbow, Hells Canyon, and Brownlee) which would fully protect the water rights of potential upstream water conservation developments. The following stipulation would provide the desired protection:
>
> "The use of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries in connection with works constructed pursuant to this license shall be subordinate to all future depletion of streamflow attributable to future upstream diversions for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses under State law."

There is no time limit on the language of S. 1333. In contrast, any license for a private project can be revoked or modified at the end of the 50-year license period.

These facts are directed to the senior Senators from Utah and Idaho, who, as members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, have claimed that the Hells Canyon bill (S. 1333) does not protect upstream irrigation rights. The similar, but less extensive, language of the Interior Department's suggestion for private projects—the language of the Idaho Power Co. licenses—is far less protective of the rights over which they express concern.

COMPANY PROCEEDS WITHOUT OREGON'S APPROVAL

Moreover, we have seen how the company flouts Federal and State laws. The company has begun preliminary construction work without obtaining a license and water rights from Oregon under Oregon water law. The company has

used its condemnation powers in Idaho ruthlessly. There is no consolation to upstream water users in the company's action.

HIGH AND COMPANY DAMS COMPARED

On the basis of the record of extensive hearings and findings, the comparison between high Hells Canyon and the company three-dam plan is as follows. Bear in mind that the company has received licenses for only two dams. The third will probably never be built. That factor makes the proven superiority of the high Hells Canyon Dam even more clear and the company program even less in the public interest.

POLITICS CANNOT CHANGE PHYSICAL FACTS

In the historic debate on Hells Canyon much will be said. Politics and private utility partisanship will result in false arguments and distortions of the engineering facts as they have been testified to before Congress and the Federal Power Commission.

I believe the superiority of Hells Canyon Dam for the Pacific Northwest and the Nation will carry the day. I warn solemnly that nothing less than the truth will do. Politics and partisanship can distort and confuse. But the floods of tomorrow, the power shortages ahead, the economic underdevelopment that threatens cannot be controlled or averted by false facts and arguments.

The Columbia River Basin and its greatest tributary, the Snake River, are living, physical facts. They are gifts to our people from providence. Let us use them wisely and honestly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table entitled "Comparison Between the High Hells Canyon Project and the Idaho Power Company Three-Dam Scheme."

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

Comparison between the high Hells Canyon project and the Idaho Power Co. 3-dam scheme

Item	High Hells Canyon Dam	Idaho Power Co. 3 dams [1]
1. Power output (prime kilowatts)	924,000	505,000.
2. Power costs (per kilowatt-hour)	2.7 mills	6.69 mills.
3. Active storage (acre-feet)	3,880,000	1,000,000.
4. Flood control benefits (annual)	$2,300,000	$1,000,000.
5. Navigation benefits (annual)	$189,000	$108,000.
6. Recreation benefits (number of annual visitors)	500,000 to 650,000	250,000 to 325,000.
7. Power revenues for aid to future reclamation	Yes	No.
8. Availability of power to entire region	do	Do.
9. Development of phosphate fertilizer	"The high dam project by providing power at low rates might be expected to stimulate large-scale development of the prosphate resources and large-scale expansion of fertilizer production" (examiner's finding No. 159). This means fertilizer to farmers in Midwest and West at savings of $10 to $20 a ton.	"The 3-dam plan would stimulate less phosphate development and less fertilizer production than the high dam project" (examiner's finding No. 160).
10. Development of electroprocess industries	"The high dam project, because of its high volume and low cost power output, might be expected to stimulate the expansion of electroprocess industries to a greater extent than the 3-dam plan, including those which would utilize regional mineral resources" (examiner's finding No. 162).	(See examiner's finding No. 162, opposite column.)
11. Cost of project (less transmission lines)	$308,473,000 FPC examiner said: "The facts seem to point to the inescapable conclusion that with the marked and substantial advantage of the Government's credit the high dam would be, dollar for dollar, the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the Middle Snake."	$175,766,000.
12. Benefit-to-cost ratio	1.83 to 1	0.91 to 1 (dividing the examiner's figures on annual value of power at market by the annual cost of power at market. This shows the 3-dam plan as being economically unfeasible.)

[1] In fact, the FPC and company have indicated that the third dam may never be built even if the FPC decision is not reversed.

THE LOSS TO THE PEOPLE IF THE FPC DECISION IS ALLOWED TO STAND

1. Active storage capacity of 2,880,000 acre-feet vitally needed to aid in controlling the river and meeting the goals of the Army engineers' main control plan.

2. Nearly the equivalent of the power production of Bonneville Dam—419,000 prime, year-around kilowatts. Several important downstream dams are dependent upon Hells Canyon storage for power output. Lacking Hells Canyon storage they may not be built. The total loss would amount to 2¼ million kilowatts of prime power capability.

3. Nine hundred and twenty-four thousand kilowatts of prime power generated at 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour and available over the Bonneville transmission grid to serve loads throughout the region at Federal wholesale rates of slightly over 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. The Commission wishes to substitute in their stead 505,000 kilowatts of private power costing 6.69 mills per kilowatt-hour to generate and available only to the Idaho Power Co. service area.

4. Thirty-five thousand jobs in manufacturing—another 35,000 jobs in service industries—$700 million in manufactured products.

5. Forty-five million dollars in annual Federal income and corporation taxes—$3 million annually in local property taxes.

6. Full development of the Nation's greatest phosphates reserves—for high analysis, low-cost farm fertilizer which would save the farmers of 17 Midwestern and Western States more than $5 million annually, increase use of fertilizers on the land, reduce soil depletion, increase yield and nutritional content of crops.

7. Millions of dollars in flood control, navigation, and recreation benefits.

8. Rightful control by the people over development of their rivers to be used for their greatest benefit.

9. Realization of the goals of the comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia Basin—for this decision would mean its dismemberment for the benefit of the power companies and the attendant loss of millions of kilowatts of low-cost power and millions of acre-feet of vitally needed upstream storage. This would result in slow stagnation of the Pacific Northwest's economy, for it has but one abundant, cheap energy base—falling water—to attract new industry that cannot now be established in this country.

10. Power revenues to aid in repaying reimbursable costs of upstream irrigation projects which will be needed to provide more food in decades ahead for our rapidly growing population.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the point immediately following my speech earlier this afternoon on the subject of the Hells Canyon Dam certain newspaper articles which have just been handed to me.

The first article, which is entitled "Engineers Say Dams Answer to Control of Future Flood Crests," was written by Leverett G. Richards and published in the Portland Oregonian of Wednesday, June 6, 1956.

The article relates to the observation of Brig. Gen. L. H. Foote, of the North Pacific Division of the Corps of Engineers. Brigadier General Foote was asked whether the floods in the North Pacific are necessary. His reply was that they are not necessary; that they can be controlled within reason. He proceeds to discuss in the article the effect of flood-control installations already in existence upon the flood which has just been experienced on the Columbia River, and which was, according to the article, one of the worst floods in the recent history of the river.

It is very interesting to observe that in the course of his comments this great Army engineer points out that in order to achieve practical flood control, construction of the following dams would be required:

The high dam at Hells Canyon, 2,600,000 acre-feet; Payette River, increased by 300,000; John Day, 1,400,000; Priest Rapids, 2,100,000; Libby Dam, 3,900,000; Glacier View, 1,800,000; and increase of 3,900,000 acre-feet of storage at Grand Coulee by installation of new gates that would operate under high pressure, and by upriver storage from new dams.

The article quotes from the speech Brigadier General Foote is reported to have made in Spokane in April, as follows:

The development of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River by the 5-dam plan of the private power companies would provide about 1,500,000 acre-feet of storage (Brownlee and Pleasant Valley Dams) as compared with 2,600,000 at Hells Canyon Dam.

I am very glad this article has reached my hands on the very day I have discussed the Hells Canyon Dam issue from the standpoint of its flood-control features as well as from the standpoint of its power features.

This has always been the position of the Army engineers, ever since the so-called master plan "308" report. Hells Canyon has been one of the major recommendations of the Army engineers, so far as flood control in the Pacific Northwest is concerned.

Yet there are shortsighted persons who forget about the welfare of the future population of our section of the country, a section whose population is increasing rapidly each year, and who are willing, under the whiplash, apparently, of private utility political pressure, to deny to future generations the maximum flood-control potentiality of the Snake Rixer, which can be obtained only if a high dam is built at Hells Canyon, as the Army engineers have, without exception, recommended for some years past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, which is one of the best supporting proofs I have seen in recent times of the position which I have taken in the Senate, for 11 years now, in support of Hells Canyon, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ENGINEERS SAY DAMS ANSWER TO CONTROL OF FUTURE FLOOD CRESTS

(By Leverett G. Richards)

"Was this flood necessary?"

"Why couldn't the engineers hold down the crest and save my dike?"

These are the perennial questions asked by the people who live in the lowlands.

Brig. Gen. L. H. Foote, north Pacific division, Corps of Engineers, has the answers.

Floods aren't necessary. They can be controlled within reason. The flood of 1956 would have ranked next to the flood of 1948 if existing reservoirs along the United States portion of the Columbia and its tributaries had not been used to reduce the peak flow.

The crest was cut about 2 feet. Without Grand Coulee and other dams, the crest would have exceeded the 28.2-foot level at which Smith Lake broke suddenly through the S. P. & S. Railway fill on Memorial Day, 1948, smashing the city of Vanport. It would have been the third worst flood in the history of the river.

The Columbia crested at Vancouver, Wash., at high noon, June 13, 1948 at 30.2 feet (29.9 at Portland). Had all the present resources of the river, including existing reservoir capacity at Grand Coulee, been used in 1948, the crest could have been held down 1¾ to 2 feet.

ONE FLOOD WORSE

Peak flow of the Columbia at The Dalles in 1948 was 1,010,000 cubic feet per second on May 31. This peak outpouring of snow and rainwater has been exceeded only once in history, June 7, 1894, when 1,240,000 cubic feet per second flowed past The Dalles, raising the river at Portland to 33 feet. (No data were kept on Vancouver at that time.)

The 1894 flood, highest crest—although not the greatest runoff—in history, could have been cut down by 2 feet by full use of all the 4,900,000 acre-feet of storage now available on the river, General Foote points out.

The engineers could pull the teeth of Old Man River almost completely. They have a plan for dams to provide 20,900,000 acre-feet of storage which could cut the flow of the river in a flood of 1894 proportions down to 800,000 cubic feet per second at The Dalles. That would cut the crest at Vancouver by 7.7 feet.

The worst flood in history could be cut down to dike size—about 25 feet—if all the dams proposed were constructed to the heights proposed.

FLOOD LOSS WEIGHED

Would it be worth the cost? The cost of the program has not been estimated, but General Foote estimates a flood of 1894 proportions under present conditions would approximate $300 million damage on the lower Columbia River.

The lower river is protected by 52 improved drainage and diking districts with 307 miles of levees embracing 57 percent of the total lower river flood plain. Without these levees the average annual flood damage on the lower river would exceed $30 million, General Foote estimates.

He credits existing levees with reducing this annual loss by about $10 million, while the storage available in existing reservoirs reduces this annual loss by about another $5,000,000.

Improvements and extensions to existing levees might feasibly reduce this annual damage by another $2 million. "However, if the main control plan as originally conceived was accomplished, the combined protection of levees and flood storage would reduce the annual damage by over $27 million, including an annual credit of some $16 million of damage reduction to reservoirs."

To achieve practical flood control would require construction of the following dams:

The high dam at Hells Canyon, 2,600,000 acre-feet; Payette River, increased by 300,000; John Day, 1,400,000; Priest Rapids, 2,100,000; Libby dam, 3,900,000; Glacier View, 1,800,000; and increase of 3,900,000 acre-feet of storage at Grand Coulee by installation of new gates that would operate under high pressure, and by upriver storage from new dams.

FISH GROUP PROTESTS

These projects, together with 4,890,000 acre-feet of storage usable at existing dams, would provide 20,890,000 acre-feet of usable storage for flood control.

Opposition to the proposed full flood control program, however, will cut the available storage in half, according to the present outlook, General Foote estimates.

The Glacier View project, "although feasible from an engineering and economic standpoint, was not recommended * * * because of opposition by recreation and wildlife interests," General Foote explained in a speech to the Northwest Public Power Association in Spokane in April.

The Libby project is deferred indefinitely pending further negotiations with Canada. The plan proposed by Grant County PUD for Priest Rapids will provide only 500,000 acre-feet of storage in lieu of 2,100,000 acre-feet.

"Local interests affected by the John Day project object strenuously to the 2 million acre-feet of surcharge storage currently authorized. The modified proposal reflecting local views will provide about 500,000 acre-feet," General Foote reports.

"The development of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River by the five-dam plan of the private power companies would provide about 1,500,000 acre-feet of storage (at Brownlee and Pleasant Valley Dams) as compared with 2,600,000."

As a consequence, only half the possible flood-control storage will be available. Instead of cutting the crest of a flood of 1894 proportions by 7.7 feet at Vancouver, the crest can be cut 5.3 feet—when and if the projects outlined above are completed.

To combat this year's flood, and next year's the engineers have storage capacity available of 2,100,000 acre-feet at Hungry Horse Dam; 1,200,000 at Grand Coulee (increased at 2,800,000 this year by emergency use of diversion tunnels).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my speech on the Hells Canyon Dam issue, two articles from the St. Helens Sentinel-Mist of June 5, 1956, dealing with the recent flood. The headline of one article is "Veneer Road Flooded, Prescott Area Isolated, as River Tops 25 Feet." The headline of the other article reads, "Rainier Families Evacuate West Dike-Land District."

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

VENEER ROAD FLOODED, PRESCOTT AREA ISOLATED, AS RIVER TOPS 25 FEET

A river height of 25.5 feet was read Monday about noon at the Pope and Talbot Dock, three-tenths of a foot higher than official forecast. At that height, the river had already closed down the P. & T. creosote plant, hampered work activities at the Crown Zellerbach paper mill's wood mill, and flooded the roadway entering the CZ veneer plant. The latter condition saw workers being ferried to their jobs Monday morning from where the roadway is cut off beside the highway.

The St. Helens city dock lay under about 1 foot of water Monday morning after being flooded over the weekend. Tons of crushed rock were dumped on the roadway and over the dock to keep it from floating away.

At the lumber mill, about 1 foot of water stood between the dock and the water level. H. J. "Hawk" Olsen, plant manager at the Pope and Talbot mill, stated Monday that the mill would continue to operate as long as that foot of freeboard remained. He said that two planers were out of operation but the rest of the mill is still in production. The chip carrier that travels chips to the paper mill from the lumber mill was as a result also out of operation.

CZ officials at the papermill said that stored pulp can be used to supplement the pulp supply while chip delivery is reduced. Large stores of dried pulp have been built up against such an emergency.

In other parts of the lower Columbia area, water had edged itself up alongside the Old Portland Road in the McNulty area and toward Scappoose where the road leading from the Columbia River highway toward the airport was inundated. In the area north of St. Helens, Deer Island farms and pasture lands were standing in water and the Prescott Road toward Rainier was inundated, stranding about 150 persons. Although the homes stand on high ground, two amphibious vehicles were sent to the location to ferry people and goods.

Dikes at the paper mill were holding strong Monday as the river lapped within 2½ feet of the top at points. Saturation at certain spots was requiring sandbagging and installation of water pumps. Only small spots of water that had seeped through the dike was evident, where floodwaters had in previous years covered the whole area.

RAINIER FAMILIES EVACUATE WEST DIKE-LAND DISTRICT

Seventy-three families of the Rainier drainage district occupying 1,287 acres of lowland west of the Longview Bridge were evacuated from that area over Friday and Saturday. The exodus came as the level of the Columbia River edged nearer to the 1948 flood height that swept out the S. P. & S. Railway dike protecting the area.

The families were moved to makeshift housing in Rainier, Longview, and Kelso. The Red Cross had previously voiced an appeal to residents for such housing in case of emergency.

Animal shelter was provided in similar fashion by persons who generously answered the appeal. About 1,500 head of cattle are pastured in the district, as well as sheep and poultry.

Red Cross Disaster Chairman Adolph S. McAnear set up emergency headquarters in the Rainier Elementary School, where the chairman is also principal.

Evacuation of the Rainier district followed inspection of potential danger areas by officers of the Corps of Engineers and the State civil-defense organization, including Col. Arthur M. Sheets, State civil-defense director. They found conditions critical at five drainage districts on the Oregon side of the river.

Besides Rainier, the others are Magruder, 592 acres; Westport, 190 acres; Clatskanie, 300 acres; and Columbia No. 1, 1,600 acres of the downriver end of Sauvies Island.

Colonel Sheets, who, by agreement, is coordinator of Oregon flood emergency procedures, said that even at a river stage of 27 feet at Portland, the water would not flow over the dikes of any district, but continued pressure was expected to cause seepage and boils which, if not checked, could cause the dikes to wash out.

Colonel Sheets detailed A. R. Cardiello, emergency welfare director for State civil defense, to work with the Red Cross in handling the evacuation of Rainier district and finding housing for the refugees.

Twenty-four-hour patrols are being maintained on the dike. About $100,000 was spent by the Army engineers in reinforcing the railroad fill as flood emergency work this spring and work of sandbagging boils and seepage is continuing.

Phil Cole, area engineer in charge, said the dike itself is not critical at present, but is getting soft. Heavy seepage is reported at the lower end. The S. P. & S. has furnished section crews to assist and also provided a speeder to patrol the lower end of the district and transport sandbags.

Many of the men were moving out Friday so they would be free to work on the dike, they explained. This is the third evacuation for some of the residents.

The State civil defense organization has provided a large siren in the center of the district, which will be sounded if there is a break.

Most of the residents expected to be moved by Sunday. Others plan to stay.

Headquarters for civil defense have been set up in a small Farmers' Union clapboard hall in the district, which itself shows the ravages of several floodings. At a meeting there Thursday night the county judge promised police protection of all homes evacuated. Columbia County sheriff's office is permitting no one but residents and flood workers in the area. The guard will be augmented as more people move out.

Portable lighting equipment was delivered by the OCD for use in night work.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have put those two articles in the RECORD because they are supporting evidence of the warnings I have given the Senate in many speeches on the subject of flood dangers which constantly threaten the people of my State and the State of Washington as the result of the failure of the Congress to date to enact flood control legislation, such as the high dam for Hells Canyon, which would, as General Foote has pointed out, greatly reduce the danger to our people and the terrific loss which is suffered economically in my section of the country because flood control projects are not being built.

I have reason to believe that in the near future the Hells Canyon Dam bill, of which I am the author, will be reported to the Senate. I want to say that if anyone really believes in a liberal policy when it comes to human values, the flood control features of that bill alone recommend that the bill pass the Senate of the United States by a substantial majority.

As I said at the beginning of my speech on the Hells Canyon issue today, the eyes of the Nation will be on the Congress of the United States when the Hells Canyon Dam issue comes up for a vote before adjournment. It will raise the question whether the people control the Congress or the private-utility monopolistic combine controls the Congress. Let me say I am satisfied the people will give the Congress their answer if the Congress surrenders to monopolistic, selfish interests on the Hells Canyon Dam issue.

WASHINGTON LOWDOWN, BY LARSTON D. FARRAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a passing comment on a very interesting book entitled "Washington Lowdown," written by Larston D. Farrar, which I read on the plane the other night. One does not have to agree with everything in the book to recognize that it is a book which should be read. It is a book full of very interesting information about the Washington scene. One has only to read the table of contents to have his reading appetite whetted.

Among the chapter headings are "My First Night in Babylon"; "The Changing of the Guard"; "Washington Wonderland"; "The Not Too Moral Crusade"; "Capitol Hill—a New View for You"; "The Not-So-Exclusive Senate"; "The Unrepresentative House"; "Behind the White House Balconies"; "The Number 1 American"; "America's First Billion-Dollar Cabinet"; "The Not-So-Supreme Court"; "Feudin' and Fightin' "; "Who Speaks for the Lord—in the Halls of the People?"; "Influence"; "The Irregular Regulators"; "High and Low Society"; "Confessions of a G-Girl"; "Uncle Sam—Jack-of-All-Trades"; "The Candidates—1956 Models"; "There's More To See, in Washington, D. C."

Mr. President, this book is not light reading, even though the headings of the chapters might indicate to the contrary. There are a great many serious implications in this book, Mr. President, in respect to the operation of our Government. Much of it has needed to be said for a long, long time. It speaks for itself.

My friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has just said he is going to get the book and read it. I think it ought to be read by a great many people in and out of this administration and in and out of Congress. There is one section of it, Mr. President, which deals with my opponent in the campaign ahead. I think it ought to be read, because he has been going up and down the State of Oregon saying that he has not given anything away. He has also been going up and down the State of Oregon saying some rather unkind things about the senior Senator from Oregon. I have not lost my sense of humor about him, and I do not intend to. However, I think it would be rather interesting to hear what a brilliant author and able newspaperman has to say in this book, Washington Lowdown, about my opponent.

That section reads:

But the biggest goat of all the members of the Cabinet has been Secretary McKay, who won quick confirmation because Senators generally felt that here was an innocuous Governor of Oregon who had been in politics a long time and understood the function of an administrator. The Senators were, of course, badly fooled, and not 2 years had passed before such men as Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon and similar guardians of the public interest were hinting that McKay ought to resign. On March 9, 1956, McKay announced his resignation to run against Morse.

The Denver Post, a Republican newspaper that vigorously supports the administration generally, had this to say about McKay, less than 3 years after he had become Secretary of the Interior:

"Why doesn't Douglas McKay follow Mrs. Hobby in retirement from President Eisenhower's Cabinet? * * *

"Mr. McKay hasn't helped the Eisenhower administration articulate a water and public works policy that makes sense. He has been of little help in passing legislation that would strengthen the Republican Party's record in that field. Nor has he dramatized the national investment values of reclamation and the use and reuse of water for the benefit of the West, whence he entered high office, or the Nation he is supposed to represent."

In one of his first speeches in Washington, to the United States Chamber of Commerce, Secretary McKay said: "We're here in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry." This was on a par with Mr. Wilson's famous General Motors remark. It also was a tip-off as to how he viewed his task as head of the Department of the Interior, which, more than any other agency in the Federal Government, guards the treasures that belong to the public—ranging from the grazing lands in the West to the national parks in every State in the Nation. Mr. McKay also became the first member of the President's Cabinet who had to withdraw an appointee's nomination. Although Tom Lyon had admitted publicly that he did not believe in the Federal safety inspection of mines, McKay named him Director of the Bureau of Mines. Mr. Lyon was also drawing a sizable pension from one of the largest mine companies in the country, and big mining companies traditionally have fought Federal inspection, the only true safeguard for the unprotected worker.

Almost at the same time, Mr. McKay abruptly dismissed Albert M. Day, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, who had risen through the ranks in Government service from 1918. This brought protests from sportsmen's organizations and conservation groups throughout the Nation. He appointed in Mr. Day's place one John L. Farley, whose only qualification to lead the most important game and wildlife agency in the country was that he had worked with the Crown Zellerbach Corp., a paper and pulp manufacturing company, and with a private utility company.

Mr. McKay also dismissed Marion Clawson, director of the Bureau of Land Management, who had been in the Government since the Hoover administration, because, Mr. Clawson said publicly, he would not grant the requests of the "grazing interests." After Mr. Clawson was out, Mr. McKay gave his Department's undivided support to the Eisenhower-approved legislation to give a small group of stockmen special rights to

public grazing lands. The Democrats on Capitol Hill defeated the measure.

But far more significant than the men with whom he surrounded himself were the actions Mr. McKay took. With the cooperation of President Eisenhower, McKay reversed the former administration's policy with regard to Hells Canyon, a deep gorge on the Snake River at the Oregon-Idaho border. Interior officials before McKay had favored a single high Federal dam at the site, as opposed to the Idaho Power Co.'s plan to build three smaller dams producing a total of only about half as much power as the Federal dam and at much higher cost to consumers. The Interior Department—and most western Democrats—had maintained that to permit the smaller dams to be built would be wasting the use of a much-needed water power resource, but within months after taking office, McKay withdrew the Department of Interior's objections to the Idaho Power Co. plan, after "clearing" it with the President and the Cabinet. The Federal Power Commission then voted to approve the Idaho Power Co. application for a permit to build the first dam, although its own hearing examiner had found that "the high [Federal] dam is dollar for dollar the best investment and the more nearly ideal development of the middle Snake River."

The Democrats point to these samples of why they gave McKay the title of "The Giveaway King."

A $40 million Government plant in Louisiana, Mo., was on the verge of perfecting a process of producing oil from coal. It was closed abruptly by Secretary McKay and part of the plant sold to the Hercules Powder Co. for less than 25 cents on the taxpayer's dollar.

A similar Federal plant in western Colorado has been working on extracting oil from oil-bearing shale. Since the experiment has proved a success, the oil industry has told Secretary McKay that it can take over from here, and McKay has given his nod of approval. Even Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican, of Colorado, who has never been known to favor Government ownership, has objected to this proposal.

Secretary McKay has told California officials that he would "listen to a proposal" for them to buy out Uncle Sam's Central Valley multipurpose project, in which the taxpayers have half a billion dollars invested.

Mr. President, I have read the section of the book about McKay because it supports the views of many people who oppose his record as Secretary of Interior. The section of the book which I have read is printed in a book written by a newspaperman, who has been in a good position to observe the operation of governmental departments. He is familiar with McKay's sorry record. What author Larston Farrar says about McKay is of interest, in view of the fact that my opponent is so profuse in his disclaimers about said record as Secretary of Interior. I am sure the voters of my State will be interested in learning that there are others besides his opponent in the campaign who are of the view that his policy in the field of natural resources has not been a policy that has promoted the best interests of the public.

The other chapters of Farrar's book are also revealing of unfortunate malfeasance in office of some other officials. It is a book which will challenge the wishful thinking of many Americans if they will but read it. It discloses many of the political expediencies of the Eisenhower administration.

BAN ON FORCED LABOR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the important matters to come before the current 39th conference of the International Labor Organization is a convention to ban forced labor. While there should not be any question about the attitude of the free world, and particularly of the United States Government on such a question, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], recognizing some indecision and difference of opinion within the present administration, wisely introduced Senate Joint Resolution 117, and later Senate Resolution 248, to express the conviction that our Government should exercise leadership in the ILO to develop and adopt an international convention which would effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

In April of this year the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare received devastating testimony concerning the continuation of the institution of forced labor in Communist Russia and other Iron Curtain and some Arab countries. The importance and urgent need for such an international convention was clearly demonstrated.

Despite the reported support for such a convention by the Department of Labor of our Government, the State Department has been insisting upon a watered-down version of the convention which would make it apply only to prohibit international trade in the products of forced labor, and I understand that some Republican members of the Labor Committee have delayed adoption of the more sweeping resolution proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, because of this attitude on the part of our State Department. They have, indeed, made informal suggestions for amendment of the resolution so as to permit it to be interpreted as applying only to such prohibition of international trade.

The weak and altogether inadequate position of the State Department was set forth in a Statement of United States Policy sent to me by Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary of State, on May 24. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY WITH RESPECT TO THE POSSIBILITY OF AN INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONVENTION ON FORCED LABOR

(Transmitted by Assistant Secretary of State Robert C. Hill, May 24, 1956)

There is an item, Forced Labor, on the agenda of the ILO Conference which is to meet at Geneva in June 1956. The conference will decide what action the ILO should take on the subject. The conference might simply adopt a resolution, or might decide that the ILO should draft a new ILO convention to be submitted to ILO member governments for ratification. The replies of ILO member governments to an ILO questionnaire indicate that a majority of ILO member governments will vote in favor of having the ILO proceed to prepare a new convention.

The immediate issue before the United States Government therefore is to determine whether this Government should vote in favor of the formulation of an ILO convention on forced labor. There has been some delay in determining the position because of the ramifications of the problem of ILO action for United States treaty policy. There is a clear distinction between subjects which are appropriate for the United States treaty power and those which are not. No subject is appropriate for the exercise of the United States treaty power except matters of international concern which are appropriate matters for contracts between nations.

An ILO convention whose provisions relate solely to domestic measures to ban forced labor would not be appropriate for United States treaty action. However, an ILO convention prohibiting international trade and commerce in materials, goods and articles mined, manufactured or produced, wholly or in part, by forced labor, as defined in that convention, would be appropriate for United States treaty action.

In view of the fact that the United States abhors forced labor, the delegation to the International Labor Conference is being instructed to propose that the ILO formulate and adopt a convention which would prohibit international trade and commerce in the products of forced labor. The United States delegation is being authorized to state that the United States Government would support such a convention and would undertake to secure its ratification.

The position of the United States Government therefore is completely clear. If an ILO convention is confined to prohibiting international trade and commerce in the products of forced labor, the United States will support such a convention and undertake to secure its ratification.

If in addition to providing for the prohibition of trade in products of forced labor the draft convention were to contain provisions for undertaking to institute domestic measures to ban forced labor, the United States would have to make reservation against the provisions purporting to outlaw forced labor as this is not an appropriate matter for a United States treaty. Under the Constitution, forced labor is already prohibited in this country.

A third possibility is that a convention might be formulated which did not relate to international trade and commerce in products of forced labor but confined its provisions to prohibitions on forced-labor practices within countries; the delegation will be instructed to abstain, pointing out that such practices are prohibited in the United States by the Constitution and that the proposed convention provisions are not appropriate for a United States treaty.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to say that explanation is, I think, unworthy of the Government of the United States.

I believe this policy of the State Department and the delay on the part of some of the members of the Labor Committee on the other side of the aisle in approving Senate Resolution 248 are grave mistakes. Surely, the United States must not hesitate both to approve and to urge other nations to approve a convention which outlaws involuntary servitude, which for many years has been outlawed under our own Constitution. This immediate opportunity through the ILO to strike a blow for freedom and to point out one of the continuing evils of the Communist system should not be lost.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times for June 13, 1956, urging the support by our Government of such a convention to abolish slave labor. I urge upon our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are members of the Senate Labor Committee the most care-

ful consideration of this editorial opinion, to the end that Senate action on Senate Resolution 248 may be forthcoming without further delay.

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

TO END FORCED LABOR

Forced labor is the No. 1 issue before the 39th conference of the International Labor Organization, which has begun in Geneva this week. Both in the United Nations and in the ILO the United States has unsparingly condemned forced labor, and we actively promoted the ILO investigations which exposed its widespread practice in the countries of the Communist bloc.

The ILO now has to decide what to do about it. The conference could adopt a mere "recommendation" to each member nation to put an end to forced labor, or it might pass a "convention," which would commit each ratifying nation to take action. The State Department first favored a recommendation because Secretary Dulles told the Senate last year that a treaty should not deal with "what are essentially matters of domestic concern." The Department of Labor, however, has consistently favored a convention, as has George P. Delaney, the United States labor delegate. The employer delegate, Charles H. Smith, Jr., has not yet publicly taken sides.

Just before the conference opened 1 of the 2 United States Government delegates, John Ernest Wilkins, Assistant Secretary of Labor, disclosed in a public statement what apparently is now to be our Government's line: Promotion of a convention which would effectively abolish forced labor by removing its products from international trade.

A prohibition against such trade should certainly be passed and we hope all our delegates will help to see it through. But this alone would not put an end to forced labor, even if it were effectively carried out. After all, few of the products of forced labor are exported. The conference should also outlaw forced labor within the boundaries of each member country.

To hesitate because ILO conventions on this or any other subject are treaties is absurd. The State Department itself has not acted as if they were in the past—including those dealing with domestic affairs. Four such, which our ILO Government delegates had supported without the Department's protest, were forwarded last year by Mr. Dulles to the President for submission to Congress—not to the Senate, as would have been required had they been treaties. Also, unlike treaties, ILO conventions are, by the terms of its constitution, submissible by any member government to its constituent states for ratification. This is now being done in the case of the four just mentioned because they involve matters within the purview of the states, such as minimum wages and equal pay for equal work.

But an ILO convention outlawing forced labor would not require any such procedure. This country has already prohibited involuntary servitude everywhere within its borders, and this act has been ratified by the several States. We call to witness the 13th amendment of the United States Constitution.

All four United States delegates at Geneva should push for a forthright convention that will outlaw forced labor and all its works—both inside and outside the boundaries of each member nation. And, if it is passed—even without any reference to international trade—the State Department should take the lead in promoting its unanimous ratification by appropriate Government action. Anything short of this would bring contempt on our former protestations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Illinois knows, I am very much interested in the work of his committee in respect to the slave-labor problem. I wish to ask whether the committee has taken into consideration at all the problem, and the allegations in respect to it, of the prevalence of human slavery in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, it was covered in the report of the International Labor Organization and in the proceedings. Undoubtedly it is true that the slave trade still exists, and that slaves are being transported from Africa into Saudi Arabia, across the narrow strait of the Red Sea which separates the Arabian peninsula from Africa. It has been a long-standing evil. There is evidence that it still continues. To my mind it is a great blot upon the record of that country.

Mr. MORSE. I think that to be carrying on relationships with, and supplying economic aid to, a country which still traffics in the slavery of human beings is also a great blot on the record of the United States.

I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that in my judgment an airbase in Saudi Arabia is not worth the sacrifice of American ideals, and neither is oil worth the sacrifice of those ideals.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Oregon. I also feel that the attitude of our State Department in not only permitting but encouraging the sale of munitions to Saudi Arabia and in permitting the Saudi Arabian Government to exercise a veto power as to what members of the United States Armed Forces shall be permitted to go to Saudi Arabia is a disgraceful ceding of national self-respect. When Thomas Jefferson had to deal with the pirates of Tunis, he did not behave in a fashion similar to that in which our State Department, under Mr. Dulles, is now behaving.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to hear the comments on this matter by the Senator from Illinois. I am satisfied that in southeast Asia we are finding ourselves in great trouble, so far as our prestige is concerned, because the leaders of some of those countries—or, at least, some of the leaders to whom I have talked—throw right into my face the Saudi Arabia slave traffic, and charge us, in effect, with condoning it, because of the activities we carry on in Saudi Arabia. I think we should make very clear that we are not going to give support or economic aid to a country which engages in human slavery.

On the other point the Senator from Illinois makes—namely, the fact that an American soldier who is a Jew cannot serve in the Armed Forces of the United States at our airbase in Saudi Arabia—I wish to say I think that situation is simply inexcusable. I hold to the point of view that we should remove our forces from Saudi Arabia, if having them stay there means that we have to sacrifice what I consider to be a sovereign right. If the Government of Saudi Arabia does not wish to respect our right to have any American, regardless of his race, color, or creed, serve in a United States uniform at a United States base in Saudi Arabia, then let us remove our forces from Saudi Arabia.

Incidentally, I think the importance of that base is greatly overrated. In my opinion, it probably is considered of more importance to certain economic oil interests than it is important to the United States as a blockade against possible aggression by communism.

Neither am I greatly moved by the argument that if we do not participate in the kind of program we have inaugurated in Saudi Arabia, Saudi Arabia might go over to the Communists. I do not believe there is any danger that such a thing will happen; but if it should happen, let me say it would be quite a headache to the Communists. I am not sure that in the long run it would not be to our benefit, rather than to our injury.

In any event, I think we should stand behind our ideals as a Nation. In connection with the policy we are following in Saudi Arabia, we cannot justify sacrificing our ideals.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree. Let me say that I think the State Department not only has been extraordinarily timid, but also has been extraordinarily callous as regards human principles in this whole matter.

In testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, of which I was then chairman, an Assistant Secretary of State had the nerve to argue that a convention opposing forced labor would have to be in the form of a treaty submitted to the Senate, and that it would, by implication, expose the administration to the opposition of those who do not wish to have the treaty power used for welfare and humane purposes. Even on the technical point which was raised, I know the Assistant Secretary of State was mistaken, because the charter of the International Labor Organization specifically provides that in Federal countries—this being a Federal country—the signatory nation has one of a number of alternative courses which are perfectly legitimate. Of course, one course is to submit it as a treaty; but that is not required. Another is to submit it to both Houses of Congress, so that both Houses can consider the matter. A third is that if under the Federal system the power in these matters is vested in the constituent states, the matter can be submitted to the states. In other words, the basic charter of the International Labor Organization does not require the submission of such a matter to the Congress in the form of a treaty.

I would not be opposed to having it so submitted to the Congress. I am not afraid to have the United States Congress take a stand against forced labor. I do not believe that the people of the United States are afraid to take a stand against forced labor. As a matter of fact, it is outlawed by the 13th amendment, which abolishes slavery and involuntary servitude in the United States. It is thoroughly in keeping with American policy to prevent slave labor.

The primary practitioners of forced labor are Communist Russia, which has from 15 million to 25 million people in slave-labor camps, and Communist

China, which has approximately 15 million. They are the nations which are practicing slave labor, and they are the nations which should be called to account.

Those countries now have the effrontery to support this international convention. It would be an extraordinary thing if our State Department should put us in a position before the world of opposing a convention on forced labor which will be primarily directed against the Soviet Union and Red China, and permit Red China and Soviet Russia to appear before the world as the defenders of human liberty.

I realize that the problems of the Department of State are many, and that we should be more charitable in judging the actions of the present Secretary of State than our Republican friends were in judging the actions of Mr. Acheson, who was very badly treated by the opposition party.

Nevertheless, I find it difficult either to understand or appreciate the attitude of the State Department and Mr. Dulles in this connection. I think it can only be said that they are afraid of that section of their party which is opposed to international cooperation and to any international agreement which either directly or indirectly could be used to effect humane purposes within this country or other countries. So I quite agree with the attitude taken by the New York Times and other newspapers.

I note the presence in the Chamber at this moment of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who started this movement in the winter, and who has borne the main burden of the struggle.

Our delegation is now in Geneva. It will shortly be called upon to vote on this question. I very much hope that the State Department will reverse its position and permit the conscience of the country to be felt. I hope it will support this convention, instead of trying to limit the convention to commodities which enter into international trade.

Only an insignificant proportion of the articles upon which forced labor works in Red China and Red Russia enter into international trade. The major portion of forced labor is used on so-called public works in those countries, or upon articles in domestic trade. So the proposal of the State Department is not at all effective. It is a sham and a delusion. They should not be allowed to get away with it, and I hope very much that popular indignation will force them to reverse themselves.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota, to whom the country owes a great deal for arousing the public conscience on this subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that we are all very grateful to him for holding the hearings which he has held, and for permitting us to make our positions clear relative to the attitude of the State Department; also the position that many groups in this country hold, as to the necessity of an ILO convention which will put the United States squarely on the line in opposition to any type of forced labor.

As the Senator from Illinois has noted in his comment, we were led to believe a few weeks ago that the administration had changed its position from that of objecting to a convention to outlaw or ban slave labor, to that of supporting such a convention. I was led to believe this through statements which I read in the press, through the editorial in the New York Times, and through comments in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota took the floor and praised the Secretary of Labor for the part he had played, and commended the administration for reversing its position, and so did the Senator from Illinois. We are always glad to praise the administration when it does well or seems to do so. But in this case in our desire to be fair we were badly deceived.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Again I say to the Senator that the administration's reversal is somewhat apropos of some of its other reversals. We are led to believe by the spoken word, by the inflection, by the adjectives which are used, that there has been a change of heart or a change of policy. This is particularly true whenever the administration speaks through the President or through one of the spokesmen of the administration not directly related to the problem.

In this instance, Secretary of Labor Mitchell spoke in what I thought were clear and unmistakable terms as to the attitude of his Department, the President, and the administration, in support of an ILO convention. But the State Department refused to go along.

I wish to make my position clear. First, the presentation of the State Department is open for anyone to examine. That presentation is flimsy. It is based upon assumptions which are not meritorious. It contains what I call hair-splitting legal arguments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which are not well founded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Which would not be accepted in a law school as sound legal doctrine. Surely the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. MORSE], the former dean of a law school, would be able to take the argument of the State Department to pieces, bit by bit, and show its lack of merit.

As the Senator may recall, we argued this question out. I asked for the privilege of returning to the committee at the time the State Department representative was there, following my own testimony. I did so return, and I believe the RECORD will indicate that we made it crystal clear that under the constitution of the ILO we could adopt such a convention without any violation whatsoever of American constitutional procedures. Furthermore, the President has sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations similar conventions which did not call for ratification.

There is no argument except the argument of the unwillingness of the administration to take a principal position. Why? This administration wants to carry water on both shoulders. It wants to be pro-Bricker amendment and anti-Bricker amendment at the same time. That is what it boils down to. The administration wants to be for Executive leadership in foreign policy in some parts of the country, but not really for it in some other parts of the country. It wants to be all things to all people.

The result will be that our country will become the laughing stock of all the other peoples of the world. If the United States cannot go on record against forced labor, what can we go on record for or against?

The next thing the administration will suggest is that we take a halfhearted attitude with respect to Mother's Day and the Fourth of July.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to defend the administration in that connection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps I should not have said both—one or the other.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the administration will verbally defend American mothers, American homes, and the Fourth of July.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the ways to defend both American mothers and the Fourth of July is to go on record for human dignity. Forced labor is the complete denial of human dignity. Here is an administration and a Government supposedly representing the finest traditions and principles of human dignity and freedom. The greatest free labor movement in the world is asking this Government to commit itself, by convention and by document, at least to an expression of an attitude and policy against forced labor. Why do we not do it?

We do not do it because of some clever legal arguments that such a course might not fit into the pattern of American constitutional government, despite the fact that the ILO convention contains a separate article designed expressly for the type of Federal system which the United States Constitution establishes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That article was placed in the ILO constitution by Samuel Gompers at the organization meeting of the ILO in Paris in 1919, to meet the specific case of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

This is but further evidence of what I call the failure of the administration to comprehend the problems which beset the world, the failure of the Government to meet head-on the great challenges in foreign policy, the failure to appreciate the psychological aspects of foreign policy, the failure to understand that this is not only a struggle with guns, but a struggle for men's minds and souls, and the spirits of the people. This is why our foreign-aid bill is in trouble.

The foreign-aid bill is in trouble, despite the pronouncements of the President and his agents, because it tries to be all things to all people. The spokesmen of the administration have talked about foreign aid in the past as if it were a great burden. They have reassured the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in the past that foreign aid would be cut. They have come before the Committee on Foreign Relations and told us that the world is one of peace and joy and plenty and happiness, and that the world

is better and that the whole picture is rosy.

Now they come before Congress and ask us to appropriate $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid. Is it any wonder that the foreign-aid bill is in trouble?

It is in trouble because this administration, from the President to the Secretary of State down, has not spoken frankly and honestly to the American people about the international situation. Many Members of the Senate are sick and tired of being played with, and sick and tired of being misinformed and having misrepresentations given them about these matters.

I have been a loyal supporter of foreign-aid bills, as the Presiding Officer knows and as the Senator from Illinois knows. I have been a supporter even when it meant parting with my political and social friends on the issue. I have voted for every request the administration has made in that field. However, Mr. President, I say that today I have grave doubts about the present bill. I happen to believe that this administration will have to do more than merely issue press releases and call hastily concocted conferences with two or three leaders in the Senate. There are no two or three leaders in the Senate who will deliver this Senator's vote. It is one vote apiece in this Chamber. If the foreign-aid bill is as important as it has been said it is, let the administration consult with all of us. I want to know more about it. I have studied it very carefully, and I have read every document concerning it which has been presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am aware of everything that has taken place in connection with that subject in years gone by.

Mr. President, it is impossible to be all things to all people. This administration has got to make up its mind whether it wants to be popular in the press or responsible in leadership. When it substitutes popularity for leadership, it gets into trouble, and when it substitutes mediocrity for principle, it gets into more trouble. The administration would rather have popularity than leadership, and would rather have mediocrity than principle. That is what they are getting, Mr. President. They will get a mediocre bill when the roll is called, if that is what they are going to do. The House has already passed a mediocre bill, and the administration will probably get another mediocre bill from the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss the foreign-aid bill today. I had intended to confine my remarks to the position of our Government on the ILO Convention at Geneva.

However, I may say that the comments of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] force me to define my position more carefully. I, too, have supported the administration in years past. I am very dubious, however, whether I should do so on this occasion.

The reasons for my dubiousness are those cited by the Senator from Minnesota. First, cooperation is a two-way street and not a one-way street. Those of us who have supported the administration in the past not only never received any thanks from the administration for what we did—and of course we never expected that much—but the administration and its party has proceeded to try to defame us in our States. Our very support, in fact, has been used as the basis for a bitter and relentless attack on us by the administration party in our home States.

For the sake of the record I will ask my colleagues to seriously consider this possibility that I am about to suggest. In European parliaments, a member can abstain from voting. In the Senate, if a Member is challenged, he may be required to state his reasons for abstaining.

I shall suggest to my Democratic colleagues that they at least think over the possibility of abstaining from voting on the mutual-security bill, and then let the Senators on the other side see if they can pass it by themselves. It might be very well if we washed our hands of the measure. We know quite well what our fate will be if we do support it. Of course, we are not afraid in these matters, and we are ready to face the consequences, and we are ready to have the administration party defame us and allow their defamation to continue, provided the administration will itself fight for the principles in which it says it believes, and if it will observe the minimum of polite behavior in such matters.

However, when the Secretary of State appears before the Committee on Foreign Relations and makes the statement that everything is fine in the world, and when the President makes a speech saying that our prestige has never been as high as it is today, it naturally raises the question in the minds of Senators and of people generally as to why the appropriation for foreign aid should be increased.

If those statements are correct, the implication is that foreign aid should be reduced. If those statements are not correct, then the administration owes an explanation to the American people, and, in my judgment, an apology and retraction. It is not enough to issue contradictory statements.

Therefore, I hope very much that the administration will consider this matter very carefully and will realize that if it expects cooperation on this side of the aisle, it must extend some cooperation itself. We do not ask for political support, but is it too much to suggest that we should be treated as having pure motives?

I am getting a little sick and tired of being called upon to bail out the administration and then to find that very act of bailing out the administration is being used as a ground for relentless attacks by those who profess to be administration supporters.

Mr. President, I should say, in conclusion, that we do not question the patriotism of the President or of the Secretary of State. I believe the President is just as patriotic as was Harry Truman, and that the present Secretary of State is just as patriotic as was Dean Acheson. One difference is that, whereas the patriotism of President Truman and Dean Acheson was bitterly attacked by certain Members on the other side of the aisle, we on our side of the aisle have been very careful not to question the motives of the President and the Secretary of State. We should continue along that course. We think they are patriotic and well-meaning men, but that they do not understand the principles of bipartisan cooperation on foreign policy, and that they do not realize the importance of holding to moral positions and being consistent in truth telling in their attitude toward the public.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry that I did not come into the Chamber in time to hear all the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois and of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and the full colloquy which took place.

I was a little amused, however, by the complaint of the Senator from Illinois that there had not been affirmative support on the part of the administration for Senators who voted in favor of certain proposals in the field of foreign policy, which the administration had advocated.

I have been a Member of the Senate for only 11 years. During that time I have supported the Greek-Turkish aid program, the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, the Marshall plan, and other measures related to our foreign policy, which had been advocated by the then President of the United States, Mr. Truman. I supported those programs dealing with foreign policy not because a Democratic President was advocating them, but because he was my President of the United States and had the responsibility to the American people of making the recommendations. After that rather consistent and full support, in which many other Senators on this side of the aisle joined, I have no recollection of having had any endorsement from Mr. Truman in 1952, when I was running for reelection.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hardly think it is within the realm of party politics, as we know it, that the distinguished Senator from Illinois should put that price upon his support of foreign policy for the benefit of our entire Nation.

I may say that I was a little disappointed, if not shocked, by the Senator's suggestion that an alternative was to have a sitdown strike on the part of a substantial group of Democrats in regard to mutual aid. This is, to be sure, a controversial subject. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who will honestly differ as to the precise course mutual aid should take in dollar figures, or whether, indeed, there should be a mutual-aid bill at all. Such differences have occurred on both sides of the aisle in years past. I think, if the Senator will check the rollcalls, he will find they have occurred on both sides of the aisle. Senators have their rights, responsibilities, and obligations.

As I have stated, I have served in this Chamber for 11 years, and for 6 years previously I served in the California Legislature. I have never cast a vote in order to avoid a difficult rollcall. I think every Senator, obviously, is entitled to vote. Under the Constitution, he is expected to vote, and I do not believe there should occur in the Senate such a thing as a sitdown strike of Senators, who, accordingly, would not be assuming their full obligations and their full responsibilities in whatever action the Senate of the United States might

take on the mutual aid bill, which at least the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe is important to the future defense of our country and the preservation of a free world of free men.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it seems to me the remarks of the Senator from California call for clarification on my part.

I may say that, certainly, I do not think it is possible under present American party politics for a member of one party who is supporting the program of a President of another party to receive the active support of the President; but I have been disappointed at the failure of the President to support members of his own party who support his program.

I think however there are certain obligations which the development of the bipartisan foreign policy imposes upon the administration and upon the official party of the administration, if they seek the cooperation of the opposition party. At least, our motives should not be questioned. We should not be labeled as noncooperative or as being obstructionists. We should not be told that if the administration does not get a majority there will be a cold war. It should not be said that we are the war party, as was said in the last election campaign in many States. I have documentary evidence in the form of circulars which claim that the Democratic Party is the war party. There were speeches made saying we were causing the lifeblood of American boys to be shed. We were held up as vampires or veritable werewolves and even worse things were said.

Mr. President, these are untrue charges. They threaten the solidarity of the American Republic. We Democrats love this country as much as do the Senators on the other side of the aisle. We would sacrifice our lives and spill our blood for our country. I think that has been proved. We do not think that when we support the administration in measures which we believe to be correct, we should then be defamed. It has been done.

Let me make it clear that the President himself has not defamed us. I think the President himself is a man of good will. But he has not restrained members of his party who have defamed us.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that, certainly, no such statement has been made by the President of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is aware that no such statement has ever been made or even contemplated by the minority leader, who has consistently pointed out that there is no less devotion to the public service, no less patriotism to our country, among those who sit on the other side of the aisle than there is among those who sit on this side of the aisle. At the time I was majority leader I tried to make it clear that there is only one party of treason in this country, and that is the Communist Party, which constitutes an international conspiracy to destroy the country which we all love and seek to serve.

If we wanted to document the case, I think we would find, perhaps, that there have been irresponsible statements on the part of persons in both parties. I know the Senator regrets it as I regret it, wherever it may occur. I happen to be one of those who believe that we may be in greater danger when the men in the Kremlin smile than when they frown, and we certainly want to create no issues which will fundamentally divide and cause a great cleavage between our people. The Communist program is to divide and conquer, so far as they can successfully do so.

There will be honest debate and differences of opinion on various public issues. I think we can raise those issues and discuss them in the political forum without questioning the motives of any man as to his patriotism or his desire to serve his country and to leave to our children a better land than we ourselves found.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the remarks which my good friend from California has made. I have never heard him become personal in debate. He has always conducted discussions on a high level. And that is true of a great many members of his party. I think, however, the Democratic Party has taken a great deal of unjustified punishment in regard to its motives within the past 10 years, and these utterances have seldom been restrained by the leaders of the Republican Party. I am not aware that members of our party have made similar charges against the Republican Party. If they have, I certainly regret it and believe they should not have been made.

What I was really trying to say was exactly the point to which the Senator from California finally came, namely, that the issues before the country are so serious that we should not permit a cleavage to develop. The way to build mutual trust is not to undertake to do it at the last minute when a measure is before Congress for action. It is in the day-to-day activities and the day-to-day conduct of our political affairs. I think it is appropriate to call attention to the fact that we Democrats have had our patience sorely tried in connection with these matters. When the administration gets into a difficult position and needs our votes, it asks for them, but, almost immediately afterwards, the drumfire of attack, frequently with poisoned bullets, continues. It is only natural that many of us should resent this.

With regard to the specific point of abstention from voting, I think the RECORD will show that I did not say I would abstain or that I necessarily advised Senators on our side of the aisle to abstain. I suggested it as a possibility to be considered. I do not know how I will vote on the measure. I want to read the testimony.

But I can say that the general behavior of the administration, and of its party toward the Members of our party does not encourage cooperation; it makes cooperation more difficult. In all charity, I think there is room for an improvement in their manners.

That is all I wish to say, Mr. President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely want to add one word to what has been said, since the Senator from California alluded to me. The Senator from California, the minority leader, was not present during my comments. I may say to the Senator that I think, in a sense, he would agree with what I said.

I pointed out that I felt the foreign-aid bill was in difficulty for the following reasons: First, there had been a number of statements made in recent years—during the past 3 years or more—to the effect that the funds provided for foreign aid could be substantially reduced. Furthermore, last year, as I think the RECORD will bear out, there was an indication that the foreign-aid bill for the coming fiscal year would not be more than it was last year, but it was hoped that the amount could be reduced.

I recall the hearings in 1953. I recall that the budget which came up at that time from the previous administration was cut approximately $2 billion. The reduction was heralded as a substantial saving.

I am mindful of the fact that in the present foreign-aid bill there is an increase of about $2 billion, which does not increase our foreign aid one bit, but which merely fills in the pipeline which was being drained dry or was being drained off faster than the replenishment or the refilling could take place. In other words, as we say in my section of the country, the chickens have come home to roost. We have spent a little more than we expected to spend in the past 3 years, and the backlog, the reserve, the inheritance, so to speak, from previous authorizations has begun to run out.

I said, and I repeat, that I feel the administration has had more difficulty with the foreign-aid bill, for one reason—not solely, but for one reason—namely, that Congress and the public have been led to believe that foreign aid would taper off, while responsible person after responsible person has said throughout the years that the struggle with Communist tyranny may last not for 5 years or 10 years or 25 years, but perhaps for 50 years. We do not know.

Furthermore, I think it is somewhat paradoxical that the very time the administration has asked for $4,900,000,000 as a foreign-aid authorization because the world situation demands it, the testimony before not only the Senate committees, but also the committees of the other Chamber and also public statements, indicate that the world situation is much better. I have even heard the Secretary of State say that the reason why the Soviet Union is doing what it is now doing is that we have been so successful in our foreign policy. I hope that is true. But I may suggest that we cannot have it both ways. We cannot say, on the one hand, that everything is much better and that we are winning, and then, on the other hand, indicate that it is necessary to have much more money in order to be able to hold our position.

I look forward to the testimony of men like General Gruenther and Admiral Radford being made public. Admiral Radford said that one of the main weaknesses in our foreign policy was a po-

litical weakness, not a military weakness. I believe the senior Senator from California was present when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in response to a question, said that the main weakness today, particularly in NATO, as he saw it, was not military, but political. There is no amount of money which will firm up political weakness. That can come only from able political leadership.

I happen to be an active supporter of foreign aid. I have never made any apologies for it. I am perfectly willing to go back to my constituency and justify my votes for extensive foreign-aid commitments.

I must say, in all candor, that I am not particularly impressed with the request for substantial funds for Baghdad Pact countries. I am interested in their caloric intake. I am not certain, based upon my limited knowledge of the Middle East, that many of them can carry the weapons we are about to send them.

I am concerned about the amount of funds we are willing to put into certain parts of Europe, especially the parts of Europe which have shown within recent weeks tendencies toward great affection not only for the West, but also for the Soviet bloc. I must confess that I have not been one who thinks that some of the military shipments to southeast Asia are worth very much more than the shipment of the goods. I have been of the opinion that some of the military shipments to some areas have promoted friendship for rather than served as a deterrent against the Soviets. I have noticed that when we have supplied guns, instead of frightening the Russians, we have frightened the Indians and the Afghans. I have noticed that when we have put weapons into the Middle East, instead of frightening Russians we have frightened the Israelis, the Iraquis, the Saudi Arabians, or the Egyptians. When we have sent weapons into the South Asian countries—and we sent plenty into Indochina—it did not save them.

I favor economic aid for South Vietnam; make no mistake about it. My record bears me out. I am for military assistance for countries struggling for a free existence—countries like Korea, South Vietnam, and Taiwan. But I think the time is well at hand to evaluate the amount of military assistance we shall give and what good it will do. That is my position. I do not think the Senator from California and I basically disagree about it.

I read the statement of the Senator from California on the ticker today of his willingness to restore the substantial cut made by the House of Representatives. I am not for an across the board promiscuous cut, but I do favor a selective analysis of each and every item.

One of the reasons why the bill is in trouble is that we have had contradictory statements from the leadership in the administration.

I can bring to the floor mail from my constituency—and it is an able, intelligent constituency—asking me, "Senator HUMPHREY, are you going to support President Eisenhower in his request for more funds?"

I asked Mr. Hollister, the head of the ICA, "Do you support the use of more United States funds through the United Nations agencies?"

Mr. Hollister said, "No." But Mr. Lodge, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, made a public speech in which he advocated the spending of more money; and apparently he is the administrative spokesman. He is our chief Ambassador to the United Nations.

We were led to believe some months ago by spokesmen for the administration that more and more funds should be put into technical assistance, into what we call straight economic assistance—not defense support, but economic assistance. I submit that in the case of the present foreign-aid bill, which we will debate extensively, more than 80 percent, almost 90 percent, of its total funds are for either direct military assistance or defense support.

These are things which are confusing. That is why there are serious problems confronting Congress. If it is desired to have a foreign-aid bill around which support can be mustered, I think the support will cut across both sides of the aisle. I agree with that. I think if anyone will check the record, he will find that the basic support for the foreign-aid requests of this administration has come from this side of the aisle. It is one thing to vote for foreign aid, but how much is needed? It is like building a house, but putting no furnishings in it. We have basically supported the administration's request for an authorization.

I only wanted to clear my own record on this question, because I think it will be found that when it has finally been decided, the junior Senator from Minnesota will be found, in the main, giving substantial support to a foreign-aid bill which, I hope and trust, will be worthy of this Government; a foreign-aid bill which will not be displeasing to those in responsible leadership.

UNITED STATES DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a full-page advertisement paid for by private electric utility companies appeared in a large number of daily newspapers throughout the United States today. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the advertisement be printed, together with a list of the newspapers with which at least one advertising agency placed the advertisement.

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

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this partial list of newspapers, in which this full-page advertisement appeared, indicates that the private power companies spent approximately $100,000 today to mislead and misinform the American people on the nuclear power program. I want to demonstrate how cleverly it has been done. A headline over the advertisement reads:

> This is the way nations rate in nuclear reactors built or planned.

Then beneath that headline, in smaller type, and within parentheses, there are these words:

> All types and for all purposes.

Now, for the United States, this advertisement lists 55 reactors completed as of 1956. It lists 35 reactors as "building or planned." It lists for the Soviet Union 6 as completed in 1956, and 11 as built or planned.

I wish to refer to the figures listed for the United States. This is not the first time the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has heard of these so-called power reactors. In testimony before the Joint Committee there appeared Mr. Elmer L. Lindseth, representing the Edison Electric Institute. He testified on May 24. He presented to the committee a list of 89 reactors, either completed, under development, planned or applied for. I notice the advertisement indicates 90 rather than 89. I suppose the sum of 90 is a little more appealing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the list of so-called power reactors which Mr. Lindseth included in his presentation to the committee.

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

Nuclear reactors in the United States—Completed, under development, planned or applied for

PRESSURIZED WATER REACTORS, WATER-COOLED AND MODERATED

Name	Owned by	Location	Function	Date of operation
Low intensity reactor MTR mockup	AEC	Oak Ridge, Tenn	Research	1950.
Materials testing reactor	do	Arco, Idaho	Testing	1952.
Submarine thermal reactor, mark I	Navy	do	Submarine	1953.
Submarine thermal reactor, mark II	do	*Nautilus*	do	1955.
Shippingport	AEC–Duquesne	Shippingport, Pa	Power	1957.
Westinghouse test reactor	Westinghouse	Blairsville, Pa	Testing	1957.
Engineering test reactor	AEC	Arco, Idaho	do	1957.
Army package power reactor	do	Fort Belvoir, Va	Power	1957.
University of Florida reactor	University of Florida	Gainesville vicinity	Research	1959.
Yankee Atomic Electric Co	Yankee Atomic Electric Co	Rowe, Mass	Power	1960.
Consolidated Edison Co	Consolidated Edison Co	Indian Point, N. Y	do	1960.
Submarine fleet reactor	Navy	Not stated	Submarine	Not stated.
Large ship reactor	AEC	Arco, Idaho	Large ship	Do.
Submarine advanced reactor	do	West Milton, N. Y	Submarine	Do.

Nuclear reactors in the United States—Completed, under development, planned or applied for—Continued

BOILING WATER REACTORS, WATER MODERATED AND COOLED

Name	Owned by	Location	Function	Date of operation
Boiling experimental reactor borax I (destroyed)	AEC-ANL	Arco, Idaho	Experimental	1953.
Boiling experimental reactor borax II (rebuilt as borax III).	do	do	do	1954.
Boiling experimental reactor borax III	do	do	Power prototype	1955.
Experimental boiling water reactor	do	Lamont, Ill	do	1956.
General Electric	General Electric	Livermore-Pleasanton, Calif.	Research-power	1957.
Nuclear power group (dual cycle)	Commonwealth Edison	Morton, Ill	Power	1960.
Elk River	Elk River Rural Electric Cooperative Association	Elk River, Minn	do	1960.

SWIMMING POOL REACTORS, WATER MODERATED AND COOLED

Bulk shielding reactor	AEC-ORNL	Oak Ridge, Tenn	Research	1950.
Convair research reactor	Not stated	Fort Worth, Tex	do	1953.
Tower shielding reactor	AEC-ORNL	Oak Ridge, Tenn	do	Not stated.
Pennsylvania State University	Penn State University	University Park, Pa	do	1955.
University of Michigan	University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, Mich	do	1956.
Naval Research Laboratories	Naval Research Laboratory	Washington, D. C	do	1956.
American Machine & Foundry	American Machine & Foundry	New York City area	do	1956.
Battelle Memorial Institute	Battelle Memorial Institute	Columbus, Ohio	do	1956.
Livermore Laboratory (low power test reactor)	AEC	Livermore, Calif	do	1957.
Oak Ridge research reactor	do	Oak Ridge, Tenn	do	1957.
Omega West	do	Los Alamos, N. Mex	do	Not stated.
Watertown Arsenal	Watertown Arsenal	Watertown, Mass	do	Do.
Washington State	Washington State	Pullman, Wash	do	Do.

HOMOGENEOUS REACTORS

Low power water boiler	AEC	Los Alamos, N. Mex	Research	1944.
High power water boiler	do	do	do	1944.
Super power water boiler	do	do	do	1951.
Homogeneous reactor experiment (dismantled)	do	Oak Ridge, Tenn	do	1952.
Homogeneous test reactor 1 (dismantled)	do	do	Power prototype	1952.
North Carolina State reactor	North Carolina State College	Raleigh, N. C	Research	1953.
Los Alamos power reactor 1	AEC	Los Alamos, N. Mex	Power prototype	1956.
Los Alamos power reactor 2	do	do	do	1956.
Homogeneous test reactor 2	AEC	Oak Ridge, Tenn	do	1956.
Armour Research Foundation	Armour Research Foundation	Chicago, Ill	Research	1956.
Gamma Corp	Gamma	Mansfield, Mass	do	1956.
UCLA Medical	UCLA	UCLA Medical Center	Research and treatment.	1956.
Wolverine	Wolverine Electric Cooperative	Vicinity, Hersey, Mich	Power	1959.
Pennsylvania advanced reactor	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	Pennsylvania	do	1962.
North American Aviation	Not stated	Downey, Calif	Research	Not stated.

HEAVY WATER REACTORS

Chicago pile 3	AEC	Chicago, Ill	Research	1944.
(Modified to) Chicago pile 3′	do	do	do	1950.
Chicago pile 5	do	Lamont, Ill	do	1953.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	MIT	Cambridge, Mass	Research-medical therapy.	1957–59.
Chugach	Chugach Electric Association	Vicinity, Anchorage, Alaska	Power	1961.
Savannah River (5 reactors)	AEC	Aiken, S. C	Production	Not stated.
Brookhaven Medical	do	Upton, N. Y	Research	Do.

GRAPHITE REACTORS

Chicago pile 1	AEC	Chicago, Ill	First reactor	1942.
(rebuilt as) Chicago pile 2	do	do	Research	1943.
Oak Ridge X-10 area reactor	do	Oak Ridge, Tenn	Isotope production.	1943.
Hanford 305 test reactor	do	Hanford, Wash	Testing	1944.
Hanford (8 reactors)	do	do	Production	1944.
Brookhaven National Laboratory	do	Upton, N. Y	Research	1950.
Thermal test reactor	do	Schenectady, N. Y	do	1951.
Sodium reactor experiment	AEC, NAA	Santa Susanna, Calif	Power prototype	1956.
Nebraska group	Consumers Public Power District	Nebraska	Power	1959.
Holyoke	City of Holyoke, Mass	Vicinity, Holyoke, Mass	do	1960.

LIQUID METAL FUEL REACTORS

Liquid metal fueled reactor	AEC	Brookhaven, N. Y	Research-power	1959.
Orlando	City of Orlando, Fla	Vicinity, Orlando, Fla	Power	1960.

FAST BREEDER REACTORS

Experimental breeder reactor 1	AEC	Arco, Idaho	Research	1951.
Experimental breeder reactor 2	do	do	Power prototype	1959.
Power Reactor Development Co	Power Reactor Development Co	Monroe, Mich	Power	1960.

ORGANIC MODERATED REACTORS

Organic moderated reactor	AEC	Arco, Idaho	Research-power	1957.
Piqua	City of Piqua, Ohio	Vicinity, Piqua, Ohio	Power	1960.

Nuclear reactors in the United States—Completed, under development, planned or applied for—Continued

VARIOUS TYPE REACTORS

Name	Owned by	Location	Function	Date of operation
Los Alamos fast Clementine (dismantled)	AEC	Los Alamos, N. Mex.	Research	1946.
Sodium intermediate reactor mark A	do	West Milton, N. Y.	Land-based prototype submarine.	1955.
Sodium intermediate reactor mark B	do	Submarine *Sea Wolf*	Submarine	Not stated.
Aircraft reactor experiment	Not stated	Not stated	Experimental	Do.

TYPE NOT YET SELECTED

Florida group	Not stated	Tampa Bay area	Power	1962-63.

Nuclear powerplants, investor-owned utilities participation

Organization	Reactor type	Capacity (kilowatts)	Estimated investment by organization (millions)	In operation by	Status as of May 1956
Duquesne Light Co	Pressurized water	100,000	$15	1957	Construction half completed. Reactor due to go critical in summer of 1957.
Consolidated Edison	Pressurized water thorium-uranium converter.	236,000	55	1960	Construction permit issued May 4, 1956. Site procured. Studies, research and engineering underway. Construction scheduled to start in summer of 1956.
Nuclear power group (7 utility companies).	Boiling water	180,000	45	1960	Construction permit issued May 4, 1956. Site procured. Studies, research and engineering underway. Construction scheduled to start in summer of 1956.
Penn Power & Light Co	Homogeneous	150,000	(1)	1962	Announced in July 1955 intention to build homogeneous reactor by 1962. Carrying on various studies, research and development and engineering.
Power Reactor Development Co. (18 utility companies).	Fast breeder	100.000	55	1960	Proposal accepted by AEC as basis for negotiation of contract Aug. 8, 1955. Construction permit applied for Jan. 6, 1956. Studies, research, and engineering underway. Construction tentatively scheduled to start August 1956.
Yankee Atomic Electric Co	Pressurized water	134,000	33.4	(2)	Proposal accepted by AEC as basis for negotiation of contract, Feb. 8, 1956. Site procured. Studies, research and engineering underway. Construction tentatively scheduled to start in spring of 1957.
Florida group (3 utility companies)	Not stated	200,000	50	(3)	Announced in March 1956, intention to build reactor by 1962-63. Carrying on various studies to determine best reactor.
Pacific Gas & Electric	Boiling water	5,000	1.5	1957	Construction permit issued May 15, 1956. Site procured. Studies, research and engineering underway. Construction to start in 1956.
Southern California Edison Co	Sodium graphite	7,500	1	1956	Construction about completed. Due in operation in 1956.
Total		1,112,500	305.2		

[1] Not stated. [2] 1959 or 1960. [3] 1962 or 1963.

Mr. GORE. I should like to call attention to the fact that one of the reactors listed by Mr. Lindseth is the Boiling Experimental Reactor, Borax 1. It is listed as being in Arco, Idaho. As a matter of fact, as the distinguished chairman of the committee well knows, this was a small experimental reactor, which is not there anymore because, as an experiment, it was permitted to be blown up in order to secure additional information. It is listed as one of the 89. It is not in existence at all.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GORE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Tennessee is aware, of course, that in this advertisement the question is asked, "Is America behind in the development of atomic-electric power?" And the advertisement says, "The full facts answer 'No.'"

Then the advertisement continues and purports to prove it by listing the number of reactors of all types, as it says. Those reactors may not be designed at all for power. The great majority were not so designed at all.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Tennessee knows, does he not, that one of the reactors listed is a reactor in a submarine, that it has probably the highest operating cost of any reactor one can imagine, and is not in any way designed to generate electric power?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I do.

Mr. ANDERSON. Could not the Senator from Tennessee go through the list and name the reactors one by one, and find that many of them are of exactly the same type?

Mr. GORE. As a matter of fact, I have Mr. Lindseth's testimony, and I read a part of it from page 274 of the hearings. I asked Mr. Lindseth this question:

> Mr. Lindseth, by way of demonstrating whether or not this list of 89 which you have cited is mostly of the test-tube variety, would you be so kind as to point out one single power reactor, except for Shippingport, the nuclear portion of which is financed largely by the Government, and a reactor to produce weapon materials or military propulsion, that has been constructed or on which construction has even started to generate power in as much as 5,000 kilowatts?

There was some colloquy. Mr. Lindseth did not understand the question. Finally, we got down to the answer, which appears on page 275 of the hearings:

> Mr. LINDSETH. To my knowledge, there is no reactor other than a military reactor producing power in the amounts which Senator GORE has limited the question to, 5,000 kilowatts.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Tennessee used the term 5,000 kilowatts. He probably had a reason for so doing. Is the Senator from Tennessee familiar with the fact that a 5,000 kilowatt station has been in operation in Russia since 1954?

Mr. GORE. I am, and I read in the newspapers a few days ago that Mr. Tito had been invited to see it.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Tennessee recalls, does he not, that during the Atoms-for-Peace Conference in Geneva, a general invitation was extended to scientists to see that station?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Tennessee recall that some time ago some American scientists went to see that station, and stated that they were impressed by what they had seen?

Mr. GORE. The expression they used was quite complimentary.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Does the Senator from Tennessee notice that in the list of the nuclear reactors Mr. Lindseth submitted, he included Chicago Pile No. 1, the first reactor in 1942, in which Fermi for the first time got an atomic reaction?

Mr. GORE. Yes. That is one of the 89.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is one of the evidences of how much of a contribution the private power industry is making to this program.

Mr. GORE. That is cited as evidence of how America is getting ahead with this program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator from Tennessee believe that Chicago pile No. 1 is in any way connected with the development of a modern powerplant, except that it was the first reactor of its kind?

Mr. GORE. Not at all.

Mr. ANDERSON. I read the advertisement and I noticed the Atomic Energy Commission, which may get some comfort out of the advertisement, gave an award the other day to Dr. John Von Neumann. I think it was a very well deserved award. After the advertisement, I think they should find out who prepared the advertisement and certify him a permanent award and membership in the Loyal Council of Ananias. I must say this is a marvelous piece of work, in which the electric companies can take no pride.

Mr. GORE. And for which the customers of the utilities will have to pay.

Mr. ANDERSON. This will go into the calculations of why their rates need to be sustained.

I should like also to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I asked the newspapers for the list. They said I could have it on request. They did not have it, but they are going to get it for me. I think it would be well to summon before the committee the presidents of the companies, and have them tell us where these 90 reactors are.

Apparently they know some things that some of the rest of us do not know, because certainly we cannot find out where 90 power reactors are being planned; and Chicago Pile No. 1 would scarcely be called a power reactor, it seems to me.

I talked to the president of one of the companies which supposedly was responsible for the advertisement. The president of the company said to me, "I want you to understand that my company had no connection whatever with this." So I am very anxious to learn what companies did have a connection with it, because this is the sort of thing which gets the private electric industry into trouble.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee will concede that by means of the hearing on indemnity insurance which is scheduled for tomorrow, the joint committee is trying hard to help with the development of reactors. We have been trying in every way we can to help the electric industry get off the ground. But this advertisement is the sort of thing that sinks the industry back to earth again.

Mr. GORE. I have joined with the distinguished chairman of the committee in trying to remove the roadblocks and in trying to facilitate the entrance of private industry—whether utilities or otherwise—into the field of nuclear power. As the Senator from New Mexico knows, in hearings held before our committee, there has been presented evidence which caused us deep concern about how the United States was lagging behind in the development of atomic power. But in this $100,000, full-page advertisement, the American people are assured that groups in the United States "have built, or are building or planning" more nuclear reactors than all other nations combined. Does the distinguished chairman of the committee think that the testimony presented at the hearings we held, which have just been completed, justifies this advertisement?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not only do I not believe they justify it, but I think it is a tragic thing that an attempt is made to picture this activity in a way in which it does not deserve to be portrayed.

For example, the "Los Alamos Fast Clementine" reactor is shown in the list. "Clementine" is a nice word; and after listing that project, the word "dismantled" is included. So I suppose the advertising agency which is responsible for the advertisement will rise and will sing "Thou art lost and gone forever, dreadful sorry, Clementine."

Mr. GORE. Of the 55 referred to in the advertisement as completed in 1956, not 1 plant is able to produce electric power in commercial or industrial quantity and of the 35 listed as being built or planned, only 1 is under construction. I ask the chairman of the committee whether my statement is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the Senator from Tennessee will remember, when we went into this matter, we found that words became changed around considerably. I think I would say that only one private plant was under construction. However, in order to prove that another was under construction, I could say there was testimony that a small plant was being built in California, to test the theory; and if the small plant worked, it could be said that it would be translated into a big plant somewhere else in the United States. Thus, it could be said that construction of the tiny plant in California was proof that the big plant was under construction. If words can thus be completely twisted around, one might also say that in view of the fact that 50 years ago Einstein presented his theory of relativity, which led to all these developments, therefore it could be said that that plant was under construction 50 years ago.

Mr. GORE. As a matter of fact, if we use the phrase "building or planned," the figure "35" could just as well be 10 times that number.

Mr. ANDERSON. Again I say it is tragic that they did not include with the statement about "building or planned" a statement that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has a bill calling for six reactors. Those responsible for the advertisement certainly should add those six reactors, as called for by the Gore bill, because they are planned.

Mr. GORE. Yes; by all means.

Mr. ANDERSON. Furthermore, Representative COLE, a fine and able man, a Republican from the State of New York, and a most serious and helpful member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, whom I would not criticize for all the world, and whom I do not criticize, asked me whether I would join him in sponsoring a bill for the purpose of seeing whether there was a desire to have a reactor built here in the Capitol, so that all the people, particularly the children of America, as they visit the Capitol, could see a reactor operating and turning a little bit of electric energy into the electric line supplying the Capitol. We introduced that bill. I think it is very discourteous of the advertising agency to ignore the former committee chairman, and the present committee member, who is participating in that venture, which is planned.

The Florida group is also listed. It is dependent on the Brookhaven device. Private industry did not have a thing to do with the Brookhaven experiment. But when that experiment got well along, the Atomic Energy Commission entered into a contract with Babcock and Wilcox to develop further the Brookhaven reactor. If that concept works out as well as the Government hopes it will, then private industry will take it over and use it. As a result, it would seem that private industry now takes credit for that activity by the Government, inasmuch as it is listed among the 90.

That is why I think the man who planned the advertisement is entitled to some sort of special certificate for his imagination.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. I point out that of the 35 listed as building or planned, one is now under construction to produce electricity in commercial quantities; but it is being constructed, not under the 1954 act, but under the 1946 act. The reactor part of it is being paid for almost exclusively by the Federal Government. This is the shipping port reactor. I also point out that all the other 34 referred to in the advertisement are in the discussion or "talking" stage. I am not sure how definitely they are being talked about or discussed. But the fact is that since the 1954 act became law, not one license has been issued for the construction and operation of an atomic-power reactor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield again to me?

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wish to try to point out that some fine things have been done in this country. I hope America does have the lead in nuclear electric power.

Mr. GORE. I hope it will lead.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope it does; I do not say that I think it does or does not. For the purpose of what I wish to say, I only say I hope America always will have the lead.

One of the ways in which I think it may have the lead is the very way by which we have taken the giant steps which already have been taken. The great lead of American technology results from the step Albert Einstein took when he wrote to the President of the United States. I cannot quote his letter exactly, but he said he had been ac-

quainted with the work of Fermi and Szilard—S-z-i-l-a-r-d; and I spell the name because one of the able persons conducting the examination asked, one day, "What is this reference to lizards"? [Laughter.]

Albert Einstein said to President Roosevelt that he had become acquainted with the work of Fermi and Szilard, in manuscript; and that that led him to believe that certain things could be done. So the slender thread of that one letter from that great man to the President of the United States resulted in the beginning of the work. The Chicago pile was built. Many fine scientists participated in the work on that pile. I believe that most of them were connected with educational institutions. The story is told that Compton sent to the president of a great institution a telegram saying "The Italian navigator has reached his destination. The natives were friendly."

From that start, the lead of the United States has been brought about by the Government's sponsoring of the program—not by the private utility companies, as the advertisement would lead one to believe. It has been carried on in the great national laboratories, by Dr. Zinn and his staff at Argonne, and by Dr. Weinberg and his staff at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and by cooperation with such great industrial organizations as Westinghouse, General Electric under Government contracts; and in the case of the *Nautilus*, under the technical guidance of Admiral Rickover.

I think it is too bad if we try to pick up all the reactors which have been constructed by great public-spirited individuals or organizations and say, "This is the magnificent work of the private utility industry of America."

Only a short time ago, Dr. Hafstad left the Atomic Energy Commission, where he was making only a few thousand dollars a year, to move to a position of responsibility, first, with a great bank, and then with a great industrial organization. I am not trying to embarrass him; but the salary he is now receiving is several times the salary he received when he was connected with the Atomic Energy Commission.

The development of these laboratories has been made possible by the dedicated service of men like Zinn, Weinberg, and other individuals, and by the contributions made by a great group of professors scattered across the country in educational institutions. To try to make up a claptrap advertisement in a newspaper, with the idea of persuading the American people that private industry has carried the load all the way and is now prepared to carry it in unprecedented proportions, is ridiculous.

No one that I know anything about is trying to stop the program for reactor development upon which the Atomic Energy Commission has launched. I have commended the able Senator from Tennessee for the fact that he has suggested that we supplement that program by a continuation of the type of Government inspiration and Government operation which has characterized the work at Argonne and Oak Ridge. The private utilities do the progress of atomic energy development severe damage when they allow an advertisement such as this to be prepared, taking to themselves credit for things they have not done, would not do, and could not do.

Mr. GORE. And do not expect to do.

I thank the distinguished and eloquent chairman of the committee.

Let me refer once again to the figures contained in the advertisement. In view of the fact that the Soviet Union was the first to have a 5,000 kilowatt power reactor, as such, and in view of the fact that the Soviet Union was the first to drop from an airplane a hydrogen weapon or device, I wonder just how they made such an accomplishment with only 6 reactors, whereas the United States, according to this advertisement, had 55. Obviously they are using different criteria with respect to the number of reactors within the United States, and with respect to the type and kind of reactors in the Soviet Union.

Let me read another sentence from the advertisement:

> From this basic research—some of which is also being done by America's independent electric companies—the next step is big, full size commercial atomic electric plants.

That is exactly what I have been pleading for—that the next step be a vigorous program of actual construction and operation of full size demonstration atomic electric plants which are prototypes of regular commercial plants.

That is not what is being done. That is what needs to be done.

I read further:

> That step is being taken, too.

Where is that step being taken? I continue to read:

> The electric light and power companies already have seven of these large atomic electric plants on the way or under study.

I repeat—"on the way or under study." What does that term mean?

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know why they stop with seven. They could just as well have said 70, because American industry has the Russian plants under study. It has the British plants under study. I talked with Dr. Philip Sporn, of American Gas & Electric, only a day or two ago, and asked him if he was familiar with the Calder-Hall plant. He said, "Yes, I have gone through it." He had it under study. That plant should have been added to the list.

Mr. GORE. By all means.

Mr. ANDERSON. I personally have been at Harwell and have taken a look at the installations there. I had that plant under study. I resent the fact that the utility companies do not pay any attention to my study, but are interested only in the study of the private utility companies.

I point out to the able Senator from Tennessee that I think we should ask American industry to write another advertisement, explaining the terrific advance of the Russians, in view of all the numbers against them. We have 90 on our list, and there are only 7 on theirs. As the Senator from Tennessee pointed out, they have the first commercial plant in operation generating power. It generates 5,000 kilowatts. I mention this only because not long ago I spoke before a group of high energy nuclear physicists, at their international meeting at Rochester. I was at the banquet table. At the session at which I spoke, two notches to my left was Dr. Veksler, the great Russian physicist, and just beyond him Professor McMillan, of the University of California. I believe Professor McMillan was mainly responsible, with Ernest Lawrence and others—I do not undertake to allocate individual credits—for building a six-bev bevatron. However, that night in the discussion they were talking about the great, magnificent one which had already been constructed in Russia, 10-bev accelerator. That 10-bev machine is much larger than anything we have. It is said that we are going to catch up with them by building another larger one at Brookhaven; but when we have it almost finished, the Russians will have brought in one several times bigger than ours will be when it is finished, and they will have it in operation.

The Russians are also building the first atomic-powered surface vessel. I do not believe anyone questions the fact that they have an icebreaker under way and hope to launch it within a year. As the able Senator from Tennessee pointed out a moment ago, they have been able to drop a thermonuclear bomb from an airplane ahead of the time when we dropped ours; and not only that, but they announced to the world when we were going to drop ours. That announcement came as a shock to me. I would like to have been let in on the secret, as I am sure the Senator from Tennessee would have been.

The amazing thing is that the Russians accomplished all this with a ratio of only 17 to 90. My point is that if they are gaining on us that rapidly, it might be well for us to look to our leadership, if we hope to keep it in the days ahead.

Mr. GORE. The Senator suggests that the Joint Committee and the American people would like to have more information. The closing sentence in the advertisement to which I have been referring is as follows:

> Because this is so, reports of progress in atomic electric power will be brought to you from time to time by America's independent electric light and power companies.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. In that particular connection, I hope we shall have a hearing on this subject before the Congress adjourns, because I want the private utility people to bring me up to date. The law provides that the committee shall be currently and fully informed by the Atomic Energy Commission. If the Atomic Energy Commission falls down on the job, I assume private industry can pick up the ball and give it to us.

I had inquired from the people who were receiving these advertisements if they had received the next series of advertisements. I was informed that they had not. I talked with a man in New

York and tried to obtain some advance copies of the advertisements, so that I could be brought up to date by the advertising agency. However, they were not available.

I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that if we hold a hearing on this subject the private utilities may be a little more cautious in the next advertisement and stay a little closer to the facts. I do not doubt that by counting everything, including dismantled plants and plants which have been forgotten, they can count up to 90; but I will say to the able Senator from Tennessee that, as a member of the joint committee, I went over some of the restricted areas near Los Alamos.

While it is true that the first atomic explosion took place at Alamogordo, hundreds and hundreds of test shots took place on the New Mexico desert long before the big one was shot off. So, if this is going to be the technique to be followed, we will have to go back and find out about all the hundreds of tiny shots that may help develop some theory which may lead finally to the Alamogordo bomb. That is not what we do.

Therefore I think they had better pay some attention, and not talk about some tiny little reactors which have been dismantled and discarded and forgotten, and not try to foist those off on the American people as powerplants which are under way.

Mr. GORE. And as accomplishments of the private utilities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator has suggested that we would profit by experience. I want to call to his attention another sentence in this advertisement, and I agree with this sentence:

> Until they provide operating experience, no one will know which types are most useful for further development.

With that I thoroughly agree.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I dislike very much to interrupt the Senator again, but I wish to point out that in the hearings which have just been held, and in which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been blessed by the services of Dr. Zinn as a consultant—and he is as able a man as we could have found, and he is a wonderful person—we have learned that possibly—just possibly—the types we are now exploring may not be the ultimate type at all. We have not been exploring the gas-cooled reactor, which may offer the possibility of economical power. We are not fully trying high temperatures. It should be remembered that it is only by high temperatures that high efficiency is obtained in the transfer of heat energy.

All these things have been brought out and pointed out to us in the last few weeks and will shortly be available in the printed report on the Gore bill. I say to the Senator that that statement is true; that we will not know until we try. That is what he and I and other Senators have been trying to say, that we had better have a great many bets, including some bets on the types that are said to be the types which will become commercially feasible and competitive with other types of fuel.

It is all very well to say that we will build the same thing in Shippingport, Pa., that is in the *Nautilus*. However, let us remember that the *Nautilus* type is not commercially feasible as yet. Let us remember also that the current which will be supplied at Shippingport in the first installation is said to be 52 mills. No one is interested in 52-mill power. No one will accuse private industry of trying to stack the deck by having its reactors so expensive that they can prove that atomic power is not commercially feasible. They are tending in the right direction, and they hope to get it down to perhaps 14 mills. However, what is needed is 6- or 8- or 10-mill power.

We have been proposing—the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and other Senators—that an effort be made to find out if there are not other types of reactors which will produce current, so that we can get it down into that area.

It is only by testing some of these second guesses and some of the other bets, as well as what looked promising in the first test, that that can be accomplished. I am sure that the Senator agrees with the statement that that is what we have been trying to accomplish.

Mr. GORE. I agree thoroughly. I wish to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the type of reactor which he indicates is not being undertaken in this country—the gas-cooled reactor—is being developed by both Great Britain and Russia, and that a reactor of that type was designed in this country as early as 1946.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee has stated the fact correctly. The British plants which are going to be used as dual purpose reactors are using gas cooling. What their final types will be, I do not know. The Russians are starting to build a gas-cooled reactor. It seems only proper that the country which is supposed to have the leadership in this field should try one.

I call attention to the fact that probably as early as 1944 it was expected that a gas-cooled reactor would be built in this country. We went so far as to let a contract to the Monsanto Chemical Co. for the construction of it, and $3 million was set aside for it. I am not going to try to find out how it got stopped. Certainly by now, 12 years later, it might be safe to go ahead with it a little bit.

Mr. GORE. The fact remains that there are experienced and competent technical personnel in the Atomic Energy Commission who want to develop this kind of reactor, and who want to see it developed.

However, the fact also remains, Mr. President, that under the 1954 act, the Atomic Energy Commission is powerless to bring about the development of a large-scale reactor using this approach unless some private concern comes forward and volunteers to build one. The Commission apparently can only react to proposals submitted to it. The Commission has had made to it, under the 1954 act, proposals involving some reactor designs.

There are other, perhaps more promising designs, on which no proposal has been made.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I am greatly interested in what the Senator from Tennessee has said and what the Senator from New Mexico has said. It has been a very enlightening discussion. I have only a very limited knowledge of this great program. It is not my privilege to serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I wish to commend again the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from New Mexico. I read the Senator's statement before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I wrote him a letter about it. I read every word of it. In fact, I briefed it. It was almost an article for an encyclopedia in its soundness and breadth and scope.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator may have noticed that I motioned to one of the staff members to come over so that I could talk with him for a moment. I heard the Senator say that the 1954 Atomic Energy Act does not permit the Atomic Energy Commission to initiate this type of reactor the Senator was discussing—the gas-cooled reactor, I believe he called it.

Mr. GORE. The law does not permit the Commission to initiate construction of any type of reactor of commercial size.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of a commercial size. I recall that the amendment offered by the former Senator from Colorado, now the able and distinguished Governor of Colorado, Mr. Johnson—and I was keenly interested in that amendment and voted for it—authorized the Commission to undertake these power developments. At least I thought that was the case.

I have been informed just now that the amendment was so modified in conference as to remove its very spirit. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether the prohibition to which the Senator refers is a matter of policy established by the present Commission.

Mr. GORE. The 1954 act does not authorize the making of an appropriation for the construction by the Government of a reactor to generate electricity in commercial or industrial quantities.

To that extent the Commission's hands are tied. To that extent private enterprise has a monopoly on the use of this natural resource, atomic energy, for the generation of electricity in commercial quantities. It so happens that utility companies are the only segment of private industry to submit such proposals. I do not say this in criticism of private industry. I do criticize the utilities which have attempted to mislead the American people on the stage of development of atomic power in the United States. I do not criticize them for being cautious and reluctant to enter this very risky field. Under the 1954 act, we are

relying solely upon the profit motive for the actual development and operation of large-scale atomic powerplants. The profit motive is not very effective, because the economic barrier to competitive electricity has not yet been broken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the Senator's point and I think it is a very valid one.

I wish to conclude my comment by saying that I think the whole country is deeply indebted to the Senator and his associates on the committee, particularly the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], whom I have heard speak on this subject from time to time. But the Senator from Tennessee has a record of great service. He has pointed out some inaccuracies in the advertisement to which he has directed his remarks. That, in itself, is a great service. But I think the important service is to try to keep the record straight in our relative position in research into the uses of atomic energy.

If I correctly understand the Senator's point, it is that today the Commission has its hands tied in terms of the broad experimentation which may be necessary to find the most economical and feasible source for electric energy. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Insofar as the actual construction and operation of large-scale powerplants are concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. And the Senator is apparently of the opinion that unless we construct such a plant we cannot really ascertain whether it is economically feasible to have atomic-energy-developed electric energy.

Mr. GORE. I so say, and so does the advertisement. So does the Atomic Energy Commission. So do all the technicians who have spoken, so far as I am informed, upon this subject. It is in doing that we learn. It is in the actual construction and operation of the first reactor, the second generation, and the third generation of reactors, which use and benefit by the experience of the previous ones that we will acquire the necessary skill and will break the bottlenecks leading to economical atomic power. I want to see our country do it, and do it first.

One of the serious deficiencies of the present program and of the present law is that the Atomic Energy Commission itself, the United States Government, by the law is prevented from taking the initiative. It must respond to propositions which some private concern makes to it. I hope private concerns will offer more propositions, that they will move in more vigorously. I want to invite them in. I want to remove some obstacles, and I hope the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will report a bill tomorrow to have the Government assume a large share of the insurance risk on these reactors. I want to bring the American private-enterprise system into this program with widespread participation. What is the way to do it? It is to demonstrate the feasibility and the practicality of atomic power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly feel that the Senator is correct. I recall the remarks to which I alluded earlier when he emphasized the very point he is now reiterating so succinctly and so positively. It seems to me a shame, after the people have contributed billions of dollars, that there should be such a lag at this particular moment. I cannot help being mindful of the kind of law we might have had in 1954 had the bill not been amended in the Senate. The bill which came from the committee at that time was very disappointing to me; and I think the Senator from Tennessee recalls his very vigorous participation in the debate.

Mr. GORE. Yes, I do. I had a few sleepless nights.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to ask the Senator one final question, to see if he can give us a little enlightenment on it. I understand that the OEEC has made a report relating to the European countries' plan of organization and development of reactors for electric power. Does the Senator have any information he can give the Senate on that point? I know the Senator showed me the report an hour or so ago, and I thought maybe he might want to refer to it.

Mr. GORE. I have that report in hand. It was released only last Tuesday, June 5. Before reading from it I wish to point out to the Senator a matter which may prove of some interest to him and perhaps to other persons. The United States representative to the OEEC, which is the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, is a gentleman by the name of Walker L. Cisler, who happens also to be president of the Power Reactor Development Corporation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that a public or a private corporation?

Mr. GORE. That is a private corporation in which there are involved a number of concerns, but of which Mr. Cisler's corporation is the principal leader and of which he is president. He is also President of the Detroit-Edison Company.

Incidentally, I understand that some of the OEEC representatives are in Washington at this time.

The reactor development program in Western Europe, I point out to the Senator, from Minnesota who is a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee, is at a critical stage.

Mr. President, it is now 7:47 p. m., and I do not expect to talk very much longer, but I think I shall have something more to say, perhaps tomorrow or the next day, on the importance of reactor development in Western Europe.

I wish to read only a few sentences now from the OEEC report to which I referred:

> Without including the immense amounts which are being and will be spent on research and experimental plant, we can estimate the OEEC area investment in nuclear powerplants for 1955–75 at $11,000 million, to which should be added $500 million for the erection of plant to mine, prepare, process, and regenerate nuclear fuels, giving a total estimate of $11,500 million.

I ask the Senator if that statement does not have significance in this country. Western Europe is an area of short energy supply. Western Europe has exploited much of its coal deposits. It is dependent upon the Middle East for oil. This study shows that within the next few years the gap between supply and demand, the gap between a reliable supply of coal, oil, and gas, all normal fuels, and the requirement for fuel, is very great.

One question is, to what country will Western Europe turn to supply this demand for $11 billion worth of reactors and reactor fuel? Will the United States furnish it, or will the Soviet Union furnish it?

I shall submit the report to the able Senator, and shall make some further remarks about it later. I suggest that this is a matter of the gravest importance, not only economically here at home, but economically abroad, and in international affairs.

I read in today's issue of the New York Times that a broadcast from the Soviet Union only yesterday pilloried the United States for having dropped the first atom bomb. The newspaper article was a United Press dispatch from Tokyo. The broadcast was heard there by the Japanese people and other Asiatic peoples. It was upon the Japanese people that that bomb was dropped.

I do not join in the criticism of the United States for having done so, but I say that we bear that responsibility in world opinion. I think it places upon us a moral obligation to maintain America's leadership in bringing the benefits of the peacetime uses of atomic energy not only to the people of the United States, but to the people of the world.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senator from Tennessee on another day will bring to the attention of this body more of the facts in the report on European cooperation for the development of atomic energy.

As I understand, with the great power needs in Western Europe, with an expanding European industry, and with Europe facing a shortage of coal, oil, gas, and other fuels, Western European countries are pushing hard for the development of nuclear reactors.

As the Senator has said—and I think he has put his finger upon a very important economic development, and, I may say, a very important, significant political development—if the Western European countries are to import reactors, so to speak, if they are to get them from other areas, it will be from either the United States or the Soviet Union.

At the present time, from what I have heard in the discussion and from what I have read in the newspapers, and particularly from what I have read in the statements of members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Soviet Union is making considerable advancement and progress in the development of nuclear reactors. Therefore, she may very well be in a position to deliver a

variety of reactors which are economically feasible, or feasible for the economic production of electrical energy. If Soviet Russia can deliver such reactors to, let us say, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, and other countries, she will then have moved into a very sensitive area of the Western European economy, because she will be able to follow that effort by a type of political control.

We have known, for example, that the fuel oil which comes from the Middle East, much of which has been under British and French control for years, has given Great Britain and France considerable influence in Western Europe. The Soviet Union today is in the stage where she can threaten the free flow of that oil and literally choke it off, unless we are willing to engage in hostilities to prevent it. If the Soviet Union can wield such a threat on the supply of oil and at the same time can develop her reactors, which will be available for sale in Western European countries to meet the power gap——

Mr. GORE. And also if she can make available the necessary fuel.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And also the necessary fuel, yes, which goes with those reactors, Russia will be in a very enviable position.

So we are not simply talking about a small peacetime enterprise, and whether or not we ought to have more reactors so that we can do business; we are also talking high policy, national security policy, international policy, political policy. We are talking about a policy which has primarily economic implications.

I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee agrees with that general analysis.

Mr. GORE. I think the point is most important. The evidence available to the joint committee indicates that the United States is falling woefully behind the Soviet Union in the actual development, construction, and operation of large-scale power reactors.

I say to the Senator that the bottlenecks may not be broken by a small laboratory reactor; they may not be broken by a pilot plant; but they may be broken by a large-scale prototype reactor.

Furthermore, the secret of the release of the vast amount of economic power which is surely soon to come will likely not be solved by relying upon development of reactors of any one particular design. All must be explored.

The junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is chairman of the joint committee, referred to one type of reactor which is not being developed in this country as a large-scale plant. There are many more. For instance, I can name two offhand. We are not building a power reactor to utilize the experience of the big reactors at Savannah River. We are not developing a reactor to utilize the experience of the reactors at Hanford, Wash.

We need to move vigorously on this program. It is through governmental leadership and through cooperation between the Government and industry that we can do so. It is only through that process that we can do so.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times of June 13, 1956]

HOW AMERICA WILL KEEP ITS LEAD IN ATOMIC ELECTRIC POWER

This is the way nations rate in nuclear reactors built or planned (all types and for all purposes):

Completed as of 1956:	
United States	55
Great Britain	7
Russia	6
All others	10
Building or planned:	
United States	35
Great Britain	23
Russia	11
All others	14

In the past few months, the question has been raised, "Is America behind in the development of atomic-electric power?" The full facts answer "No." And America's electric light and power industry, in full cooperation with other organizations in this country engaged in atomic research and development, will do its part to make sure the answer remains "No."

At the present time, for instance, the Atomic Energy Commission, the electric companies, and various other organizations have built, or are building or planning, more nuclear reactors than all other nations combined. More in number and scope—90, representing many reactor designs. And more promising for the future—for every reactor today is largely experimental, built to provide research in and knowledge of a whole new science and a new technology.

ELECTRICITY FROM THE ATOM

Much of this research and knowledge has a direct bearing on one of the atom's greatest promises, the production of electric power. Far more experimentation will be required to prove which of the many types of reactors are most efficient, most workable and most economical. But we are well on the way to finding out.

Foremost in this experimentation is the basic and comprehensive reactor research program led and carried on by the Atomic Energy Commission. This research puts theories to the test, discovers how to design and build various types of reactors, uncovers basic problems and possibilities, and provides the vital first tries that are necessary before larger and better reactors can be designed and built. Already, these tests are separating the most promising from the least.

THE NEXT STEP

From this basic research—some of which is also being done by America's independent electric companies—the next step is big, full-size commercial atomic-electric plants. That step is being taken, too. The electric light and power companies already have seven of these large atomic-electric plants on the way or under study. They, too, are experimental as far as their reactors go—for they include a number of different kinds of reactors and various designs. Until they provide operating experience, no one will know which types are most useful for further development.

The problem of producing electricity from the atom was solved long ago. But so long as we have adequate supplies of coal, oil, and gas that can produce low-price electricity, it would be wasteful for America to build large numbers of atomic-electric powerplants which could produce electricity only at high cost. Our objective should be economy and efficiency in reactor design and construction, without passing up any promising designs in our search. Progress toward this objective is being made.

ELECTRIC COMPANIES BUILD

More than $300 million from individual investors is involved in the planning and construction of atomic-electric plants and related research. A total of 44 electric companies is participating in building these reactor plants. In so doing, they are drawing on their industry's 75-year experience in producing electricity from other fuels.

To speed this program still further, America's independent, electric companies are forming a special task force on atomic-electric reactors. The function and nature of this new group is described in the box below.

STILL IN TESTING STAGE

Because the United States today has plenty of electric power and plenty of conventional fuels, the wise program is to test many reactors, types, and designs and select the best. It will help assure our continuing lead in atomic development over countries which are building atomic-electric plants with today's limited knowledge because they so desperately need electricity at any price.

Information like this about our Nation's atomic-electric power program is important to you and others interested in the welfare of their country. It is important to you as a citizen and as an electric customer. Because this is so, reports of progress in atomic-electric power will be brought to you from time to time by America's independent electric light and power companies.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Atomic-electric power is in its infancy. So varied are its possibilities that special measures must be taken to see that none of the atom's promises will be overlooked.

To make sure of this, America's electric light and power companies are forming a technical appraisal task force to evaluate and stimulate research, development, and construction that will advance the promise of economical and practical electric power. This task force will be composed of some of the Nation's leading nuclear engineers and scientists, as well as leaders in the electric industry.

The findings of this task force, as well as all other experience and knowledge of America's power companies in the field of nuclear reactors, will be shared wtih any group dedicated to the objective of maintaining American leadership in atomic-electric power.

EXHIBIT 2

New York Times.
New York Herald Tribune.
Washington Post and Times Herald.
The Evening Star.
Cleveland Plain Dealer.
Detroit News.
Detroit Free Press.
Chicago Tribune.
St. Louis Globe Democrat.
St. Louis Post Dispatch.
Minneapolis Star.
Minneapolis Tribune.
St. Paul Dispatch.
St. Paul Pioneer Press.
Denver Post.
Christian Science Monitor.
Wall Street Journal.
San Francisco Examiner.
Oakland Tribune.
Los Angeles Times.
Boston Herald.
Boston Traveler.
New Orleans Times Picayune.
New Orleans States.
Dallas News.
Atlanta Constitution.
Atlanta Journal.
Des Moines Register.
Des Moines Tribune
Seattle Times.
Kansas City Times.
Kansas City Star.
Philadelphia Bulletin.
Philadelphia Inquirer.
Portland Oregonian.
Pittsburgh Press.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR BRICKER AS MEMBER OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SENATE RECEPTION ROOM, VICE SENATOR MILLIKIN, RESIGNED

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Before recognizing the Senator from Tennessee, the Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] as a member of the Special Committee on the Senate Reception Room, created by Senate Resolution 145, 84th Congress, in the place of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], resigned.

RECESS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order heretofore entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of June 11), 1956.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Victor R. Hansen, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Stanley N. Barnes, resigned.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Edward J. Worrel, Jr.
Charles W. Miller

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Stanley L. Smith
John A. Weber
William H. Campbell

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W–2, in the United States Coast Guard:

Carl D. Stange	Finis L. McClanahan
Donat Cotnoir	Robert F. Konrad
Bampton L. Jones	Cornelius A. Johnson
Eugene Newsome	Palmer F. Guarente
Wayne W. Fish	Philip J. Crawley
Peter P. Zilkan	Frederick M. Rummel
Alvin R. Rutz	Joseph A. DelTorto
Elbert S. Hendrix	Raymond R. Thiele
Raymond C. Buday	Earl H. McDonald
Edward C. Zachowski	Robert L. Roberts
Boyd M. Smith	James B. Hunnings
Kenneth M. Lumsden	Wilbur T. Hutchinson
Elmer L. Alban	Charles J. Albanese
George D. Miller, Jr.	William R. Bentler
Frederick D. Mann	Charter D. Edwards
James W. Berry	Harry H. Stimpson, Jr.
James I. Pledger, Jr.	Edison Jones
William F. Brock	Beverly E. Locke
Doily Fulcher	Claude W. Jenkins
Merle S. Wilson	

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be medical directors

Russell O. Settle	Curtis G. Southard
Waldron M. Sennott	Hugh B. Cottrell
Dorland J. Davis	Louis Jacobs
Albert L. Chapman	Carl L. Larson
James K. Shafer	Max M. Van Sandt

To be senior surgeon

Eli M. Lippman

To be surgeons

William J. Zukel	William H. Sage III
Carl F. Essig, Jr.	Charles A. Jarvis
Simon P. Abrahams	Charles H. Lithgow
Virgil B. Polley	John M. Bishop, Jr.
Jarvis E. Seegmiller	Robert H. Aronstam
John S. Shuttleworth	James W. Osberg, Jr.
DeArmond Moore	Robert L. Brutsche
Richmond T. Prehn	James R. Lewis
Harry S. Wise	Carl F. Mattern
Paul M. Duffy	Clifford H. Cole
John V. Osborne	Harvey A. Itano
John H. Waite	Daniel J. Tenenberg
Thos. J. Kennedy, Jr.	C. F. Sparger
Victor E. Archer	Ernest Cotlove
Charles J. Buhrow	Douglas H. Crockett
Ernest G. Hanowell	

To be senior assistant surgeons

Allen C. Pirkle	John R. Moran
John F. Lee, Jr.	James D. Tovey
Jack Durell	John W. Glotfelty
Don E. Leuzinger	William K. Carlile

To be dental director

Herbert A. Spencer

To be dental surgeons

Alfred Popper	Quentin M. Smith
John W. Heck	Reuben L. Turner

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

L. Charles Larsen	George J. Yocum
Charles H. Davis	Leonard R. Iverson
George E. Garrington	

To be sanitary engineer director

Glen J. Hopkins

To be senior sanitary engineers

Frederick K. Erickson	Joseph H. Coffey
Paul C. Henderson	Frederick Aldridge
Ernest P. Dubuque	E. Carl Warkentin
Harry Stierli	John H. Ludwig
John R. Thoman	Harvey F. Ludwig
Frank A. Butrico	Harry W. Poston
Bernard B. Berger	Donald J. Schliessmann
Louis F. Warrick	James H. Crawford
Ray Raneri	Samuel R. Weibel
O. John Schmidt	Curtis E. Richey
Kenneth C. Lauster	Gerald Dyksterhouse
Joseph A. Boyer	
Ross W. Buck	

To be sanitary engineers

William B. Page
Ernest C. Tsivoglou

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Jerrold M. Michael

To be senior pharmacists

Ernest J. Simnacher
Carmen A. Carrato
Boyd W. Stephenson

To be pharmacists

Milton W. Skolaut
Frank E. Dondero
Allen J. Brands

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Albert B. Ripley	Joseph N. Salvino
Mario C. Baratta	Bertram J. Baughman

To be scientist director

John T. Tripp

To be senior scientists

Francis M. Middleton
Richard P. Dow
Simon Kinsman

To be senior assistant scientist

Virgil R. Carlson

To be senior sanitarian

Daniel E. O'Keefe

To be sanitarians

Charles E. Gerhardt
Samuel M. Rogers

To be senior veterinarian

Robert D. Courter

To be nurse director

Florence H. Callahan

To be senior nurse officers

Elizabeth H. Boeker	Gladys C. Guydes
Marjorie W. Spaulding	M. Lois Power
Catherine M. Sullivan	M. Dolores Jones
Margaret E. Willhoit	Anne H. MacNeill

To be nurse officers

Genevieve T. Piette	Faye G. Abdellah
Florence J. Ullman	Elizabeth J. Haglund
Elizabeth Kuhlman	

To be senior dietitian

Engla J. Anderson

To be dietitian

Susanne C. Van Leuzen

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 415 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while so serving:

Maj. Gen. Ray A. Robinson, United States Marine Corps.

Maj. Gen. Merrill B. Twining, United States Marine Corps.

The following-named officers, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of lieutenant general:

Lt. Gen. Alfred H. Noble, United States Marine Corps.

Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, United States Marine Corps.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Daniel C. Pollock	Maurice W. Fletcher
Monfurd K. Peyton	Albert F. Lucas III
Ralph A. Collins, Jr.	Donald M. Schmuck
Edward N. Rydalch	John P. Leonard, Jr.
Raymond G. Davis	Andrew G. Smith, Jr.
Ransom M. Wood	Raymond L. Dean
Walter S. Osipoff	Alfred H. Marks
Jess P. Ferrill, Jr.	Everette H. Vaughan
Guy H. Kissinger, Jr.	Randolph C. Berkeley, Jr.
Edward H. Hurst	Jackson B. Butterfield
Donn J. Robertson	Robert A. Harvey
William M. Frash	John F. Carey
Elmer A. Wrenn	John A. McAlister
Thomas L. Ridge	Hamilton Lawrence
Byron V. Leary	Rex R. Stillwell
Merrill M. Day	Norman H. Jungers
Lowell E. English	Richard E. Figley
Robert F. Steidtmann	Gordon D. Gayle
Alvin S. Sanders	James D. McBrayer, Jr.
James C. Magee, Jr.	Jack Hawkins
Albert J. Roose	William A. Stiles
Rodney M. Handley	Edwin C. Aiken
Harold C. Boehm	Russell Duncan
Robert C. Hiatt	Richard M. Huizenga
John H. McMillan	William A. Cloman, Jr.
Charles W. McCoy	
John W. Burkhardt	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Truman K. Lyford	Anthony A. Akstin
James B. Carpenter, Jr.	Kenneth L. Reusser
Joseph A. Bruder	Paul M. Smith
Irving B. Hayes	Whitman S. Bartley
Warren E. Whipple	Bruce E. Keith
Glenn E. Norris	Robert S. Anderson
John P. Lanigan	James C. Short
Bernard McShane	Maurice H. Clarke
Robert H. Hammond	Robert A. McCabe
John E. Shepherd, Jr.	Roscoe E. Cole
Charles H. Horn	Cecil D. Ferguson
Leslie A. Gilson, Jr.	William R. Ourand, Jr.
Frederic F. Draper	Richard J. Morrisey
	Harold Wallace

Jack R. Munday
Frank C. Thomas
John W. Zuber
Donald V. Anderson
Donald T. Rohrabacher
Howard M. Lee
Thomas H. Rogers, Jr.
George H. Hazel
Henry W. Hise
Jules M. Rouse
Fritz Stampfli
Herbert Gomes
George J. Brookes, Jr.
Richard L. Braun
Griffith B. Doyle
Robert E. Johnson
Gordon L. Allen
John S. Reamy
Alfred A. Tillmann
Dorian J. Wright
Jack R. Edwards
Edward C. Thoemmes
Bolish J. Kozak
Alton P. Trapnell
William E. Baird
John H. Biumenstein
Francis P. Dayton
James S. Williams
Lyle E. Buck
Robert S. Hudson
Howard W. Bollmann
Alexander M. Hearn
Dan H. Johnson
William H. Costello
Norman O'Bryan
Alton W. McCully
James R. Dyer
Wilbur F. Evans, Jr.
Leslie J. Parnell
Philip T. Kujovsky
Clarence T. Risher, Jr.
J. E. Estes
Joseph L. Abel
Kenneth B. Boyd
Edward H. Voorhees
Richard E. Sullivan
Virgil T. Wills
Frank W. Harrington
Dave E. Severance
Harold E. Nelson
Frederick Simpson
Don P. Wyckoff
Sanford B. Hunt, Jr.
Thomas S. Witherspoon
John R. Stone
Douglas E. Haberlie
Joseph L. Atkins
Robert Hall
Roy H. Elrod
William H. Rankin
John S. Chambers, Jr.
Charles J. Keen
John D. Lines, Jr.
Gilbert Percy
Thomas H. Hughes, Jr.
Eugene G. McIntyre
Albert L. Clark
Gerard M. Shuchter
Edwin E. Shifflett
Paul H. Kellogg
James H. Phillips
James A. Crotinger
Paul L. Pankhurst
Lynn E. Midkiff
Norman S. Chase
Judson C. Richardson, Jr.
Richard Hey, Jr.
George P. Blackburn, Jr.
Ben L. Hoover
Edwin H. Simmons
David W. Bridges
George W. Carrington, Jr.
Thomas M. Fields
Richard H. Jeschke, Jr.
John P. McNeil
Ralph J. Parker, Jr.
Arthur M. Hale
Robert A. Scherr
Grover C. Williams, Jr.
John A. Hood
William V. Schwebke
Steve J. Cibik
James L. Jones
Warren H. Keck
James P. Treadwell
Robert E. Lorigan
Donald V. Nahrgang
Roy H. Thompson
Robert S. Wilson
John Marston, Jr.
Eugene J. Robinson
Dennis P. Casey
Robert L. Rathbun
Thomas J. Cushman, Jr.
Louis V. Brooks
John J. Windsor
Earl N. Lewis
Thomas M. Forsyth, Jr.
Willis L. Fairbanks
Robert F. Stinkraus
John Skinner, Jr.
Clement J. Stadler
Elswin P. Dunn
Walter W. Turner
William D. Armstrong
George M. Warnke
Wesley R. Christie
Charles H. Le Claire
George W. Ellis
Fred E. Haynes, Jr.
William L. Bates, Jr.
Robert M. Calland
Albert Hartman
Robert B. Carney, Jr.
James F. McClanahan
Frank Johnson
Merwin H. Silverthorn, Jr.
William L. Dick
Joseph E. Fogg
Beldon Lidyard
Michael J. Sisul
Albert H. Keith
Irvin H. Elrod
Walter H. Eastham
Raymond F. Gotko
George Jones
William A. Searight
Richard P. Brezinski
Theodore R. Cathey
James W. Eldridge

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

John A. Ritchie
Richard J. Collins
Edwin H. Lathrop
Daniel R. Kingsley
Albert H. Risner
Richard E. Moody
Thomas B. Sparkman
William M. Sigler, Jr.
Walter B. Patton
Bevan G. Cass
Thomas F. McGraw, Jr.
Albert C. Schoner
Dwight E. Mayo
Robert W. Hohl
Richard J. Schriver
Edward Shamis
Robert B. Clay
John W. Walker
John E. Shields
Cecil E. Robbins
Roscoe R. St. John
David G. Swinford
William J. Longfellow
Richard A. Bauer
Norman G. Ewers
Roger A. Morris
Harold O. Jones
Randolph J. Ewan
Raymond M. Smith
Edward S. Lambert
Clarence E. Leonard
Joseph W. Clune
Oliver R. Davis
John P. Kelley
John T. Moore
Donald E. Whitfield
Harry L. Foust
Julius R. Rose
William Shanks, Jr.
Dean W. Lindley
Henry F. Brandon
George J. King
Willmar M. Bledsoe
Laurence H. Woods
Richard H. Kern
Norris D. Allen
Harold R. Reed, Jr.
Hardy V. Huffstutter, Jr.
William C. McGraw, Jr.
Dee E. Ezell
Edward P. Stamford
James S. Ashman
Charles J. O'Malley
Lewis L. Miller
Eugene N. James
Merrill F. Suter
Robert M. Fraser, Jr.
Rex C. Denny, Jr.
Arthur E. Phillips
Clyde R. Jarrett
Collin H. Rushfeldt
John J. Hilburn, Jr.
Rockwell M. Rutledge
Bernadin J. Daigle
Eugene V. Goldston
John J. Filippo
Frederic T. Watts, Jr.
Norman W. Flinn, Jr.
Robert R. Klingman
Edward N. Le Faivre
William C. Parker, Jr.
Gordon R. Reier
John J. Danner
Austin C. Fitzgerald
William H. Drewitz
Harold L. Sharkey
William I. Armagost
Robert E. McCann
Amil K. Clark
Robert G. Williams
James A. Hoey, Jr.
Robert A. McMullen
John A. Hughes
Harold W. Adams
Franklin F. Ramseur, Jr.
Neil E. Barber
Mercer R. Smith
Donald J. Hallameyer
Marvin A. Skeath, Jr.
John S. Perrin
George E. Chamberlin, Jr.
Philip J. Keleher
Richard S. Togerson
George E. Petro
Samuel F. Martin
Gilbert A. Barrett
Darwin B. Pond, Jr.
John W. Ruhsam
Samuel E. Helm, Jr.
Joseph T. Murphy
Emidio Briganti
John McCabe
Walter J. Klimek
Charles R. Leutz, Jr.
Allen R. Semb
John F. Sutkus
Raymond H. Schanamann
Kenneth T. Dykes
Lloyd J. Parsons
Emery E. Nelson
W. C. Hall
Roy J. Leite, Jr.
Edgar P. Holt
Robert Dobbins, Jr.
Alfred F. McCaleb, Jr.
Thomas H. Horn
Walter C. Stewart, Jr.
Ernest W. Payne
Paul Schmuck, Jr.
John H. Thomas
Goodwin C. Groff
James W. Bateman
William R. Gould
Norman C. Wiley
Arthur O. Schmagel
Leroy A. Seipp
John W. Sullivan
Richard A. Winters, Jr.
Charles H. Coppedge
Byron Graham, Jr.
Robert F. Marr
Edward D. Smith
Harrel K. Jobe
Edwin Pendrey
George S. Mansfield
William J. Halligan
Russell Swanson
Richard A. Ward
Charles A. Salser
Albert Fowler
Ronald H. Gemmell
Stone W. Quillian
Charles F. Dizney
Harold W. Hawkins
Grady W. Ray
Nicholas J. Dennis
Donald E. Francke
Charles H. Gould
Lynn F. Williams
Harry B. Hanson
Kenneth E. Huntington
Roland S. Helstrom
George H. Albers
Norman R. Reichwald
William A. Danckaert
Elmer Amundson
Robert E. Gilmour
Donald Conroy
Edward L. Andre
Jerry B. Smith
Carl S. Detmering
Richard C. Andrews
Bill E. Horner
George A. Phillips
Arthur W. Ecklund
Lee R. Miller
Edward H. Walker
Dudley Cook
Paul W. Seabaugh
Neil F. Young
Owen G. Jackson, Jr.
Elmer J. Zorn
James D. Johnson, Jr.
John N. Snapper
Wilbur O. Nelson
Philip A. Davis
Daniel G. Murray
George W. Parker
Charles T. Caldwell
Frank J. O'Hara, Jr.
Dale L. Ward
Russell A. Andres
Arthur W. Newendorp
John M. Jagoda
Anthony D. Anton
Thomas A. Gribbin II
Albert A. Grasselli
George J. Collins
George E. Mouzakis
Olen H. Price
Charles W. Egan
Charles E. Boswell, Jr.
Ralph P. Ward, Jr.
Robert L. Smith
Leland C. Ritter
Merlin L. Dake
Charles R. Howe
Eugene W. Meyer
John J. Fischer
Jack A. Miller
Robert M. Schneider
Kenneth G. Fiegener
Robert R. Tabler
Robert L. Gibson
Roy J. Molick
Edward A. Bray
Jack G. Harrington
Donald A. Panska
Charles C. Angle
Merlin T. Matthews
Guy M. Washburn
Durwood P. McCall
Lenhrew E. Lovette
Richard J. Sullivan
Robert F. Warren
Roderick J. Munro
Henry G. Holmes, Jr.
Ruel H. Corley, Jr.
Harry F. Painter
John M. McLaurin, Jr.
Urban A. Lees
Bernard J. Stender
Charles D. Dawkins, Jr.
Lewis E. Bolts
Charles C. Whipple
Ira V. Babcock
Donald F. Mileson
Oliver J. Koester
Ward L. Hooper
Guy M. Gipple
Robert B. Robinson
Leslie T. McFadden
Gordon C. Hart
Alexander Wilson
Robert D. Green
Dwain L. Redalen
Jefferson A. Davis, Jr.
Robert J. Wright
Harold G. McRay
Kenneth L. Anstock
Grover C. Jackson
Robert W. Petersen
Craig C. Crabb
Gerald Q. Fagnan
Russell G. Patterson, Jr.
Richard B. Newport
James M. Babb
Harvey E. Wendt
Robert E. Wagner
Harry O. Taylor
Robert J. Graham
Varge G. Frisbie
John F. McMahon, Jr.
James W. Ferris
Robert King, Jr.
Roland B. Heilman
William L. Atwater, Jr.
Walter E. Daniel
Daniel P. Githens, Jr.
Richard L. Michael, Jr.
William H. Bortz, Jr.
Wilbur F. Simlik
Harry G. C. Henneberger
William Whitehill
Weldon C. Cooke
Earl A. Trager, Jr.
Williams P. Brown
Homer D. Hoyle
Robert J. Zitnik
Arnold W. Barden
William H. Roley
Don G. Derryberry
Crawford B. Malone
Alva Anderson
George Mottl
Dan C. Holland
Sylvester F. Leis
James E. Meehan
William R. Lucas
Walter N. Roark, Jr.
Richard H. Peacock
Thomas E. Mulvihill
Otis R. Waldrop
Robert J. Young
Clark Ashton
Thomas H. Hughes
William J. Peter, Jr.
Elmer F. Koehler
John L. Greene
Dail D. Fine
Burton D. Currier
William J. Donovan
Robert Rause
Hugh D. Washburn, Jr.
Raymond H. W. Pett
Charles F. Stansbury
Earl E. Jones, Jr.
Rose T. Pinkston
John S. Banks
George H. Elias
James Sharp II
Myron P. Weiczorek
Troy L. Galford
Arthur L. Jackson
Woodrow W. Brown
Virgil R. Martin
Eugene Anderson
Matthew J. Kruszewski
Ray M. Burrill
James B. Seaton
Walter P. Landis
John H. Tomlinson
Lornie Leslie
Saint Clair Tant
Conrad J. Morgan
David R. McGrew, Jr.
Joseph W. Utz
Donald L. Shenaut
Albert F. Rinehart
Anthony J. Roscoe
William D. Miears
Robert J. Greenway
William M. Rossiter
Oscar A. Bosma
John C. Hudock
Felix L. Ferranto
Alfred T. Coon
William L. Nolte
Adam A. Metz
Edgar S. Hamilton
Paul Adams
Bill L. Parham
Gerald L. Pines
Henry G. Goare
Warren L. Mobley
Kenneth M. Stayer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Carlisle G. Kohl, Jr.
Charles R. Puckett
Page H. Holmes
Doyle H. Cole
William G. Siegfried, Sr.
Thomas G. Mooney
Leonard F. Blake
David G. Geddes
Vernon C. Shortsleeves
George E. Fuller
Estas L. Williams
George W. Troxler
Leonard Schoenberger
Timothy S. Vogt
Warren J. Skvaril
Thomas I. Gunning
Leonard C. Taft
Charles S. Smith
Ernest B. Altekruse
Charles E. Woodul
Nick J. Kapetan
James H. Mac Lean
Maurice C. Ashley, Jr.
Robert W. Taylor
Thomas W. Turner
Richard S. McCutchen
Robert C. Needham
Mallett C. Jackson, Jr.
John H. Miller
Harry J. Nolan
Roger W. Peard, Jr.
Warren C. Sherman
John C. Gordy, Jr.
William Wentworth

John M. Johnson, Jr.
Raymond L. Barrie, Jr.
Robert F. Maiden
Richard H. Francis
William F. Saunders, Jr.
Ralph H. Brown
Pierre D. Reissner
Henry W. Tubbs, Jr.
Harold L. Dawe, Jr.
Charles R. Kennington, Jr.
Kenneth W. Schieweck
Wayne L. Hall
Robert L. McElroy
Kenneth R. Steele
Basile Lubka
Charles B. Sturgell
Charles M. C. Jones, Jr.
Robert G. Hunt, Jr.
James R. Gober
Harold A. Hatch
William F. Sparks
Thomas B. White, Jr.
Dwight E. Roberts
Derrell C. Briden
Tom D. Parsons
George E. Hayward
Hans W. Henzel
Richard W. Sheppe
Alan M. Lindell
John L. Eareckson
Thomas J. Deen, Jr.
John F. Conroy
Willard D. Merrill
Joseph Z. Taylor
Miles M. Hoover, Jr.
Thomas G. Borden
Kelly J. Davis, Jr.
Robert L. Scruggs
Kenneth E. Turner
Daniel J. Boyle, Jr.
Thomas E. Ringwood, Jr.
William J. Budge
Francis A. Gore, Jr.
James S. Wilson
Eugene O. Speckart
Lewis H. Devine
Richard H. West
Charles H. Opfar, Jr.
James W. Stanhouse
Calhoun J. Killeen
Robert L. Lockhart
John P. Schied
John R. Heppert
Theophil P. Riegert
James F. Wolfe, Jr.
Luther G. Troen
Walter A. Gagne, Jr.
Andrew B. Cook
John G. Belden
Berthal H. Henning, Jr.
William D. Bassett, Jr.
Henry A. Commiskey, Sr.
Raymond R. Rall, Jr.
Ivil L. Carver
Tilton A. Anderson
Thomas G. Snipes
Charles D. Fay
Harry D. Woods
George A. P. Haynes
Wendell O. Beard
Charles S. Whiting
Randlett T. Lawrence
Charles V. Jarman
Samuel E. Englehart
Theodore R. Wall
Littleton W. T. Waller II
Raymond C. Paulson
Max A. Merritt
Robert G. Staffney
Jack E. Townsend
David S. Karukin
Bruce C. Ogilvie
Edgar F. Musgrove
John W. Haggerty III
Richard R. Miller
Clyde L. Eyer
Allen S. Harris
Charles P. McCallum, Jr.
Byron L. Magness
Robert J. Barton
John F. McCarthy, Jr.
Fred Grabowsky
Albert C. Smith, Jr.
John R. Dickson
Willard S. Peterson
Robert H. Krider
George H. Grimes
C. P. Clark, Jr.
Frederick M. Haden
Gilbert W. Ferguson
Richard C. Andersen
Howard M. Markus
Richard D. Alexander
Richard B. Talbott
Orvis O. Gaughf, Jr.
George R. Phillips
Charles A. Webster
William T. Harrell, Jr.
Harris J. Levert, Jr.
George R. Lamb
George B. Addison, Jr.
Donald J. Burger
Victor O'Hanesian
Douglas E. Wade
William C. Keith, Jr.
William F. Alsop, Jr.
Ralph L. Cunningham, Jr.
William R. Grubaugh
Kenneth S. Foley
Emmett J. Hyde
Robert S. Silverthorn
Adolph G. Sadeski
Garland T. Beyerle
Marvin H. Stevens
Jerry F. Mathis
Claude E. Deering, Jr.
William E. Cross, Jr.
Elwin B. Hart
Harold E. Stine
David G. Mehargue
Edward J. Bronars
John J. Oltermann
James W. Marsh
Harry O. Cowing, Jr.
George F. Tubley
Lee R. Bendell
Charles A. Rosenfeld
Donald N. McKeon
Arthur R. Petersen
Vincent J. Pross, Jr.
John E. Greenwood
Wendell N. Vest
Martin B. Reilly
Taylor J. Tucker
Grover C. Koontz
Andrew E. Hare
David M. Twomey
James J. Dinardo, Jr.
Paul D. Walker, Jr.
Audrey P. McNair
Robert J. Irwin
Thomas A. Palmer
Robert B. Brennan
Warren M. Brown
Ira L. Morgan, Jr.
Alexander P. McMillan
Otto I. Svenson, Jr.
Fredric A. Green
Leo A. Shane
Laurence D. Krentzlin
Johan S. Gestson
George T. Sargent, Jr.
Harry L. Gary
Robert E. Gruenler
Walter V. Walsh
Stanley A. Herman
Harry B. Randall III
Raymond M. Ryan
Jack Erwin
Lawrence A. Hall
Gilbert H. Holmes
Bernard L. Turner
Wilson E. D. Shepherd
Bain McClintock
Robert N. Good
Donald C. Miller
Charles S. Homola, Jr.
Richard K. Buchanan
David M. Ridderhof
Aubrey W. Talbert, Jr.
Birchard B. De Witt
David J. Wightman
Winston D. Chapman
William B. Shields
Oral R. Swigart, Jr.
Holcombe H. Thomas
Frederick M. Woeller
Richard E. Jones
Cornelius F. Savage, Jr.
Rodolfo L. Trevino
Eugene F. Hertling, Jr.
Albert J. Ziogar
Joseph Nastasi
Kenneth M. Buss
Cyril Wadzita
Richard B. Sheridan
Jack L. Handey
Joshua W. Dorsey III
William Lesser
Paul G. McMahon
James H. Bryson
John N. Webb
Robert G. Brown
Henry E. Wold
Winans D. Holliday
Don L. Keller
David J. Hytrek
William R. Corson
Kenneth L. Robinson, Jr.
Robert W. Oliver
Peter G. Paraskos
Thomas J. Burckell
Eugene D. Foxworth, Jr.
Edward J. Rigby
Robert O. Ducker
James W. Wood
Donald C. Stanton
Erin D. Smith
James L. Bowman
James R. Aichele
Lawrence R. Dorsa
James E. Bald
William B. Fleming
Warren R. Johnson
Joseph V. McLernan
Robert H. Harter
John L. Lowe
Stewart G. Mayse
Gregory J. Cizek
William K. Horn
Charles W. Abbott
Joseph J. N. Gambardella
Thomas E. Bulger
Stanley H. Olson
William B. McCurdy
Edward R. Watson
Robert C. Jenkins
Richard J. Smith
Earl F. Roth, Jr.
Reagan L. Preis
Richard B. Wyatt
Newell D. Staley, Jr.
William M. Herrin, Jr.
Robert L. Gunter
Jesse L. Gibney, Jr.
Withold J. Bacauskas
Anthony A. Monti
Thomas I. Gerard
Robert E. Wehrle
Joseph C. Shea, Jr.
William K. Rockey
Heman J. Redfield III
Richard T. Guidera
Arthur W. Anthony, Jr.
Richard E. Campbell
Marshall J. Treado
Robert E. Presson
Steve Minko
Robert B. March
Charles G. Cooper
Grover J. Rees, Jr.
Robert A. Lindsley
Harold C. Colvin
James R. McEnaney
David J. Hunter
Norman B. McCrary
Henry V. Martin
Elliott R. Laine, Jr.
Thomas F. Manley
Frederick D. Leder
James E. Spangler
Alexander M. Stewart
David I. Carter
Robert D. Whitesell
John K. Davis
Clinton J. Thro, Jr.
Stanley P. Daggett, Jr.
William B. Muir
Lloyd E. Tatem
Harrison G. Frasier
Roddey B. Moss
Kenneth J. Ivanson
George V. Ruos, Jr.
William V. H. White
Howard L. Barrett, Jr.
Robert R. Montgomery
Robert E. Hunter, Jr.
Hugh T. Kennedy
Carlton D. Goodiel, Jr.
Hal W. Vincent
George E. Beattie
Jack F. Ingalls III
Clement C. Buckley, Jr.
James W. Abraham
James A. Todd
Richard H. Burnett
Paul X. Kelley
Ross L. Mulford
George W. Houck
Byron T. Chen
James W. Myers
Donald J. Beatty
Birney A. Adams
Peter F. C. Armstrong
John E. Buynak
Francis C. Cushing, Jr.
William J. Galyon
Charles K. Whitfield
William M. Tatum, Jr.
Richard D. Mickelson
Henry C. Hutson
James W. Laseter
Joseph L. Sadowski
Robert A. Walker
Edward L. Lieland, Jr.
William K. Parcell
Winston F. Fontaine
Jean M. Penney
Joseph M. Laney, Jr.
Raymond W. Craig
Clinton Roberson
Carey S. Hughes
Carl R. Lundquist
Goodell P. Warren
Charles F. Whitehead
Darrel E. Bjorklund
David Y. Westling
James N. Bardin
Edward J. Rutty
Robert W. Cooney
Douglas V. Stowell
Edward J. Driscoll, Jr.
Philip M. Crosswait
Ronald I. Severson
Wilford E. Overgard
George D. Cumming
Robert E. Howard, Jr.
James G. Martz III
Robert E. Miller
George H. Shutt, Jr.
Dean C. Macho
Luther S. Smith, Jr.
Clarke A. Rhykerd
Raymond A. Cameron
Charles O. Hiett
Herbert M. Baker
Frank R. Smoke
William G. McCool, Jr.
Richard E. Percival
Russell W. McNutt
Ural W. Shadrick
Frederick H. Seitz
William D. Stoddart III
Arnold E. Bench
Franklin G. Cowie, Jr.
Louis A. Bonin
Leslie L. Darbyshire
Francis E. Doud
Edgar K. Jacks
Charles A. Sewell
Conrad P. Buschmann
Lucius O. Davis
L. G. Linman
William S. Russ
James A. Trout
Edward M. Guell
Paul A. Manning
Francis H. Thurston
Eugene R. Brady
James F. Meyers, Jr.
Clement C. Chamberlain, Jr.
Richard A. Bonney
Robert P. Kuhn
Victor A. Ruvo
Palmer A. Roessle
Thomas P. Bartleson, Jr.
Freddie J. Baker
James M. Bannan
Dalvin Serrin
Joseph J. Marron
Donald R. Stiver
Donald L. Rice
Cecil G. Dunnagan
Francis L. Delaney
John W. Unkle
Preston E. Howell
Douglas E. Erway
Paul W. Niesen
Whitlock N. Sharpe
Ralph D. Wallace
Frank E. Weitz
Dwight E. Howard
Frank D. McCarthy
Leonard M. Gillespie
Jack W. Conard
Daniel M. Wilson
James R. O'Mara
Jimmie W. Duncan
John H. Strope
James G. Doss, Jr.
Edward F. Penico
Vance E. Brown
Baxter W. Seaton
David D. Finne, Jr.
Charles H. Walker
Joseph R. Donaldson
Keith H. Helms
Charles E. Kiser
Winon E. Corley
Thomas L. Curtis
Joseph A. Corvi
Andrew V. Mincey
John E. Forde, Jr.
Ralph W. Tufts
Louis J. Bacher
Kenneth K. Case
Mark P. Fennessy
Richard N. Buethe
Marion A. Andrews
Maurice H. Alexander
Philip W. Haley
Donald P. Plante
William E. Caslin
James H. McGee
Ernest G. Schauppner
John R. Hansford
Gerard M. Kieswetter
Marshall B. Armstrong
Laverne D. Highhouse
Arthur S. Ohlgren
Frank L. Leister
Charles H. Van Diver
Robert F. Koehler
Albert W. Wallach
Charles M. Reitz
Everette D. Bedwell
Robert M. Tremmel
Robert K. Damon
Tom W. Williams
George L. Newton
Richard V. Molesky
Themistocles T. Annas
Warren F. Wolff
William J. Spiesel
Walter E. Kiracofe
Gary Wilder
William J. Dinse
Herbert O. Smith
George L. Bartlett
Raymond J. O'Leary
William D. Kent
Albert O. Nelson
Gordon M. B. Livingston
John E. Watson
Edwin C. King
Elmer N. Snyder
Norman L. Padgett
Alan D. Albert, Jr.
Peter A. Soderbergh
Robert N. Burhans
William E. Clemens
Charles R. Kerr, Jr.
William R. Miller, Jr.
Robert J. Norton
Donald L. Mitchell
Arnold G. Ziegler
Paul E. Wilson
Leo N. Nagrodsky
Richard E. Kutz
Frank L. Bourne, Jr.
Henry Englisch
Harry L. Morris, Jr.
Elmer H. Holthus
Rodger E. Rourke
Ermil L. Whisman
Garry M. Pearce, Jr.
Conway L. Austin
Arthur M. Brown
Robert L. Simonis
Hubert I. Frey
Walter A. Weston
Howard R. Mead, Jr.
Billy M. Adrian
Theodore Lowdermilk, Jr.
Paul S. Dopp
Elmer M. Thompson
William C. Vielhauer
Marion M. Etheridge, Jr.
Joseph F. Schoen, Jr.
Leonard E. Fuchs
Herbert L. Fogarty
Wade E. Branen
Joseph K. Griffis, Jr.
Roland L. McDaniel
Jack W. Evans
William A. Thompson
James S. G. Turner
Charles R. Figard
Richard L. Robinson
Thomas A. Hodges
Bruce M. Phillips
Roger H. Barnard
William M. Clelland
Edward R. Toner
Richard C. Schulze
Robert B. McIntosh
Charles C. Renshaw II
William Fellner
Harry N. McCutcheon
Gearl M. English
Johnny L. Carter
Gene C. Martin
Alex H. Touchton
John A. Rapp
Hershel H. Henson
Jerry A. Harness
Talmadge R. Liles
Edward L. Zielinski
Maurice W. Collins
William C. Adams
Howard E. Pyles
Charles R. Livingston
Lytton F. Blass
Henry G. Roberts
Frank L. Bradshaw
William J. Varley
Jack F. Bailey
Hubert C. Grow

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Sidney R. Bader	Charles H. Knowles
William T. Baldwin	Richard L. Kussman
Roy L. Belli	Earl F. Lovell
Joseph A. Como	Michael Mura
William D. Conroy	Paul V. Murphy
Raymond F. Fitzsimmons	Roy I. Parker
	Donald D. Robinson
John A. Fullinwider	Hosea E. Taylor
George M. Garner	Joseph F. Taylor, Jr.
Louis Gasparine, Jr.	Dwight R. Timmons, Jr.
Thomas J. Gipson, Jr.	
Edward E. Grebenstein, Jr.	Raymond D. Walters
	John L. White
Thomas G. Henry	Loren G. Witty
William D. Hubbard	Richard H. Young
Thomas W. Jones	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Russell W. Adamczuk	James F. Newell
James E. Anderson	John T. Nichols
Harry H. Bair	William H. Nulty
Eugene A. Bambic	John P. Oliver
David L. Battaglia	George E. Owings
Kenneth E. Baublitz	Donald C. Pauley
William V. Bicknel	John A. Sebring
Donald C. Bieger	Franklin R. Shoemaker
Joseph J. Bischoff	
Ira Blalock, Jr.	James D. Shubert
George A. Candea	William P. Shunkey, Jr.
Robert L. Carlisle	
Leroy R. Cates	Craig H. Stephenson
Robert E. Cleveland	Donald E. Sudduth
Jack L. Cole	Robert A. Utter
James L. Cooper	Ralph V. Walker, Jr.
Jerry J. S. Crittenden	Frank V. Weiler
John G. Fifield	Richard C. White
Clarence D. Foreman	Carl A. Zimmerman III
Jerald L. Frandsen	
Donald R. Gerber	Miguel E. Bustamante, Jr.
Clarence B. Grey	
Harold J. Horan, Jr.	Michael P. Cady
Ernest P. Lewis, Jr.	Arthur B. Carr, Jr.
Frank W. Martino	Bruce W. Emberton
Andrew G. Marushok	Edwin B. Henson, Jr.
Ronald A. Mason	Raymond C. Lafser
James F. McNelis	Charles P. Williams
Harry L. Mills	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of June 11), 1956:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Frederick O. Mercer, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Illinois.

Frederick Van Pelt Bryan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Ralph Silverstein, spiritual leader of Temple Sinai (the Arlington Temple), Brooklyn, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Lord of the universe, Father of all mankind, bless, we pray Thee, the distinguished Members of this great deliberative body—the House of Representatives.

Bless our ailing President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and grant that he may enjoy a speedy and complete recovery.

In this hour of continuing world crisis, O Lord, when the dark clouds of hydrogen war continue to hover so menacingly overhead and when the very fate of civilization itself seems to tremble in the balance, we are deeply stirred and heartened by the knowledge that in our beloved land and elsewhere throughout the world men of all faiths are turning to Thee in ever greater numbers. For in the face of global events and movements so overwhelming in their very magnitude and complexity, we are but as helpless children groping for Thy light and Thy salvation. But Thy divine spirit, O God, moves within us in ways which passeth understanding. There are great and gifted men in this our Government, in this our House of Representatives. Inspire them, O Heavenly Father—enlarge their vision. Fill them with a holy zeal and a crusading spirit to bring the blessings of true brotherhood to our own beloved America so that none may be demeaned as second-class citizens, whatever be their faith or their race, for all are truly Thy children and Thou are our Father.

Make them unfailingly mindful that in many ways Washington is the capital of the world, that whatever is said and done here literally affects the very fate of mankind. Grant us the strength, the wisdom, and the determination to banish forever the dread scourge of war from the face of the earth and ordain, we beseech Thee, that our sorely troubled world may at long last enjoy Thy sweet blessings of universal peace and brotherhood under Thine all-embracing fatherhood, O God. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VOTE TO RECOMMIT H. R. 5881

Mr. GAVIN. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, when you vote today on the most-favored 17 States in the Northwest legislation, conference report on H. R. 5881, small-projects legislation, vote to recommit this bill. Because you are voting a $100 million authorization to these 17 most-favored States to the exclusion of 31 other States which were included in the legislation; but after the conferees got through with H. R. 5881, these 31 States were excluded. The only participation the States in the East and the South will enjoy in this legislation—if it can be called enjoyment—is that your constituents will be called upon to pay the taxes to pay the $100 million incorporated in the bill in the report for the benefit of the 17 most-favored States. Vote to recommit the conference report.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Folsom, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have just introduced legislation designed to carry out the first recommendation of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School which he recently appointed. It would authorize the appropriation of $800,000 for grants to the States to encourage the States to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school to conduct studies and conferences and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies to meet our pressing problems related to higher education.

Our Nation cannot afford to lapse into a situation of desperation with respect to higher education. I commend the President of the United States for his insistence that there be advanced planning so that we can avert a crisis in higher education. My bill would carry out the President's, the administration's policy. The best explanation is set forth in a letter from Mr. Folsom to Speaker RAYBURN which is here set forth:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, June 11, 1956.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school.

The draft bill would authorize the appropriation of $800,000, to be available until June 30, 1958, for grants to the States on the basis of their respective populations, in order to encourage and assist each State to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school, which committee, through studies and conferences, would consider educational problems beyond the high school and make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies at local, State, regional, and Federal levels. States would be required, through their Governors, to undertake to use grants solely for the purposes of the act and to have their State committees submit reports to the Commissioner of Education for use of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

You will recall that the President in his special message to the Congress on January 12, 1956, expressed his concern about the growing problems in the field of education beyond the high school and indicated that he would appoint a committee to develop proposals in this field, as follows:

"Shortages now exist in medicine, teaching, nursing, science, engineering, and in other fields of knowledge which require education beyond the level of the secondary school. Changing times and conditions create new opportunities and challenges. There are now possibilities for older persons, properly trained, to lead more productive and rewarding lives. The tide of increasing school enrollment will soon reach higher educational institutions. Within 10 years we may expect 3 students in our colleges and universities for every 2 who are there now.

"Higher education is and must remain the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions. But to lay before us all the problems of education beyond high school, and to encourage active and systematic attack on them, I shall ap-

point a distinguished group of educators and citizens to develop this year, through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field. Through the leadership and counsel of this group, beneficial results can be expected to flow to education and to the Nation, in the years ahead."

Composition of the committee was announced April 19 and on April 27 it met, organized, and agreed on basic objectives as follows: First, to collect, assemble, and disseminate information for the purpose of increasing public awareness of the vast challenge which lies ahead in the field of education beyond the high school; second, to encourage the planning and action which must now be undertaken by institutions and groups of institutions, locally and nationally, publicly and privately, to meet the impending demands upon our educational system; the third, to advise the President as to the proper role of the Federal Government in this field and to recommend appropriate Federal policies and relationships.

In order to provide immediate stimulus to the initiation of widespread planning, studies, and action which should be undertaken now by institutions, States, and localities, the committee recommended the provision of one-time grants to the States to encourage and assist each State to establish a State committee on education beyond the high school. These State counterparts to the national committee are essential not only for coordination of study and planning activities in the States but to provide a nationwide mechanism for liaison with the national committee. The instant draft bill is designed to accomplish these objectives.

This Department shares with the Committee on Education Beyond the High School and with the educational leadership of the Nation, the great concern we all have about the necessity of bringing concerted action to bear on the mounting problems which we foresee ahead in this field of education and in meeting our future manpower needs. We are, therefore, in accord with the recommendation of the committee.

I shall appreciate it if you would refer the draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

PROSPERITY OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. HILL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a clipping from the Longmont Times-Call, Longmont, Colo., which clearly indicates the prosperity of the State of Colorado. Income-tax collections are a definite barometer of the economic conditions of business interests. It is worth reading and answers some of the arguments of those who would have you believe we are on the verge of a depression.

STATE INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS $2½ MILLION AHEAD

DENVER.—Colorado State income tax collections are $2,500,000 ahead of the first 5 months of last year, Revenue Director Earl Blevins reported Friday.

He said receipts for the first 5 months of 1956 totaled $20,987,591, compared with $18,403,749 for the same 1955 period.

Income-tax receipts for all of 1955 amounted to $26,203,286.

Blevins said the department has processed 470,661 returns so far this year, as compared with 423,684 for the first 5 months of last year. Approximately 100,000 returns remain to be processed, he added.

The total number of returns last year was 500,847.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Friday to file their report on the bill H. R. 11742.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to recommit the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects, and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

Without objection the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

The was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAYLOR moves to recommit the conference report to the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 10, noes 32.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 209, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—179

Abbitt	Bowler	Cunningham
Alexander	Bray	Curtis, Mass.
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ohio	Dague
	Brownson	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Broyhill	Davis, Wis.
Ashley	Bush	Derounian
Ashmore	Byrne, Pa.	Devereux
Auchincloss	Byrnes, Wis.	Dodd
Barrett	Canfield	Dondero
Bass, N. H.	Cannon	Donohue
Bates	Carlyle	Donovan
Baumhart	Carrigg	Dorn, N. Y.
Beamer	Cederberg	Durham
Becker	Chelf	Feighan
Bennett, Mich.	Chiperfield	Fenton
Bentley	Chudoff	Fino
Betts	Church	Flood
Boggs	Clark	Flynt
Bolton, Frances P.	Clevenger	Ford
	Cole	Forrester
Bolton, Oliver P.	Colmer	Fountain
	Corbett	Frelinghuysen
Bonner	Coudert	Fulton
Bosch	Cramer	Gary
Bow	Cretella	Gavin
Gray	Latham	Sadlak
Green, Pa.	LeCompte	St. George
Gregory	Long	Saylor
Gross	McCulloch	Schenck
Gwinn	McGregor	Scherer
Haley	McVey	Schwengel
Hand	Macdonald	Seely-Brown
Harden	Martin	Sheehan
Hardy	Meader	Short
Harrison, Va.	Merrow	Shuford
Henderson	Miller, Md.	Siler
Heselton	Minshall	Simpson, Ill.
Hess	Morano	Smith, Miss.
Hoeven	Moulder	Smith, Va.
Holland	Mumma	Smith, Wis.
Hull	Nicholson	Taber
Hyde	O'Neill	Talle
James	Osmers	Taylor
Jenkins	Ostertag	Thompson, Mich.
Jennings	Patterson	
Jensen	Perkins	Tuck
Johansen	Philbin	Van Zandt
Jonas	Pilcher	Vorys
Jones, Mo.	Pillion	Vursell
Jones, N. C.	Poff	Walter
Judd	Polk	Watts
Kean	Preston	Wharton
Kearney	Quigley	Whitten
Kearns	Radwan	Widnall
Keating	Ray	Wigglesworth
Kilburn	Reece, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
King, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Knox	Riehlman	Willis
Laird	Robeson, Va.	Winstead
Landrum	Robsion, Ky.	Wolcott
Lanham	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton

NAYS—209

Abernethy	Frazier	Morgan
Adair	Friedel	Moss
Addonizio	Garmatz	Multer
Albert	Gathings	Murray, Ill.
Alger	Gentry	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	Natcher
Andrews	Grant	Norblad
Anfuso	Green, Oreg.	Norrell
Aspinall	Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.
Avery	Gubser	O'Brien, N. Y.
Ayres	Hagen	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Harris	O'Konski
Baker	Harrison, Nebr.	Passman
Baldwin	Harvey	Pelly
Barden	Hays, Ark.	Pfost
Bass, Tenn.	Hayworth	Phillips
Belcher	Healey	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Powell
Berry	Herlong	Price
Blatnik	Hiestand	Priest
Blitch	Hill	Rabaut
Boland	Hillings	Rains
Bolling	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Boykin	Holmes	Reuss
Boyle	Holt	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Holtzman	Riley
Brooks, Tex.	Hope	Roberts
Brown, Ga.	Hosmer	Rodino
Buckley	Huddleston	Rogers, Colo.
Budge	Ikard	Rogers, Fla.
Burdick	Jarman	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Burnside	Johnson, Wis.	Roosevelt
Byrd	Jones, Ala.	Rutherford
Celler	Karsten	Scrivner
Chase	Kee	Scudder
Chatham	Kelly, N. Y.	Selden
Chenoweth	Keogh	Shelley
Coon	Kilday	Sheppard
Cooper	Kilgore	Sieminski
Crumpacker	King, Calif.	Sikes
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Spence
Dawson, Ill.	Kluczynski	Springer
Dawson, Utah	Knutson	Staggers
Deane	Krueger	Steed
Delaney	Lankford	Sullivan
Dempsey	Lesinski	Teague, Calif.
Denton	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Dies	Lovre	Thomas
Dingell	McCarthy	Thompson, N. J.
Dixon	McCormack	Thompson, Tex.
Dollinger	McDonough	Thomson, Wyo.
Dorn, S. C.	McDowell	Tollefson
Doyle	McIntire	Trimble
Edmondson	Mack, Ill.	Tumulty
Elliott	Mack, Wash.	Udall
Ellsworth	Madden	Utt
Engle	Magnuson	Vanik
Evins	Mahon	Van Pelt
Fallon	Mailliard	Velde
Fascell	Marshall	Vinson
Fernandez	Matthews	Wainwright
Fisher	Metcalf	Weaver
Fjare	Miller, Nebr.	Wier
Fogarty	Mills	Williams, N. J.
Forand	Mollohan	Wilson, Calif.

Wilson, Ind.	Yates	Zablocki
Withrow	Young	Zelenko
Wright	Younger	

NOT VOTING—44

Allen, Ill.	Halleck	Morrison
Andersen, H. Carl	Hays, Ohio	Nelson
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Carnahan	Hoffman, Mich.	Patman
Christopher	Holifield	Prouty
Cooley	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Davidson	Jackson	Richards
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Dolliver	Lane	Scott
Dowdy	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Eberharter	McMillan	Sisk
Gamble	Machrowicz	Thompson, La.
George	Mason	Thornberry
Hale	Miller, Calif.	Westland
	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Westland against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Horan against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Hale for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Prouty for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Davidson against.

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Wier with Mr. George.

Mr. Richards with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. RABAUT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. QUIGLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BELCHER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MERROW changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEAMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHENOWETH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KIRWAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PERKINS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this legislation plugs the gap in our present water conservation program. Prior to 1902, the pioneer residents of the arid western States had constructed on their own just about all of the reclamation projects that could be financed without assistance in the form of loans from the Government. The passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902 recognized that fact. Since that time, the Federal Government through the Bureau of Reclamation has made additional funds available on a repayable basis. This has enabled the rapidly growing West to meet its current water requirements.

There is an area, however, where an additional program is needed. Local financing takes care of the projects under $1 million. The Bureau of Reclamation program in the past has furnished the engineering know-how for the larger multipurpose projects. But in each of the western reclamation States there are feasible projects in the $1 million to $5 million class. The extensive engineering and supervision required for Bureau construction makes it uneconomical at the present time for these smaller projects to be constructed under present law. However, if funds were available for noninterest loans, and if the local sponsoring groups could furnish the engineering data and supervision, many fine, feasible projects would be built. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Much has been said about this being a special bill for a special region. That is true. What is being overlooked, however, is the basic reason for our reclamation act. The Federal Government, for example, owns over 70 percent of the land area of my State of Utah. We cannot tax this area. The major portion of the revenues from users of the area go into a special reclamation fund. Ten percent of the revenues go into the Federal Treasury.

Legislation establishing a program of development restricted to these 17 public land States is no more regional than legislation establishing beach control projects and rivers and harbor improvement. And let it be remembered, that the reclamation States repay the Treasury the cost of the project—a rather unique penalty we pay for having too little, rather than too much water.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the motion to recommit the bill (H. R. 4090) amending the Communications Act of 1934.

Without objection, the Clerk will read the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PELLY moves to recommit H. R. 4090 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

1. For the purpose of bringing about evaluation of reliability of device under actual operational conditions of sufficient variety and duration to determine value of the device for safety purposes;

2. To bring in line with international procedures and criteria for safety and distress; and

3. For purpose of determining alternative and more reliable methods of accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 151, nays 228, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—151

Adair	Dixon	Merrow
Alger	Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Md.
Allen, Calif.	Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Fjare	Minshall
Andrews	Ford	Mumma
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Nicholson
Ashley	Gentry	Norblad
Ashmore	Grant	Osmers
Auchincloss	Gross	Ostertag
Avery	Gubser	Pelly
Ayres	Hand	Phillips
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Pilcher
Bates	Harvey	Poff
Baumhart	Henderson	Preston
Beamer	Hess	Prouty
Becker	Hiestand	Ray
Belcher	Hillings	Robeson, Va.
Bennett, Mich.	Hinshaw	Robsion, Ky.
Bentley	Hoeven	St. George
Berry	Holmes	Scherer
Betts	Holt	Scrivner
Bolton, Frances P.	Hosmer	Scudder
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hyde	Siler
Bosch	James	Simpson, Ill.
Bow	Jenkins	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Jensen	Smith, Wis.
Budge	Johansen	Taber
Bush	Johnson, Calif.	Talle
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Taylor
Cederberg	Jones, N. C.	Teague, Calif.
Chase	Judd	Thompson, Mich.
Chatham	Kean	Thomson, Wyo.
Chiperfield	Kearns	Tollefson
Church	Keating	Tuck
Clevenger	Kilburn	Utt
Cole	Kilgore	Van Pelt
Coon	King, Pa.	Velde
Coudert	Knox	Vorys
Cramer	Krueger	Vursell
Crumpacker	Laird	Wainwright
Cunningham	Landrum	Weaver
Curtis, Mass.	Latham	Wharton
Curtis, Mo.	LeCompte	Widnall
Dague	Lipscomb	Wigglesworth
Davis, Ga.	Lovre	Williams, N. Y.
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Wilson, Calif.
Dawson, Utah	McVey	Wilson, Ind.
Derounian	Mack, Wash.	Wolcott
Devereux	Magnuson	Young
	Mailliard	Younger
	Marshall	
	Meader	

NAYS—228

Abbitt	Carlyle	Fernandez
Abernethy	Carrigg	Fino
Addonizio	Celler	Fisher
Albert	Chelf	Flood
Alexander	Chenoweth	Flynt
Anfuso	Chudoff	Fogarty
Aspinall	Clark	Forand
Bailey	Colmer	Forrester
Baker	Cooper	Fountain
Baldwin	Corbett	Frazier
Barden	Cretella	Friedel
Barrett	Davis, Tenn.	Fulton
Bass, Tenn.	Dawson, Ill.	Garmatz
Bennett, Fla.	Deane	Gary
Blatnik	Delaney	Gathings
Blitch	Dempsey	Gavin
Boggs	Denton	Gordon
Boland	Dies	Gray
Bolling	Dingell	Green, Oreg.
Bowler	Dodd	Green, Pa.
Boyle	Dollinger	Gregory
Bray	Dondero	Griffiths
Brooks, La.	Donohue	Hagen
Brooks, Tex.	Dorn, N. Y.	Haley
Brown, Ohio	Doyle	Harden
Brownson	Durham	Hardy
Broyhill	Edmondson	Harris
Burdick	Elliott	Harrison, Va.
Burleson	Engle	Hays, Ark.
Burnside	Evins	Hayworth
Byrd	Fallon	Hébert
Byrne, Pa.	Fascell	Herlong
Canfield	Feighan	Heselton
Cannon	Fenton	Hill

Holifield	Morgan	Saylor
Holland	Moss	Schenck
Holtzman	Moulder	Seely-Brown
Hope	Multer	Selden
Huddleston	Murray, Ill.	Sheehan
Hull	Murray, Tenn.	Shelley
Ikard	Natcher	Sheppard
Jarman	Norrell	Short
Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.	Shuford
Johnson, Wis.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sieminski
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Ill.	Sikes
Jones, Mo.	O'Konski	Smith, Miss.
Karsten	O'Neill	Smith, Va.
Kearney	Passman	Spence
Kee	Patterson	Springer
Kelly, N. Y.	Perkins	Staggers
Keogh	Pfost	Steed
Kilday	Philbin	Sullivan
King, Calif.	Pillion	Teague, Tex.
Kirwan	Poage	Thomas
Klein	Polk	Thompson, N. J.
Kluczynski	Powell	Thompson, Tex.
Knutson	Price	Trimble
Lanham	Priest	Tumulty
Lankford	Quigley	Udall
Lesinski	Rabaut	Vanik
Long	Radwan	Van Zandt
McCarthy	Rees, Kans.	Vinson
McCormack	Reuss	Walter
McCulloch	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
McDowell	Riehlman	Whitten
McGregor	Riley	Wier
Macdonald	Roberts	Williams, Miss.
Machrowicz	Rodino	Williams, N. J.
Mack, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
Madden	Rogers, Fla.	Winstead
Mahon	Rogers, Mass.	Withrow
Matthews	Rogers, Tex.	Wolverton
Metcalf	Rooney	Wright
Mills	Roosevelt	Yates
Mollohan	Rutherford	Zablocki
Morano	Sadlak	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—53

Allen, Ill.	Gwinn	Morrison
Andersen, H. Carl	Hale	Nelson
	Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.
Bell	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Bonner	Healey	Rains
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Carnahan	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Christopher	Jackson	Richards
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Davidson	Lane	Schwengel
Diggs	McConnell	Scott
Dolliver	McIntire	Simpson, Pa.
Donovan	McMillan	Sisk
Dowdy	Martin	Thompson, La.
Eberharter	Mason	Thornberry
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Westland
George	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. George for, with Mr. Davidson against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Healey against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Westland for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Donovan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Christopher with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. CANFIELD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BROYHILL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WOLVERTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CRETELLA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 10964.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EVERY AMERICAN IS ENTITLED TO A FAIR MINIMUM WAGE AND DECENT STANDARD OF LIVING

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, early in January of last year I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.35. Some of my colleagues were of the opinion my proposed hourly rate of pay was too high, but I did not because I had first-hand knowledge of the substandard wages many of my friends and constituents in South Philadelphia were receiving. And believe me they earned every penny they made because the work was not easy and in most cases none too pleasant.

Nevertheless, since I could not obtain the full support of the committee or the House for my bill, I reluctantly agreed to support and vote for the $1 hourly minimum wage because I have learned through my 10 years' of experience here in Washington that "if you can't fight the foe and win, join them." I also remembered the trite phrase, "half a loaf is better than none."

Mr. Speaker, this coming Saturday, June 16, 1956, marks the 18th anniversary of one of the most outstanding pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress under the leadership of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Eighteen years ago Congress passed a law which made it the policy of the Government of the United States to eliminate substandard wages. Since the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act, this Nation has enjoyed years of prosperity and economic growth. Nevertheless, the Congress has been entirely too silent in making effective the legislation it has enacted in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Despite the increases in Federal minimum wages last year, I still find the mandatory minimum wage unrealistic and wanting. It was my firm conviction last year when the Congress passed the $1 minimum that it was utterly inadequate. With the passage of another year the new minimum of $1 has become even more obsolete.

Early next year when the 85th Congress convenes, I shall introduce a bill to raise the present $1 minimum to $1.50. I feel this action on my part will be more effective at that time since the present 84th Congress is now rushing toward adjournment within the next few weeks. I certainly do not wish to have the bill pigeonholed or hastily considered by the Committee on Education and Labor because of its vital importance to all working Americans. I submit that this proposed minimum is absolutely necessary if Congress is to attempt to make meaningful the law of the land which aims at eliminating substandard wages.

Studies by the United States Department of Labor indicate that a worker must earn more than $2 an hour and work steadily for 52 weeks a year in order to support a family of four with a minimum decent standard of living. Even a single woman without dependents requires, according to independent studies made by several State agencies, between a minimum of $2,000 to $3,000 a year to maintain a minimum decent standard of living.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, the minimum annual budget requirements of a single woman are estimated to be $2,400. This means that a woman working 50 weeks at 40 hours would require at least $1.20 an hour to earn the minimum requirements. That does not allow for any lay-offs, sicknesses, or other emergencies; and we know that most of the poorer paying jobs rarely offer steady employment. Thus, assuming that a single lady works 40 weeks during the year and 40 hours a week, she would require exactly $1.50 to maintain a dignified, though very modest, living.

I am also greatly concerned with the millions of workers who have been completely denied the benefits and protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. At present, many of the giant corporations of the country are exempt from paying their employees a minimum wage and are also not subject to payment of overtime rates. This is true in the retail trade where some of the exempt companies are doing a billion-dollar business during the year. Some of our most luxurious hotels in the Nation are also paying many of their employees below subsistence wages. The same is true of the giant agricultural establishments—I am not referring to small farms but to the factories in the field that employ many farmhands—which very frequently pay starvation wages. Similarly, employees of small telephone companies, laundries, local transit companies, construction, wholesaling, finance, insurance, and real estate are entitled to receive at least the minimum wages which are mandatory in other businesses under Federal law.

I believe that all employees in our great country are entitled to fair treatment, and the Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to these millions of unprotected workers.

It is my firm conviction that the Nation's economy can well afford to carry the proposed higher minimum wage. As a matter of fact, I believe that it can ill afford not to do so. The economy is still, by and large, prosperous; but many dangerous soft spots are appearing and this is the case in Philadelphia, which is classified as a distressed labor area. We have been confronted with a serious and continuing unemployment problem for many years. As of January 1956, according to the United States Employment Service, the rate of unemployment in the city of Philadelphia was 6.3 percent. The national average was 4.4 percent. Additional income received by millions of workers would protect and support the prosperity and make it possible to achieve a higher level of economic activity.

Common decency also requires that a prosperous and growing economy should not tolerate the existence of substandard wages. Increasing the minimum wage would help all areas alike. It would boost the purchasing power of people in low-income areas as well as in prosperous areas.

It would be wrong to assume that raising of the minimum wage would necessarily increase the cost of labor. It is a well-known fact that higher wages mean also more efficient employees and greater productivity per worker. Even in the few cases where the increases in wages would result in somewhat higher costs, I believe that the American public would favor the small sacrifice. I am firmly convinced that every fairminded American consumer is willing to pay the price necessary to assure his fellow American workingman at least a decent minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the 18th anniversary of the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, I appeal to you and the Members of the House of Representatives to give serious thought to my proposal. I sincerely hope I can count on your and their support of my bill to raise the minimum hourly wage to $1.50 during the 85th Congress—God willing.

YELLOWTAIL DAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower vetoed Senate Joint Resolution 135 declaring that the Bureau of Reclamation should pay the Crow Indian tribe $5 million for the land and powersite for Yellowtail Dam. This is consistent with other administrative actions. The line laid down by his administration has been—and continues to be—that public property is not something to buy, it is only something to be sold at bargain prices to friends of the administration.

When this administration took office, the taxpayers of this country owned 27 synthetic rubber plants. In the years since the end of World War II, these plants had been leased to private rubber companies and had earned an average of $68 million per year—or about 12 percent interest on the total investment of $500 million.

This $500 million public asset, which was earning an income of $68 million a year, was sold to big business for $27 million a year for 10 years. This is like buying a house for $27 a month that you have been renting for $68 a month—a real bargain for the purchaser.

When this administration took office, the taxpayers of this country owned a barge line in which they had $22 million invested. The administration sold it for $9 million plus interest on installments over 10 years.

When this administration took office, our public assets included a $35 million synthetic fuel plant in Louisiana, Mo. The administration knocked it down to the Hercules Powder Co. for $5 million.

These examples show that President Eisenhower and his administration officials don't know what property is worth. They don't know because they haven't bought any—all they have done is to conduct bargain sales.

To them—and there are many illustrations besides Hells Canyon—a dam site is not something you buy, it is something you give away to a commercial utility.

When this administration took office, fronted with buying a dam site—something he has not done before—he was unable to recognize a fair and equitable price, which he calls extravagant.

POLISH LIBERATION: THE KEY TO FREEDOM

Mr. PHILBIN. 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. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of note and moment that, according to a very appropriate custom followed for several years by the House, our membership on Polish Independence Day hails that historic event, lauds the gallantry, heroism, and fidelity to freedom of the grievously afflicted Polish people, and in compelling terms gives expression to our hopes and strivings for Polish liberation.

It is also very appropriate, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that at other times during our legislative sessions, we should address ourselves to the present, pitiful plight of millions of freedom-loving, God-fearing Polish people, who continue to be held in bondage by a ruthless and bestial Communist tyranny. Most Americans deplore the existence of this tyranny no less than they deeply resent the ill-advised, unjust, international, diplomatic concessions, which, in effect, gave colorable sanction, and originally made possible, the brutal subjugation of a great nation and its brave, indomitable people, who for centuries have struggled and sacrificed almost beyond measure to establish and preserve their God-given liberties.

History incontrovertibly proves and conclusively demonstrates the tenacious, undaunted, religious faith of Poland. It eloquently testifies to its unfaltering devotion to freedom. It clearly evidences its loyalty to the comradeship of arms, which succeeded after a welter of blood, sweat, toil, and tears in overthrowing the terrorism of the Nazi dictatorship—a struggle in which the Polish nation and its brave people became the first innocent victims of predatory, calloused aggression, suffered the pains of shameful betrayal, and yet clung to the end in bloody sacrifice until final victory came.

I have on many occasions referred to the abandonment and deliverance of Poland over to the Reds as constituting one of the great crimes of the ages, and I think no lover of freedom could validly dispute the fact that it is. I am at the moment more interested, however, in determining how and when this great crime can be expiated, how and when justice can be done, how and when self-determination and free institutions, national sovereignty, and autonomy can be restored to the valiant Poles.

In this battle for liberation of the Poles and other subject peoples suffering at present in the slave states of world communism, there are among others 2 barriers, so to speak, 2 serious obstacles, which stand in the way of ultimate recapture of Polish freedom. The first of these is the spirit of defeatism, which sometimes appears even among the proponents and champions of liberation. This view tends to accept, as it should not, the postulate that Polish domination by Russia and the Communists is an accomplished fact, and that efforts to change the situation would require a great world war and, therefore, are foredoomed to failure.

This specious view, held by many well-meaning friends of Poland and parroted by the pro-Soviet bloc, amplifies a certain sense of indifference blended with a pitying attitude of futility regarding the prospects for changing the status quo by American or international action.

The second barrier is the brazen, defiant policy of the Soviet, which in its foreign relations stresses its dictatorial sovereign power over Poland and enforces that satellite policy at the point of the bayonet and by ruthless liquidation of freedom-minded groups and continued, brutal suppression of the Polish people with one shocking outrage after another.

Both of these views are unfortunate and shortsighted. They fail to recognize the deep, profound vitality of the anti-Communist forces within Poland, in the United States, and the free world which is growing stronger every day.

It is of course morally and ethically wrong not to oppose Soviet control of Poland. From a practical viewpoint, it fails to calculate and give proper weight to the moral indignation of most free peoples, the essential grossness and unjust, inhuman nature of the subjugation process, and the unbending determination of the Polish people and other free

peoples of the world to fight this issue through to the bitter end.

I often think of the great words of an illustrious American patriot and founder—"the same God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." It remains for soulless Communists and others who do not believe in God or in freedom and their atheistic pseudo-intellectual red and pinkish followers in this country to deride and scoff at this noble expression of principles, but true Americans will harken to it and accept it in its philosophy and its practice, because they realize well that liberty is in danger throughout the world, and that unless we are prepared to defend and preserve it, whatever the cost, it will soon disappear into the dark shadows of Communist tyranny.

This administration and this Nation and the American people must never cease to battle for the liberation of Poland and the subject nations until victory is at hand. This world, no less than this Nation, cannot long endure half slave and half free. We will either have freedom for all mankind or we will have oppression and slavery for all with consequent degradation of human values of dignity, decency, independence, and spiritual integrity and then the final collapse of the very last vestige and distinguishing characteristics of civilization.

This Nation must more vigorously project the leadership of this movement for liberation. It is a righteous cause—it is the cause of the Almighty, it is the cause of all free men and women wherever they live. Nothing should deter us from insisting on liberation—neither the braggart threats and blandishments of the Reds, or our own fears of atomic-hydrogen destruction. If we are not free, if our fellow humans are not free, it would be far better for ourselves and for the world to face destruction rather than live and die in serfdom.

But have no concern, my friends. This Nation will not be destroyed. The free world will not be destroyed by any foreign aggression. The only way this Nation can be destroyed is by its own hand—by easy living, by turning away from fundamental values, by seeking easy solutions for problems which can be solved only by the free, earnest, sustained attention and labor of all the people, by profound faith, high courage, and unceasing work.

Let us never fear or appease Russia. If a great war comes—and we must use every means to prevent it—let us be sure, as I believe we can be, that there will be more devastating destruction behind the Iron Curtain than in any other part of the world. I hope that war will never again plague and devastate this sorry globe and we must exert every effort for peace. But we must insist upon preserving our rights and liberties and command respect through overwhelming strength, if necessary, for our Nation and way of life.

There are other ways than force by which this end can be sought. One of the most potent has not yet been used, and that is to withdraw diplomatic recognition from that nation, or those nations, that persist in heaping insult after insult upon us, while they conspire and work for our destruction and conquest by world communism.

Perhaps this Government should seriously consider this course and this policy. Perhaps this change from appeasement to real firmness is the one thing we need today to bring some light into the international picture and truly convince the Soviet that we cannot be kicked around by any nation. Perhaps that would be the right and the best means of liberating Poland and reestablishing true freedom in the world. People of Poland—keep to your faith, keep your courage high. Never give in to Red tyranny. You will be free sooner than you think.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CHILDREN OF SERVICEMEN WHO DIED IN LINE OF DUTY

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9824) entitled "An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict," 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 4, after "during", insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "II" and insert "II,".

Page 2, after line 10, insert:

"(1) The term 'World War I' means the period beginning on April 6, 1917, and ending on November 11, 1918."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "(1)" and insert "(2)."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)."

Page 2, line 19, after "during", insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "II" and insert "II,".

Page 3, line 1, strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)."

Page 3, line 7, strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "(7)" and insert "(8)."

Page 4, line 1, strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)."

Page 4, line 7, strike out "(9)" and insert "(10)."

Page 4, line 13, strike out "(10)" and insert "(11)."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "(11)" and insert "(12)."

Page 4, line 18, strike out "(12)" and insert "(13)."

Page 24, line 2, strike out all after "payments" down to and including "person" in line 8 and insert "of compensation or pension under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration based on the death of a parent to an eligible person over the age of 18 by reason of pursuing a course in an educational institution, or of increased rates, or additional amounts, of compensation or pension under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration because of such a person."

Page 29, after line 21, insert:

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 513. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration under the headings 'General Operating Expenses' and 'Readjustment Benefits' are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 528 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to 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. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 528 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. It provides for an open rule and 2 hours of debate on the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to continue and improve cooperative programs the Public Health Service is carrying on with the State and interstate water pollution control agencies under the Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law 845, of the 80th Congress, as amended.

Provision is made for increased technical assistance to States on new and complex problems and to broaden research programs to determine the effects of pollution on public health and

other water uses and to develop more economic methods of treating waste.

The bill also provides that the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board would consist of the Surgeon General, or a sanitary engineering officer designated by him, and nine members appointed by the President, none of whom would be Federal employees.

Section 5 of the bill authorizes the appropriation for each of the next 5 years of $5 million for grants to States and interstate agencies to cover part of the cost of their water pollution control programs. Allotments to the States would be made by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations on the basis of population, extent of the pollution problem, and the financial need of respective States. However, the Federal share could not exceed a maximum of 66⅔ percent, nor could it be less than 33⅓ percent of the cost. Allotments to interstate agencies would be made on a basis found reasonable and equitable by the Surgeon General.

Section 6 authorizes $50 million a year for grants to States, municipalities, and interstate agencies for preliminary planning and construction of treatment works. Provision is made that the amount so appropriated is not to exceed $500 million and grants are limited to 33⅓ percent of the estimated cost of the construction or $300,000, whichever is smaller. At least 50 percent of the funds are to be used for treatment works for communities of 125,000 or less, and priority is to be given to grants for advance planning.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of the resolution so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9540.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has so ably explained, the purpose of this resolution is to make in order the consideration of H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. The measure is generally satisfactory, and I want to speak of it generally, insofar as it pertains to the extension of the present Water Pollution Control Act. It contains a few minor changes in connection with the present law; but there is one section in this bill which is, I think, a new Government policy and a new type of subsidy that would cost the people of America in my opinion untold millions, hundreds of millions, and finally probably billions of dollars, because it would not be a temporary measure. It has been our experience, I am sure, that whenever you embark upon any subsidy program as an emergency or for a short period of time somehow it becomes permanent before too long, and the amounts involved always become larger rather than smaller.

Section 6 of this bill which I understand was the real bone of controversy within the Public Works Committee, as well as the Rules Committee, provides for the Federal Government to give grants of $50 million a year for a 10-year period, or $500 million in all to local communities for the purpose of installing antipollution facilities, sewage disposal plants, and installations of that kind.

Remember, if you adopt this policy, it would be a return to PWA days of the depression and would of course favor certain communities only. In other words, the communities that have already attempted to support and abide by the Antipollution Act as it is now on the statute books, and have bonded themselves to install these different facilities, would not receive a single penny under this bill. They would have to pay for the local bonds they have issued for purposes of controlling pollution, and then, in turn, pay additional taxes in order to meet the cost of this gigantic new Federal subsidy program.

Let me point out to you, if I may, that in my home town of some 2,500 in southern Ohio, under the compact that has been entered into between the cities in the Ohio Valley to eliminate pollution in the streams of that area, on the request, insistence and demand of the Ohio Health Board, we bonded ourselves for some $500,000 to put in a sewage disposal plant, with the bonds running until the year 1999, with a cost to each property owner in addition to the taxes to retire the bond issue of some $3 a month or $36 a year. The same situation is true in some of the large cities of America. I believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] will discuss with you the situation in Cincinnati, Ohio. The gentleman from Boston, who has just preceded me, will tell you what has been done there in the way of eliminating pollution and to take care of sewage disposal. Yet those cities and communities would have to pay their own taxes to retire the bonds they have issued and not receive one penny of help in any way from the Federal Government. So this section would create an entirely unfair situation as between communities.

But further than that, as a matter of principle, let me point out to you, if I may, that there is not a single municipality in any single State in this Union of ours that is not in better financial condition and position than the Federal Government.

It is my understanding amendments will be offered by members of the Public Works Committee to eliminate section 6. I hope that the Members will give that section and the debate that will take place upon it their most careful consideration and attention.

Let me again point out that if this bill is passed with section 6 in it we will embark our Government, already in financial difficulty, upon a new program of subsidies to the States and to the local communities that in time will become, in my opinion, an unbearable burden upon the American taxpayers. I shall support the rulemaking consideration of the bill under 2 hours of general debate in order. It is an open rule so that amendments may be offered. If the amendment striking section 6 is adopted, of course, I will support the measure; otherwise, I may not be able to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House on Monday and wish to record the fact at this time that on rollcall No. 65 had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to put on RECORD that I am for this Federal program to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution and Control Act. I believe the Federal Government should be interested in aiding the local communities in their regional sewage disposal programs. We people in western Pennsylvania are curing our own ills, but many of these areas cannot afford such programs as the problem even for western Pennsylvania is more than local.

I urge the House to adopt the rule and likewise support the bill, because it is going forward in an expanded program, a program that will protect the families and the children of future generations, as well as present generations.

The flies and insects living on open sewage on the rivers and streams of this country today find their way onto the tables in homes 5 or 10 miles away in most of the communities along the rivers in a comparatively short time. This is an open invitation to the spread of disease. So, I hope this bill passes to take a good step forward in cleaning up our rivers and streams, and to wipe out pollution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the bill which is the subject of this resolution is an excellent one generally, and it is certainly needed. The control and strengthening of the Water Pollution Control Act that now exists is vitally necessary, of course, to this country.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, has referred to section 6 of the bill. There are some of us on the committee who vigorously opposed the adoption of section 6 in this bill, which provides, as he said, for a completely new Federal activity and a completely new Federal spending program. In these days when all of us are talking about limiting and reducing the activities of the Federal Government, when we are talking about balancing the budget, we should carefully examine section 6 in this bill, which provides for another huge spending program on the part of the Federal Government. For the first time we are going to bypass the States, if this section becomes law, and contribute Federal funds directly to municipalities. It will be the Surgeon General who will determine which municipalities shall be given Federal aid, how much, and what priority should be given to certain cities.

Let me point out, first, that section 6 was not in the Senate bill. Section 6 is not recommended; in fact, it is opposed by the administration. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare vigorously opposed this section in the hearings before the committee. Usually the Congress has to put some check on the agencies of the Government because of their requests for more money, for re-

quests that the Federal Government engage in new activities. Here we have a case where the Congress is attempting to foist upon the agency an activity and a program which it vigorously opposes.

The proponents of this bill argue that the small cities will not be able to comply with the enforcement provisions of this bill. That they will not be able to furnish adequate sewage disposal plants because they are not in a position to finance these projects. As my colleague from Ohio pointed out, the debt of the Federal Government exceeds the debt of all of the cities and all of the States and all of the other nations of the world combined. Therefore, who is best able to pay—the cities or the Federal Government?

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made a survey and in its testimony clearly indicated that the cities who are asking for this new Federal-aid program failed conclusively to demonstrate the need for Federal aid. They pointed out that the only reason certain cities are not able to comply with the orders to stop pollution in their areas is because they have not given priority to pollution problems. They have been more interested in providing streets, even playgrounds and swimming pools than cleaning up the sewage that comes from the residences and the businesses in the area.

This bill, of course, provides only for the expenditure of $500 million. The original bill provided for an expenditure of $1 billion. But let us not be misled to believe that this is a program that is going to cost only $500 million, because that is just not so. We are getting our foot in the door. This is a new spending spree by the Federal Government. I shall show you that $500 million is only a drop in the bucket compared to the eventual cost of this program.

My own city of Cincinnati just completed a vast disposal plant installation at a cost of $50 million. That is $50 million for 1 city, while this program provides only $50 million of Federal aid for all of the cities of the United States in 1 year, over a period of 10 years. So what you are going to have is a program that will cost not $500 million, but a program that, before we get through, is going to cost about $7 billion. As soon as you give aid to some of these cities then the other cities are bound to come in and ask for aid. They will be entitled to it, and the Congress will not hesitate in future years to appropriate the necessary money.

What about the cities who have pioneered in water-pollution control—cities like Cincinnati and the city of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and hundreds of others in this country, who have taxed the people of their communities, to eliminate pollution? As I said, the city of Cincinnati, which does not have a great deal of money has had to raise the money for its disposal plant. In fact, the city of Cincinnati had to impose an income tax in the last year in order to operate that city. When we provided for this disposal system which, as I said, cost $50 million, we provided the money to pay for it by placing an 8-cent tax on every 100 cubic feet of water. The cost for the plant is paid by those who use the sewers. Industry in the area that contributes excessive pollution is required to pay a surcharge.

The argument that small cities cannot do this job is fallacious. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare survey showed that it is fallacious. I know of some small cities upstream from Cincinnati. They do not have an income tax; they have not provided a sewage or water tax to take care of their pollution. In addition to that, the assessed value of real estate is about 25 percent of the actual market value, whereas the valuation in the city of Cincinnati is from 75 to 90 percent of the market value.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not a fact that it was developed that if we provide for these grants-in-aid, it will not prove of help to facilitate and expedite the building of sewage-control systems, but will only tend to delay them, because everybody will be waiting from here on out, for this aid?

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman from New York is absolutely correct because, as I said, we provide only $500 million in this bill. The cities that do not come in the first time, instead of going forward with sewage-disposal plants as has been done in other communities, will wait until the Congress appropriates more money.

Mr. BECKER. The best thing we can do is to provide no money at all in this bill so that the cities and the towns will proceed with the erection of the facilities that they need, as they should.

Mr. SCHERER. That has been the almost uncontradicted testimony before the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman continues to speak of those cities which have been able to solve their fiscal problems through the imposition of a city income tax. The gentleman also says that most of them have not seen fit to levy a local income tax. Is not the gentleman aware that in most of the States cities are not permitted by State law to levy city income taxes; that in most States State laws restrict cities as to the taxes they may levy, and that they are bonded to the hilt?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to that question. There are two methods which can be followed by these cities. They can increase the assessed valuation of the real estate duplicate to furnish the necessary money to do this job; they can go at least to 50 percent of the market value of the real estate. Secondly, they can levy a sewer or water tax, as the city of Cincinnati has done in order to build its plant; and thirdly, the States can amend their State law instead of coming to the Federal Government, which is least able of all the segments of government to support a program such as this.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Is it not true that the National Municipal Association has been pushing very hard for this bill and that their statement before our committee was that the municipalities could not borrow money in sufficient quantity to carry out this program?

Mr. SCHERER. You would expect that professional group to do that. But I certainly do not agree with its testimony, and neither does the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I do not think anyone has refuted their testimony before our committee. And one other thing that directly points up the matter so far as the Federal Government is concerned, each year for the last 8 years we have been progressively dropping, dropping, dropping down in the matter of stopping stream pollution.

Mr. SCHERER. The new enforcement provisions of this bill are going to take care of that.

The gentleman represents the great State of West Virginia. There are a number of cities in West Virginia along the Ohio River. If Cincinnati has to contribute to this program, when we have taken care of our own pollution then we are going to have to pay twice in order to take care of the cities of West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. You do not want the polution from West Virginia coming down on Cincinnati. If we feel we cannot pay for it, you will continue to get the pollution from West Virginia.

Mr. SCHERER. What is the percentage of assessed valuation of the real estate of the West Virginia cities along the Ohio River?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I do not have those figures.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to compliment the city of Cincinnati on the work it has been doing, just as Pittsburgh has, in cleaning up this sewage disposal matter. In eastern Ohio around the Youngstown area, I do not appreciate the people that are trying to come in here and get Federal funds on the basis of flood control to do what they ought to be doing on their own, taking care of the sewage disposal. They try to get it under another program unless you come right out and say the Federal Government is going to set up a program to help on sewage disposal. I would rather face it directly, even though Pittsburgh is well advanced on the program and has gotten ahead of the others. As the gentleman from West Virginia says, we fellows that are ahead of the game do not want other cities and villages tossing in the sewage and undoing our work.

Mr. SCHERER. Do not get me wrong. There are provisions in this bill for Federal assistance, technical assistance, for planning, research, and study. I agree with that section of the bill that provides for those things. But I want to

ask, how many cities that say they cannot support such a program as will be required under the enforcement provisions, I repeat, how many of them could not do it if they gave priority to sewage disposal rather than to parks, playgrounds, streets, and even recreational facilities?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Under the highway program we heard references to a pay-back for roads that States had already built which are going to be part of the national program. Is there any such provision in this bill to reimburse those cities which have recently built such facilities?

Mr. SCHERER. There are no provisions for reimbursement in this bill.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. As a member of the committee, may I ask if it is not a fact that this is the only controversial section of the entire bill?

Mr. SCHERER. I want to make it clear that those of us who oppose this section are not opposing this bill.

Mr. BECKER. As a matter of fact, they are in favor of it.

Mr. SCHERER. The chairman of this committee has done an excellent job. We need this bill badly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I quote from the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy of December 22, 1955:

> An orderly use and control of water resources requires a background of physical facts, understanding, and accumulated experience. For any problem involving water use and development, it is necessary to know when and how much water is available in a given area and how it is distributed. This involves the study of amounts and distribution of rainfall, the flow of rivers, the occurrence of water in the ground, the nature of the rocks and the soil, and other characteristics of both land and water.

This Committee has delegated responsibility for municipal and industrial water supply planning and pollution control to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of which Department the Public Health Service is a constituent agency. This delegation carries with it the responsibility for basic data collection in the water-resources development and conservation areas.

H. R. 9540 or S. 890, as reported by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, directs the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality and such other information related to water-pollution prevention and control as he deems necessary.

Thus the Public Health Service would be able to assume its proper responsibility and to share with other Federal agencies the total Federal responsibility of the overall basic data program.

Need exists for a national water quality basic data program relating to sewage and industrial waste pollution. Need also exists for a complete and current national inventory of water, sewage, and industrial waste facilities. Moreover, a detailed basic data program should be related to the economics of water supplies and pollution control.

More specifically, the country needs base lines for measuring progress in water quality improvement and for the purpose of anticipating deterioration of the Nation's waters. The damages to water uses should be identified as to nature, cause and extent. Where water supplies require a high degree of purity, information is vitally needed as to a selection of sources for domestic and industrial water supplies. It is also important to be selective in the matter of developing sources where a lesser degree of purity is needed. In areas where conservation or improvement of water quality is of major importance, intelligent planning cannot be accomplished without essential information on basic water data.

Other specific basic data needs for which the proposed legislation is designed to serve are: (a) inventory of present and future desired water uses of various streams, (b) the determination of trends in domestic and municipal water supply and sewage and industrial waste practices, (c) implementation of mobilization readiness planning for water supply, (d) provision of data for certification of interstate common carrier watering points, (e) provision of guides in industrial site selection, and (f) provision of guides to research needs relating to water, sewage, and industrial waste facilities.

I am informed that the basic data program contemplated under the proposed legislation will be planned to supplement and not to duplicate other basic data programs of other agencies. Whenever possible, cooperation will be carried on with the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies to permit the maximum facility and economy.

This aspect of the measure now under consideration by the House is one that Members of this body can hardly reject. The cost of such a program is minimal compared with the need of protecting future investments of all agencies of government and of private industry in the conservation of the Nation's water.

PLANNING FOCUS

The development of additional water supplies to support expected population and industrial growth will present problems in areas where convenient and economical sources have already been fully developed. Consequently greater conservation of available water resources through pollution control is becoming more and more important in many areas.

It is also important that the Federal Government cooperate with the States in order to keep our streams reasonably clean, and thus anticipate the problem which confronts urban areas.

In a recent survey the Public Health Service found that more than 52 million people in communities of 25,000 and over now depend upon surface sources for their daily water supplies, as compared with fewer than 40 million—12 million increase—8 years ago. It should also be noted that dependence on untreated water cannot be relied on. Less than 1 percent of the population in communities of 25,000 and over today find it possible to use untreated water.

In the last 8 years the number of communities of 25,000 and over has increased from 422 to 570 and their combined population from 53 million to 64 million. Considering outlying suburbs to these communities, the population increase has been from 62 million to 83 million.

These population figures are impressive in relation to the water supply needs in a situation where the overall water resource is practically constant. The water supply problem is emphasized by the results of a nationwide inventory made by the Public Health Service of 1,532 community water facilities. One out of four of the larger urban areas have reported they will need additional water supplies to meet municipal and industrial growth. More than half the water supply facilities covered by the survey were reported as needing improvement or enlargement and some involved the development of new supplies.

In recent years, many cities have experienced water shortages during periods of low rainfall. Such situations are likely to increase in both number and severity as population and industry continue to expand. This obviously calls for extensive advance planning for water. In many instances, sizable water development projects will be needed. Adequate treatment of the ever-mounting quantity of wastes will permit more extensive use of available surface water. This is the logical answer to some of the present supply problems. For treatment of sewage and wastes to protect water quality makes possible the reuse of water as streams flow from city to city and from State to State.

The Federal Government is in an excellent position to cooperate with the States in planning for the control of pollution in river basins in which several States are involved. Such control must be approached in a practical manner. A balance must be struck which maintains quality of stream waters for desirable uses, and at the same time permits reasonable use of the streams for disposing of treated sewage and industrial waste. Planning of this nature is absolutely necessary for us to meet our future water supply needs. Such planning is urgent. According to the report of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power, planning is not being carried out at present with necessary foresight.

An extension of the Water Pollution Control Act will permit more vigor and foresight to be put into planning for water pollution control. Therefore, I propose to vote for the enactment of the water pollution control measure now before the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, being from a State and representing a district where our water resources, while certainly ranking among our greatest assets, present, too, some of our major problems, I am keenly conscious of the necessity for expanding and strengthening the Nation's Water Pollution Control Act, while in the process of extending it.

This holds especially true for areas, such as my own, where the availability of adequate, even abundant, water resources is resulting in increased industrialization. This industrial development is making it essential to provide for stronger and more comprehensive measures for the conservation of water resources and for effective means for pollution abatement and control.

It shall not be my purpose to enter into detailed discussion of provisions of the bill now before the House. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and others of his Public Works Subcommittee have clearly and effectively summarized and explained the legislation. It is my purpose, however, to declare my support for the bill as reported by the committee.

The need for Federal assistance to the States and political subdivisions, through financial grants-in-aid, for construction of sewage treatment and disposal plants is self-evident. Local interests have been, on the whole, unable to keep pace in providing such facilities, and, consequently, the unfilled need for pollution-control works has reached serious proportions.

With respect to this bill's provisions which would provide funds to train personnel in water control work, to conduct research and administer State programs, I am of the opinion that there can be but little, if any, valid opposition. And I fully concur in the bill's provisions which would give the Surgeon General stronger enforcement powers in instances where State agencies may be lax or slow in combating pollution. I believe that this power, which does not infringe upon the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, will result in more prompt and effective remedial action in many cases, with the result being a substantial contribution to the public health and welfare.

It is my hope that enactment of this Federal legislation may have among its beneficial effects the adoption by the various States of measures to broaden and strengthen their own laws relating to the problems of water conservation and pollution abatement and control. I especially hope that the States may be encouraged to enact legislation requiring industrial users of water to return the water, purified after use, to the same artesian strata from which it was taken. Many current water-use practices are resulting in serious depletion of the artesian sources.

May I conclude by reaffirming my support of the Blatnik bill, with its provisions for the development and operation of comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries, and for improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters; and which also gives due regard to improvements which are necessary to conserve waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agriculture, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this section 6 of the bill is going to be quite controversial and I wish to discuss it for a few minutes. I might say about the history of this legislation that this bill is intended to be an extension of existing law. The present water-pollution bill would expire on the 30th of June. A bill was brought out some months ago, but there was so much controversy about it that the committee took it back and took out most of the features to which the various States were objecting. Somewhere along the line this section 6 appeared in the bill and that is what I want to talk about. The bill authorizes one-half billion dollars at the rate of $50 million a year to be distributed among cities that have not cleaned up their pollutions. Under the formula, a city that has done its duty and has cleaned up and gone to all the expense and done the work or provided for doing the work does not get a nickel out of the bill. On the contrary, the city that has not attended to its business and has not undertaken to clean up its pollution not only gets paid for its negligence and its indifference, but the cities that have helped and have done the work are penalized in that they have to pay their proportion of the Federal taxes that go into this project. That seems to me totally inequitable. I hope the House will see fit to strike that out. The bill can be completely adequate so far as the original intent is concerned without that section in it, and as has been said here it embarks the Federal Government on another tremendous spending program. Certainly, such an inequitable provision ought not to be carried into this bill.

I want to call attention particularly, however, to one section of this bill that has to do with the distribution of funds. I would hate to vote for this section, but I will vote for it if anybody in this House can tell me what it means. I want to read it to you. You will find it on page 10 of the bill.

On line 18, it says:

(h) (1) The "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 percent less than percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ percent or less than 33⅓ percent, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ percent.

I always thought, of course, that we have changed a lot of rules around here since I have been in the Congress. But we do still have some old rules which, I think, still stick. I thought 100 percent less than any figure was nothing.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may try to explain that?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman. I have been trying to get that straightened out. I asked the gentleman about it in the Committee on Rules the other day.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman is quite right that at first sight it sounds like gobbledegook but the purpose and the meaning of it is very simple.

The program grant provisions of H. R. 9540—section 5—has two essential elements. The first provides for an allocation among the States of the Federal grant funds and the second provides for State matching of these allotments.

Most Federal grant programs contain these two elements. The following two programs administered by this Department are very similar in allotment and matching procedures to the proposals in H. R. 9540:

Hospital and medical facilities survey and construction—Hill-Burton.

Vocational rehabilitation.

But, the important thing is this: All that section does is to establish a formula by which these funds shall be distributed. Primarily, it is on the basis of the economic situation or the ability of these localities to pay for their own program plus population. What it means is this: If, in a given State, the per capita income is the same as the national income, that is 1 to 1—or 100 percent to 100 percent, then, the same ratio to 50 percent would be 50 to 50. That means the Federal funds are 50 and the State funds are 50. If, in the high income State that is economically well off, the per capita income is 120 to 100 as a national average, then one-half of 120 percent is 60 percent and you deduct that from 100 and that is 100 percent less 60 percent. That means the Federal share is only 40 percent and the State's share is 60 percent because their economic situation is favorable.

In an economic area where the per capita income is less, let us say it is 80 percent of the national per capita income, then half of 80 percent is 40 percent and you subtract that again from 100 percent, in other words, 100 percent less 40 percent and then the Federal share becomes 60 percent, to 40 percent for the States. It sounds complicated. The purpose is simple. It gives a little flexibility, so that in economically favorable areas they carry up to two-thirds of the cost, and the Federal Government one-third. In lower income areas the Federal Government will carry up to two-thirds and the State only one-third.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I hope that you smart boys know the answer if it is as simple as my friend says it is—and I want to say parenthetically that the gentleman has done a tremendous amount of work on this bill. It is an important bill and it ought to be adopted, but certainly there is no reason why it should not be plain. I want to help the gentleman get through his bill, but I want to get through a bill that somebody can understand. But I received a lot of my education in a little one-room red schoolhouse, and I was always told that "100 percent less" than something was nothing. If it is less 100

percent, I do not see how it can be anything, and I do not see why you could not have put in simple language to say that. I want to get something that we can understand. If somebody comes to me and asks me what it means, I would like to be able to tell them. I have been asking around, but I cannot find what it means. It seems to me there should be some simple language that we could put in there.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield, and I want to compliment the gentleman on the tremendous amount of work he has done.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. We did raise that same point in committee, about having more simple language. This language was written by the Department of Health.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sure it was.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is the same language that is in other legislation, such as the Hill-Burton Act. It is simple to work out. When a community is more than the average, it pays more, and when it is less it pays less. It is within a range from one-third to two-thirds.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will tell you what I think it was. It was written by the Department of Health and Education, and I think it means if you pass this bill in its present form then the Department of Education will decide whatever they want to decide, and it can be done under this language. It cannot mean anything.

I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE.]

Mr. BURNSIDE. We have a committee amendment that will clear this somewhat.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is fine.

Mr. BURNSIDE. One other thing. The Senate passed this after thinking over it for a long time. It has been on the statute books for some time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now, after we get this clarified, I just wonder how under this section 6 it is going to work and who is going to get what. It says that certain gentlemen shall distribute it and in such manner that will tend to result in a wide distribution of such funds amongst the several areas of the United States. Does that mean that the fellow who has the most creaky wheel, the wheel that creaks the loudest, is going to get the most grease? I am ashamed sometimes when people ask me about a law—"What does it mean?" I do not see why you cannot put these things into language that we know what it means and we do not have to ask the Department of Education what it means.

I join with the gentleman from Michigan in the hope that the House will strike out section 6 and not start on this tremendous campaign that was not contemplated in the original legislation. Why, in this terrible state of fiscal affairs of this Nation, should we do this thing which is going to make cities that have done their job pay for the cities that have not attended to business?

I hope the House will give that serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. 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. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

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. 9540, with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9540 is an act to extend and revise the existing Water Pollution Control Act which was passed in 1948 after half a century of discussion and consideration of the water-pollution problem and the responsibility of the Federal Government in this field of water resources use. In 1948 the first comprehensive legislation of this kind was passed, which is the existing law, Public Law 845. I use the term "comprehensive" but I wish to call the attention of the membership of the House to the fact that at that time in the House Public Works Committee it was felt that that was merely an initial step in which some Federal responsibility was justifiable to stimulate, encourage, and to some degree assist, in a cooperative way, State and local action for abatement of water pollution, which, even at that time, 8 years ago, was recognized as of growing seriousness. The act, Public Law 845, has now been on the statute books for 8 years and it is time that we reassess the effectiveness of that act.

THE GOVERNMENT ROLE IN POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The increased concern of municipalities, States, industries, and the public generally over shortages of fresh water of acceptable quality—as evidenced by the attention that is being given to the problem by the press and other media and by the number of commissions that have studied the matter in recent years—directed attention to the proper role of the Government in relation to development and use of the Nation's water resources. The bill now under consideration further defines the functions of the Federal Government in cooperating with the States to meet the grave national water pollution-control problem. It has been developed after hearing the views of all interested parties.

Last year the other body passed a water pollution control bill, S. 890, extending, revising, and improving the existing act. When the bill came over to the House side, after rather brief hearings the House committee favorably reported the bill to the House floor. At that time we received many negative queries and objections from Congressmen all over the country, particularly in those areas where the industry people, especially the pulp and paper industries, raised objections about insufficient hearings. There was also serious controversy on the enforcement procedure in the existing law and in the proposed Senate act. In view of that we recalled the bill from the floor, went back into committee, and held extensive hearings. We heard over 78 witnesses in weeks-long hearings on the entire water pollution problem.

We asked the State health officers and State health agencies to get together and work out an enforcement procedure which would get the broadest possible support among the States. That was done in a most effective and laudable manner.

The State water pollution control administrators and health officials under the able leadership of Dr. Daniel Bergsma, commissioner of health of New Jersey and president of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, and Mr. Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Water Resources Commission, after consultation with representatives of conservation and industry and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, developed a number of amendments to meet objections raised by some of the States. These provisions were incorporated into H. R. 9540 which I introduced on February 27.

Because it was evident that the crux of the national pollution problem is the lag in construction of waste treatment works, I added section 6, which provides for direct Federal grants to assist municipalities in the construction of sewage disposal facilities. My original proposal called for $100 million of Federal grants each year for 10 years, or a total of $1 billion. This turned out to be the controversial section of the bill with the minority membership in strong opposition, and the majority in equal support. The Department of Health opposed it, although agreeing that we are seriously behind with our plants and facilities for coping with pollution abatement. So, to compromise, the majority membership of the committee went along with the minority in cutting the total amount in half, from $100 million a year to $50 million a year, for a total of 10 years.

MAIN PROVISIONS OF H. R. 9540

The legislation under consideration would continue the present Federal-State cooperative program which is based on the established principle of recognizing the primary rights and responsibilities of the States in controlling water pollution. The bill would correct the insufficiencies of present law in several specific ways:

First. It authorizes an intensified and broadened research program designed to tap the research potentials of universities, research centers, and other institutions throughout the country on all aspects of the water pollution problem.

Second. It provides for program grants to States to help them strengthen all aspects of their water pollution control activities. The present law contains a provision for grants to States, but it confines the grants to studies related to industrial pollution.

Third. It improves the enforcement provision of the present law relating to the abatement of interstate pollution—pollution originating in one State which endangers the health and welfare of persons in another State. It eliminates the provision of present law requiring the consent of the State in which the pollution originates before court action may be instituted. Court action under the proposed legislation could be brought either with the consent of the State in which the pollution originates or at the request of the State injured by the pollution. The improved enforcement procedures of the bill constitute a reasonable balance between the primary rights of the States to control water pollution within their boundaries and the rights of the States affected by pollution from another State to have available to them a practical remedy.

Fourth. The bill continues the principle in present law authorizing Federal financial aid for construction of treatment works. Instead of the construction loan provisions in the existing act, however, matching grants of $50 million a year to States, municipalities, intermunicipalities, and interstate agencies for the preliminary planning and construction of treatment works would be authorized. The aggregate of sums so appropriated would not exceed $500 million. Grants are limited to 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost of the construction or $300,000 whichever is the smaller. At least 50 percent of the funds so authorized are to be used for treatment works servicing communities of 125,000 population or under, and priority is to be given to grants for advance planning.

NEED FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Testimony and evidence presented during the hearings on this bill clearly demonstrated the need for Federal financial assistance for the construction of sewage-treatment works. This is borne out by the record. The only time the construction of sewage-treatment works kept pace with the need for such construction was during the period 1933 to 1939 when Federal funds were made available through such programs as the Public Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration. Before that, and since, construction has lagged until today there is a huge backlog of needed treatment works.

Construction to take care of this backlog and at the same time keep pace with the ever-growing demands on cities and towns due to increased population and industrialization requires great capital outlay. Representatives of these cities and towns testified as to the need for financial assistance. Many communities are earnestly trying to solve these problems but have reached the limit of their legal bonded indebtedness. The tax resources of others are limited by State law and constitution. Many are simply financially unable to raise sufficient revenue to construct needed treatment works. In the meantime these communities continue to pollute the streams, jeopardizing the health of their neighbors, and degrading the Nation's most vital resource.

A small amount of Federal financial aid for construction as provided in this bill will serve to stimulate local programs of treatment works construction by providing an incentive to take action now to clean up and protect the waters of this Nation.

Before you can evaluate correctly as to whether a water pollution control program is too strong, whether, as some say, it has too many teeth in it, or, on the contrary, whether it is too weak, too inadequate and does not have enough teeth, we feel you should have as a background a broad, overall picture, a panoramic mental picture, of the water problem of America. Then you superimpose on that the mechanism, the machinery, with which you attempt to abate pollution. Thereby you can determine the relative merits or effectiveness of a pollution-control program.

So, briefly, to present the national picture of the water problem which we are here discussing, here is a chart which will aid you in a verbal description, covering the last 50 years of America's history. In 1900, the population was 75 million people, and industry was rather primitive as compared to today. From 1900 to 1950 what happened? In those 50 years, in a half century of America's progress, the population doubled, industry increased 7 times. Mind you, this is in terms of the fact that the water supply is constant. There is not any more water nor any less water than there was 50 years ago. It is in the use and reuse of the water that enables twice as many people to use water and more water per capita. People did not have so many showers and baths in 1900. People used more water per capita in 1950.

What is now happening? Let us project ahead only for 20 years. It is estimated that the population will go from 150 million to over 200 million, an increase of over 25 percent. More important is the industrial development. Industry will increase twice what we had in 1950, 14 times what we had in 1900, 75 years back. In the last 50 years the technological progress in America has been greater than in the last 2,000 years of the entire world. So that is the competitive situation that we now find ourselves faced with in regard to our fixed water supply. We have this situation, more and more water is going to be used and as more water is used more water is polluted, giving us less available usable water in the first place. It is a vicious circle. You have more and more industries using more water. The more used the more it is polluted, leaving us less water to begin with. Around and around she goes and where it will stop no one knows. Except we have the handwriting on the wall.

WATER POLLUTION AND THE NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES PROBLEM

Water use for all purposes is on the increase, particularly for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and recreational purposes, and for transportation of wastes. It is estimated that by 1975 the Nation's population will be in the range of 200 million persons and industrial capacity will be double the 1950 levels. Public water supply use will probably increase from 17 billion gallons per day to 30 billion gallons per day, and industrial water use, excluding power, will increase from 60 billion gallons per day to 115 billion gallons per day.

By 1975, reliable estimates indicate this country will require an increase in the current water supply of 145 percent—equal to the additional supply of 120 New York Citys, requiring the flow of about 11 Colorado Rivers or equal to the continuous flow over Niagara Falls. Further, as our economy expands, leisure time increases, and population grows, it will become necessary to provide more and more waters suitable for recreation, fish and wildlife, and other legitimate uses.

In meeting these increasing demands, the control of pollution has an essential role in the Nation's water-resources problem. Pollution is a waste of water. The greater the degree of pollution, the greater is the waste. Pollution can be just as effective in reducing a water resource for use as drought. Pollution control, therefore, is now recognized as a key to the national problem of water conservation. Pollution control will permit repeated reuse of the same water as it flows from its source to the sea.

In recent years, population and industry have spread to all parts of the country with the result that now almost all of the Nation's waters are affected by sewage and industrial wastes. As our population grows and our economy expands, pollution of the Nation's waters will continue to increase unless control measures are materially accelerated.

In 1920, the population equivalent of municipal wastes reaching our stream was about 40 million persons. This means the organic loading contained in the sewage, treated and untreated, discharged to streams amounted to the equivalent of the organic content in the raw or untreated sewage from 40 million persons. In 1955 the equivalent of raw sewage from nearly 55 million persons was being discharged to the Nation's waters.

The increase with respect to industrial wastes has been even greater. Reliable estimates indicate that in 1920 organic industrial waste accounted for a pollution load equal to the raw sewage from about 50 million persons and in 1955 accounted for an organic pollution load equivalent to the raw sewage from 110 million persons. Since 1920 the organic pollution load brought to bear on our water resources has increased by a population equivalent of approximately 75 million persons, despite the progress that was made in municipal sewage treatment plant construction under the Public Works Administration during the 1930's, and that which has been made by industry in recent years. In addition, ever-increasing quantities of inorganic wastes such as acids, toxic metals, cyanides, and radioactive materials are being discharged to our Nation's waterways.

A great deal needs to be done to control municipal and industrial pollution. It is estimated that projects to meet the present backlog of needs for sewage-treatment plants and intercepting sewers would cost in excess of $1.9 billion. During the period 1955–65 the cost of replacing sewage-treatment facilities reaching obsolescence is estimated to total $1.72 billion. Sewage-treatment requirements of an increasing population during the 1955–65 period are estimated to cost an additional $1.71 billion. This is a total cost for municipal pollution-abatement needs during 1955–65 of about $5 billion.

The estimated costs for new sewer systems and extensions to existing systems during 1955–65 total approximately $5.5 billion. Sewer needs reported as of today will cost an estimated $2.35 billion; replacement needs caused by obsolescence during the next 10 years will cost $1.09 billion; and during this same period new sewer requirements will cost approximately $2.06 billion. The present needs for industrial waste treatment and disposal projects to meet 1955 requirements will cost an estimated $2.5 billion.

A review of recently proposed State and Federal legislation and the findings of various commissions and committees studying water pollution and water resources development problems shows a growing consideration of the need for financial assistance to State and local governments. To illustrate, the final report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—Kestnbaum Committee—recommends that study be given to the desirability of Federal assistance to cooperative programs for the construction of pollution-abatement facilities.

Once the Nation has caught up on the tremendous backlog of needed construction—assuming greater progress in research and the further development of State and interstate pollution control programs—the offensive against water pollution will be well underway. Today we are on the defensive on all fronts, especially in the brick and mortar job of building sewage treatment works.

During the hearings on H. R. 9540, Assistant Secretary Roswell B. Perkins of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conceded that pollution of the Nation's water resources had become steadily worse during the last 5 years. In a subsequent speech, Mr. Perkins made this statement regarding the need for more pollution abatement works:

> I personally view the need for waste treatment works as ranking second only to schools in priority of claim on our capital outlay dollars for public works.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the conservation of our water resources and the maintenance of its purity is one of the great problems of the day and will become more serious as the years go by. I am in favor of this legislation, and want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for sponsoring this bill, and the committee for reporting it favorably.

Moreover, it is a national problem and the United States Government should help the cities and States solve their problems of sewage disposal and water protection and conservation. Many of the local communities just do not have the income necessary to do the job themselves.

The appropriation necessary to finance this legislation is just a drop in the bucket compared with the money we are spending in foreign countries on similar projects. Some of these may be necessary, but at the same time we must take care of this problem at home. I will vote for the bill, and against this amendment that would eliminate section 6. The adoption of the Dondero amendment would make the bill largely ineffective.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank my good friend.

So that is the picture. Now, in 1948, when the Federal Government stepped into the picture for the first time, we had grants-in-aid for State pollution-control programs. But in the entire 8 years of the law, only for 3 years were these grants given to States to help build up their State pollution-control agencies. We found out that even as late as last year, 1954, and 1955, that of the 48 States 32 of them spent $50,000 a year or less for their whole State pollution-control programs. Twenty-three of them spent only $30,000 a year or less. Many States only spent $5,000 or $7,000 for a whole year for the entire pollution-control programs in their respective States. Why, in many of those cases that amount of money would not be sufficient to provide 1 cesspool for part of a suburb of 1 municipality. Then, when the Federal Government came along with $1 million for State program grants, look what happened [pointing to chart]. In 1950, 1951, and 1952, from $2 million total money spent by all of the States, it rose steadily in 3 years up to $4 million. In that year the Federal grants were cut off. What happened to the State programs? They froze. Their expenditures have been at a plateau for the last 4 years and will continue at that plateau.

So the point I wish to stress in the grants money as well as in the aid for sewage disposal facilities for municipalities, the Federal Government does not do anything like the major part of the job for either the States or the municipalities, but it merely provides an incentive plus a little assistance, and once the States start, they carry on on their own, because we want the primary responsibility to rest in the States and local governmental units in this water-pollution-control program.

A great deal was said during the discussion on the rule in opposition to grants-in-aid to municipalities for the construction of sewage disposal facilities. We went into this as carefully as was possible, consulting with the health authorities, with the health departments of the States, with industry, with conservation groups, with mayors, with the American Municipal Association; went back into the records; into the matter of six major studies made by the Congress itself on national water pollution policy, and in each one of them attention was called that the Federal Government should take a careful look into this field of giving Federal aid for the construction of sewage disposal facilities.

Here we have a chart showing the total amount of money spent by municipalities for sewage disposal facilities since 1915 up to 1950, a period of 35 years. The average for that entire period is $172 million. And, as you look over that period there is only one time in the 50 years of history we are talking about that construction of facilities was adequate enough to meet the pollution abatement problem, and that was in the WPA and the PWA days of 1933 to 1939 in which 60 percent of the money came from the Federal Government. That is the only time; never before and never since.

What has happened? There was an average of $172 million a year being spent for sewage disposal facilities. Then came the war. It dropped to $58 million a year. We were falling further and further behind and rapidly since 1940. The population increased rapidly. More homes were being built. More young people were getting married. There were more children. We had the highest birth rate in the history of America. We had one of the most phenomenal growths in industry at a time when we were doing so little in the matter of pollution abatement.

The complex organic chemicals that are finding their way into the streams and rivers of the country today are the result, of course, of the phenomenal development of new manufacturing processes all up and down the country.

Such industries as the synthetic fabrics, the plastics, and the detergents have become gigantic operations in the span of just a few years. The production of detergents, for example, has grown from almost nothing in 1940 to almost 2 billion pounds in 1955. It is expected to double by 1975.

The processes for waste treatment, on the other hand, differ very little from those that were developed in the early part of the century. Research in the field of waste treatment simply has not kept up with the increasing quantity and complexity of the wastes produced as a result of this phenomenal development of these modern industries.

Do you know what detergents do to the water? Somebody was talking about the facilities around Pittsburgh. I intend to cast no reflections on that city. But here in this container is water from Pittsburgh that was recaptured out of the Ohio River at Wheeling, W. Va., almost 100 miles downstream. When I shake it up, see what happens. It foams up like soapsuds in your sink. Look at that detergent, look at that foam. Yet we do not know how to get rid of that. The people in Wheeling, W. Va., and all the other communities downstream have to suck this in through their intake pipes and treat it by some expensive process to make it potable, so that they may drink it with safety.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman points out that the cities and the States of this country have spent very little in an effort to control water pollution. In that the gentleman is correct. May I ask the gentleman this question, however? Will not the new enforcement provision in this bill, which is a good one, compel the cities and States to spend the money that is needed?

Mr. BLATNIK. You cannot squeeze blood out of a turnip. Many of these municipalities have reached the limit of their bonded indebtedness. They do not have other financial resources. You cannot go to them and talk about a threat of prosecution by the Attorney General of the United States unless they go ahead and build sewage disposal plants. How can they comply? They are caught in a squeeze. We who are charged with the duty of enforcing that good enforcement provision which the gentleman refers to must have some little responsibility concerning that, to give them a little bit of help, in order that they may help themselves to comply with that enforcement provision.

Mr. Chairman, if I may review just once again, for the entire 50 years, the national average has been $172 million a year for municipal construction. The only time in all of our history when the amount was adequate was in the period 1933 to 1939, about 20 years ago. But in the last 8 years, what has happened? The existing law provides $22½ million in loans at 2 percent interest. It authorizes an advance of $1 million for planning. What has happened? In 8 years there has been not one single project approved. Why? Because municipalities just cannot borrow money. They cannot go out and seek loans because of the limitation on their bonded indebtedness, or some other constitutional limitation, whatever it may be.

That is the record. Only one time in our history was the amount that was used adequate and that was when we had direct grants, in the period from 1933 to 1939. In the last 8 years, the only time we have had any Federal law, the only time we tried to give any Federal assistance was in the form of loans, and there has been not one single project. As a matter of fact, this average of $172 million a year should go up to $450 million a year, for a total of $5 billion in the next 10 or 12 years, and the only way to do that, to clean up this mess that we have got in America today is under the program we are proposing in H. R. 9540. We are spending less than half of what is required.

Somebody has said, "But these municipalities do not want to do anything about it." The record will show you that these municipalities today are spending almost a quarter of a billion dollars a year for disposal facilities, doing everything they can to win a losing fight. They are spending a quarter of a billion dollars. How much has the Federal Government spent in the last 8 years under the existing law? Mr. Chairman, I will tell you—exactly $11 million in 8 years of a program. Under existing law, which had authorized $216,000,000.

You say that these municipalities are not exerting any effort. I think the figures I have given you are evidence that the States and municipalities are trying to exert every effort to solve a problem that has become a national problem.

So I do urge favorable consideration and adoption of section 6 when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule. Somebody has said that it would be unfair to those municipalities that have already built plants.

On this point that Federal construction grants would amount to penalizing the towns that have already built sewage-treatment works, there is this to be said:

For the most part, it is the downstream community which gets the greatest benefit from a sewage treatment plant. Therefore, cities which have built treatment plants will, in a great many instances, derive direct benefit from the construction grants provision. Take the case of the city of New York where they have already spent almost $250 million for sewage treatment work facilities. There has been not one complaint from New York City. On the contrary, the mayor of New York City, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, who is president of the National Association of Municipalities, has repeatedly urged and encouraged that we adopt this grants-in-aid section 6 of the bill. The same is true of Chicago, which spent over $300 million, and many other cities. Without section 6, all you have is a lot of words. Like the weather, as Mark Twain said, "everybody talks about it and nobody wants to do anything about it."

We have had words come from the other side of the aisle regarding policy, need, and so forth, but we are not interested in only words. Just as the President said to Russia that we want deeds, not words, the test here is, "By their deeds ye shall know them," not by words said on the floor.

Every day the equivalent of the raw, untreated sewage of every man, woman, and child in America is going into our rivers, streams, and lakes; and this is increasing year by year. We have more pollution today than we had 8 years ago when the Federal act first went into effect.

All this bill is going to do, and I am sorry to have to admit it, but such a modest request is just to keep us from falling further behind, to slow up this negative rate of retrogression. If we can succeed and come back 8 years from today, and say, "Ladies and gentlemen, we must report a wonderful accomplishment. Today our water smells only as bad as it did 8 years ago," if we have not worsened our Nation's waters any more than they are now, then we shall have been successful. That is the maximum goal, that is the maximum that can be accomplished by this bill, which is certainly a rockbottom minimum. So, anyone who is trying to exaggerate or distort this matter by saying that we are engaging in a gigantic program in which the Federal Government is going to take over the whole field of pollution abatement, of course, is just misleading and distorting the facts. We are just trying to prevent ourselves from slipping backward any further.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, who has been my good friend and close-working colleague these past 8 years.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I certainly wish to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota on his work before the subcommittee in bringing this bill to the floor of the House. I am particularly interested in section 6. If I correctly understand that section, a grant may be made up to $300,000. Is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. Any modification or construction, and it could exceed $900,000, but the most the Federal Government will match is one-third of the cost, not to exceed $300,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Under section 6 it is provided that 50 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works, and so forth. This 50 percent is allocated to cities under 125,000 population. Is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is right. Of the $50 million a year, 50 percent of that shall go to muncipalities under 125,000; and I thank my good friend for his interest and support.

May I bring out just one more point. It was stated that many municipalities put sewage disposal at the bottom of their priority list; that hospitals, schools, airports, streets, parks, and other facilities come first. That is true to a large extent. But what happens? We have Federal aid now in almost every one of these, for airports, for hospitals, for schools, slum clearance, and housing. Look at the gigantic road program and urban extension roads for cities. So, for those projects which are already in a favorable priority position, we go ahead and make it more favorable with these Federal grants-in-aid funds, further pulling back on sewage-disposal projects that always had the lowest priorities.

I think it is a national disgrace that a country, such as ours, that has been blessed by the richest of resources, that we have in this country, should so shamefully neglect, mistreat, and foul up our waters as we have been doing for 200 years. The only thing that has saved us from a crisis long before this, and within the next 15 or 19 years just as sure as sour apples, we will reach that crisis; the only thing that has saved us so far is that we have had the good fortune to have such an abundance of surface water. As a Nation, we talk about technical assistance and economic aid to help raise the standard of living of people all over the world and to give them a little bit of hygiene and sanitation, yet how can we continue to have such an awful record here and be such an awful example to the rest of the world? Take a look at this polluted river, the Potomac River. This water in this glass is from the Potomac River. There are a lot of solids that have settled down at the bottom. Perhaps you cannot see too well, but I think you can see this much. Try to see the red line or band which is behind only 3½ inches of thickness of this polluted water. You cannot see an inch wide red line under a bright light through 3½ inches of this

glamorous, historic, traditionally rich Potomac River that flows right through Washington, a lovely city with parks and trees and gardens, the Capital City of America and of the world. It is one of the most shameful and disgraceful things we could have. We have this situation all over the country and not just in the Potomac. We have that problem all over the country.

This sample of polluted Potomac water has more things in it than you can shake a stick at. There are live bugs, little animals, little plants, and organic materials. There are solubles and insolubles and colloids and noncolloids and a whole lot of other things. It is really an interesting example.

Here is a specimen of clean treated water. It is a very unexciting specimen. There is really not much of interest in it. There is nothing much to it that you can see. You can see right through it. There is nothing there. It is colorless and odorless and tasteless outside of a little chlorine to kill some of the bugs. But even after it is treated, such as at the new plant that my good friend from Ohio and Cincinnati mentioned, they took the treated water that the people are drinking day in and day out and you extract that into a highly condensed concentrate and subject it to a chemical test—this is not propaganda—these bottles are from laboratories that have been chosen at random and you find this smelly residue from treated water that the people are drinking every day in Cincinnati, water which was taken out of the Ohio River. You ought to smell it. It is something the chemists do not even know what is in it and how to remove it and how to keep it out.

I do not mean to suggest that the American people are drinking unsafe water. The waterworks industry of this country has accomplished wonders in supplying our ever-increasing urban population with safe and palatable water, often from badly polluted raw water supplies.

I do say this situation is not one for complacency. Just holding our own in this pollution situation is not enough—and today we are not even holding our own.

We cannot go on indefinitely falling behind in the control of pollution without endangering the health and well-being of large numbers of people and finally the whole country.

Nor is it enough in this modern industrial world merely to have safe drinking water. We need more and more water for all purposes—for industry, for agriculture, for all kinds of municipal use—yes, and for recreation, for swimming and fishing and boating, for fish and wildlife.

It seems to me that we need to think not in terms of getting by but in terms of making it possible for our natural fresh water resources to serve all our needs.

That is why we are asking for more research funds and fellowships and scholarships in this bill. I have tried to point out the urgency of this. I have pointed out how our objectives are merely minimum. I do urge you to go along with this bill. The enactment of this bill is important. It is long overdue. We have the broadest area of agreement with municipalities, conservation groups, health agencies, State organizations, the Federal Department of Health. We have the broadest support on this bill that we have ever had on any piece of legislation on this matter that has come before the Congress. The health and well-being of millions of our people are at stake. You cannot avoid a showdown on this. You can delay it and you can stall, but you cannot avoid a showdown. You have to have a showdown, just as certainly as we are sitting here today on this problem, by 1975.

So, as I said, the extent to which streams are being polluted is a national disgrace. We ask for a modest bill, a minimum of machinery and mechanism to rectify the situation. I say that to delay is to default. To delay is a reflection of our unwillingness to meet this problem head on, a problem that until now had us on retreat.

I hope we pass the bill H. R. 9540 as written.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am interested in the figure which you have arrived at on pages 14 and 15 of the bill, "At least 50 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under." How do you arrive at the figure of 50 percent going to municipalities of that size? Did you determine that half of the people or more lived in communities of that size?

Mr. BLATNIK. We tried, as closely as possible, to find out where people lived. We did not have all the facts. The information was not available, but we tried to find out where the people lived, and in many of our smaller communities they have no treatment facilities. The larger cities can go into a thirty or forty million dollar proposition without too much difficulty. They have sanitary districts and other means by which they can raise revenues, as the gentleman described. Now that is as good an estimate as we could arrive at. We feel that after operating 2 years we will be in a better position to analyze the nature of the applications coming in, and make adjustments as necessary.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to see this safeguard in the bill for the smaller communities, where a greater financing problem does exist in taking care of this sewage, and where there is a large movement of heavy industry into those communities.

Mr. BLATNIK. We recognize the seriousness of this, particularly for large municipalities, but if we have 50 million and five large communities take it all away, there is nothing left for the smaller communities. The larger ones need help, but because of the attitude of some of the members of the committee, particularly on the minority side, all we have been given is a small amount, and we are spreading the crumbs around so that the big birds do not get all the crumbs and the little birds get none.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree with the gentleman, and I think the gentleman is pointing his finger directly at one of the most pressing problems we have today. It is appropriate recognition of a national responsibility for a national problem, and I am supporting this bill.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I am concerned with section 6 of this bill. I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he has made concerning the bill, but as I understand it, section 6 provides that there will be direct grants to municipalities, but controlled by State water commissions. Is that right?

Mr. BLATNIK. No; not controlled. The project has to be approved first by the State agency.

Mr. MORANO. That is a grant-in-aid direct to the municipality, with the approval of the State commission?

Mr. BLATNIK. It will be made direct to the municipality, but it will be approved by the State health agency, and they are working together with the Surgeon General. Previously there will be a comprehensive program for the water users to work out, and the Federal Government will be working with the State agencies involved, to conform with the need.

Mr. MORANO. The next question is, Does this bill say that 33 percent of the estimated cost of a project in a municipality will be paid by the Federal Government?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes, but not to exceed $300,000.

Mr. MORANO. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $50 million for each fiscal year.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes, each year for 10 years.

Mr. MORANO. And the aggregate amount is $500 million with this program expected to continue for 10 years.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. The last question is: Has the Congress ever before authorized an appropriation and appropriated money for this specific purpose as contained in the bill now before us.

Mr. BLATNIK. In the period 1933 to 1939, Congress gave direct grants through PWA and WPA projects for disposal facilities.

Nothing was done until the existing law, the one that is about to expire at the end of this month, was passed 8 years ago. There was a section providing for loans of $22,500,000, but no money was ever appropriated.

Mr. MORANO. Would it be accurate to say, if we enact this section, that it would be the first time we have specifically authorized the appropriation of money for this specific purpose?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. MORANO. It would be accurate to say that?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes; that is the record so far as I know.

Mr. MORANO. The other was just a blanket authorization not specifically directed to water pollution and the treatment of sewage.

Mr. BLATNIK. For public works generally.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I first want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota for the excellent job he has done as the chairman of the subcommittee and the splendid presentation he has made here today. He referred a few minutes ago to some Members on the other side of the aisle who might by inference object. I want to say to the gentleman, and if I am in error I want to be corrected, that I know of no one on either side of the aisle, or either side of the table of our committee who is opposed to the general principles of this legislation. We are taking exceptions to grants-in-aid.

I might call the gentleman's attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the first stream pollution control act passed by this Congress was passed by a Republican Congress, the 80th Congress; and we acknowledge the splendid support that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle gave us at that time.

I know of no objection to this legislation, the reenactment of existing law with some corrections.

The gentleman mentioned Cincinnati. I think that has been ably taken care of by the Member from Cincinnati, but I want to say that the praise for very fine things that he said that Cincinnati has done in cleaning this up is certainly deserved, for they did it with their own money. They even put on a 1-cent income tax on the people and they paid for it.

I reiterate that we favor this legislation but we cannot go along with the grants-in-aid. I again congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am very happy to clarify that. Perhaps in the haste of moving along rapidly I may have left, inadvertently, the wrong impression. We got excellent support from the gentleman's side of the aisle and from our side of the aisle on all but this financial aid section, the increasing of grants-in-aid.

In my view, however, these are the two most important sections of the bill, the enforcement and the grants-in-aid, the very heart of the bill.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to my neighbor from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I want to join with my distinguished colleague and neighbor in supporting this program. I think it is one of the most important bills this Congress has considered since we met here in January.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota, my friend and neighbor, this question: Without section 6, without Federal aid, does he think this bill really would mean anything to the people in America?

Mr. BLATNIK. Without this section 6, which I said was the heart of the bill, it would amount to very little. Section 6 provides the tools to carry out the objectives provided after research has pointed out what is necessary to be done. Without section 6 the bill would be about as effective as a person rapping on the windowpane with a wet sponge; no one would hear him. It would be about that effective.

Without this section I predict we will come back here 6 years from now in exactly the same situation we are in today except that the water-pollution problem will have grown steadily worse and again we will say that the pollution mess in our water is worse than it was 8 years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has an outstanding record in behalf of conservation and national resource use.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota on the wonderful statement he has made. I would like to associate myself with his views to state that I have received letters from various organizations and individuals in the Ninth District and in the State of Wisconsin endorsing a strong water pollution control bill, such as the one Congressman BLATNIK is sponsoring.

I am glad to say that I introduced a similar bill, H. R. 5897, on April 27, 1955, and that this bill contained section 6 authorizing the Surgeon General to extend financial aid in the form of grants, loans, or both to any State or municipality for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequately treated sewage. I am very much in favor of retaining section 6 in H. R. 9540 as the grants-in-aid provision is needed to put teeth into the legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota, my good friend and neighbor in northern Minnesota.

Mrs. KNUTSON. I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from Minnesota for his excellent presentation and in revealing the seriousness of this problem. I sincerely urge the support of all Members of the House of this piece of legislation.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota on his very splendid presentation. In my service as a Member of this House I have not seen a better presentation on any subject matter. I think it is well for those who assert that they believe in the principle of this program of stream pollution control to recognize the fact that the history of the previous legislation indicated that it was effective legislation only when there was a grant-in-aid program tied in with it. Many are losing sight of the fact that a number of municipalities would not be in a position to participate in such a program without some sort of Federal aid. The larger cities have greater taxing capacity. They have done a splendid job. They have invested millions of dollars in this program. But even their work will be adversely affected unless the smaller communities up the line of these rivers are able to participate wholeheartedly and fully in the program. They cannot now do that without some form of Federal aid. Just with reference to the matter of water systems, many small communities today are forced to forego a water system because they do not have the taxing capacity to support them. If you really believe in the principle of this program you have to show interest and you have to show that interest by putting the Federal participation in it backed up with Federal dollars.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], a member of our committee, in commending the gentleman for his handling of this bill in the subcommittee during its consideration. The crux of the entire matter and the issue over which there is any dispute at all is the matter of grants-in-aid to the States. I note that the gentleman says $172 million were expended last year, or in recent years in each year, by municipalities in the building of sewage treatment plants. Let us assume that these municipalities will continue that work at an accelerated pace of 50 percent. That would call for an expenditure of $258 million as against the present $172 million. In that event the Federal Government would contribute $86 million, or it could under section 6. In other words, if we just increase the work we are now doing by one-third it would involve more than the $50 million carried in this bill. I think the gentleman should explain to the House how the $50 million is going to accelerate and increase the program rather than hold it back, because that is the argument that will be made against it.

Mr. BLATNIK. When we get to consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule I will be glad to answer that question.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. Under section 3 (b) consent of Congress is given to a State to enter into interstate compacts. It is the gentleman's understanding that will also give the States which are already operating under a compact the authority to amend those compacts so that they might take advantage of any of the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. I know of no reason why they cannot amend or improve them and this provision is to encourage them to enter into such agreements.

Mr. HYDE. One other question. The argument has been made, as I understand, that if section 6 is deleted it would make the enforcement provisions practically worthless, because the communities would not be able to comply with them. Well, under the Interstate

Sanitary Commission operating in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut—and I understand very successfully—they have an enforcement provision in that compact, and so far I understand they have not even had to go to court on any of them. They have been successful in enforcing it. And their communities finance their own projects, do they not?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman and congratulate him and his colleagues who have labored so diligently to bring us this proposed legislation. I sincerely hope it passes. I would like to say to the gentleman that I have several communities in my district in Florida who have written to me about this legislation, and I am particularly pleased that those of us who represent the little towns and the little communities have an opportunity here, I think, to be of practical help to our people. Again I want to congratulate the gentleman and associate myself with him.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for his considerate and thoughtful remarks.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9540. This piece of legislation, to my way of thinking, is one of the most important bills that has come before this body in a long time. The municipalities all over the country are vitally concerned about water pollution and we must do something about the problem. The grants in Federal aid provided for in section 6 certainly should remain in the bill. The committee report recommends that the Water Pollution Control Act be extended and strengthened which is scheduled to expire June 30.

The report noted that reliable estimates indicate the Nation will require, by 1975, an increase in current water supply of 145 percent. This is equal to the additional supply of 120 cities the size of New York City. It would require the flow of about 11 Colorado Rivers, or equal the flow of Niagara Falls.

In meeting these increasing demands the control of pollution has an essential role; it is the key to the national problem of water supply, for polluted water is wasted water.

House Report 2190 of the 84th Congress, in favoring passage of the bill, noted that it would: First, authorize continuation of Federal-State cooperation in the development of water pollution control programs; second, increase technical assistance to States particularly on new and complex problems; third, intensify and broaden research to determine the effects of pollutants on public health and other waste uses and to develop fair and more economical methods of waste treatment; fourth, increase aid to the conduct of and grants for demonstrations, studies and training; fifth, broaden matching grants to States and interstate agencies for the construction of needed treatment works; sixth, continue encouragement of interstate cooperation; seventh, assist in the development of improved State water pollution control legislation; eighth, improve procedures for State-interstate-Federal collaboration on abatement of interstate pollution; and ninth, encourage prevention and control of pollution from Federal installation.

Section 6 of the bill provides for grants to States, municipalities, and other agencies, to help in the preliminary planning and construction of needed sewage treatment. This I regard as one of the key provisions of the bill and of utmost importance to our already tax-burdened municipalities.

As amended in the subcommittee which conducted thorough hearings on the bill, the section would provide Federal assistance to any one municipality up to one-third of the cost of sewage treatment facilities, or $300,000, whichever is smaller. At least 50 percent of such grants would be earmarked for aid to communities of 125,000 population or less. An appropriation of $50 million per year for such grants would be authorized by this section of the bill, to an aggregate not to exceed $500 million over a period of years. Grants are to be made only for projects approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency and the Surgeon General of the United States, and for projects included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to the terms of the bill, priority to be given to grants for advance planning.

That this is vitally needed is demonstrated by the evidence produced during the hearing that there is a backlog of sewage treatment needs amounting to $2 billion.

The predicament of the small city, for which section 6 offers some hope, was graphically presented by witness after witness during the hearings on this bill. It was testified that many communities have reached their legal limits of bonded indebtedness. Many are limited as to their tax resources and expenditures by State law. In city after city it was declared that their financial resources have been strained to the utmost by their current needs for such essential services as schools, water supply, police, and fire-protective services. They have simply exhausted their resources in many instances. And still the grave and increasing problem of providing sewage-treatment facilities has to be met.

The small or medium-sized city of up to 50,000 population, largely dependent upon one industry which contributes largely to water pollution, is at an additional disadvantage. In the event of a period of relatively depressed activity within that industry, the tax income available for public purposes decreases. The municipality is unable to attract new industry to provide a diversified tax base as it is unable to offer ample quantities of pure water upon which most modern industry is so dependent. So with lessened ability to meet the cost, they are met with the absolute need for construction of sewage-treatment facilities in order to attract new industry.

A spokesman for 35,000 municipalities, Robert Weatherford, American Municipal Association, has said that American cities are not looking for something for nothing. Anything they can finance they will finance. They are just not able to finance sewage-treatment plants fast enough. He said that at the present "we are losing the battle against water pollution. The only way we can win this battle is with Federal aid."

It is apparent that at the present rate of construction of sewage-treatment facilities that we are not only not making progress in solving the water-pollution problem, but are losing ground. There is the existing backlog of $2 billion worth of absolutely minimum construction. To this must be added the additional pollution which will result in the future from increased population, from new industries, and obsolescence of many existing treatment plants. It is truly a matter of public safety and health.

We have, on the one hand, a vast and dangerously increasing problem and on the other an equally increasing inability of the municipality to fully cope with this problem. Passage of this bill, H. R. 9540, by the Congress will go far toward an eventual solution. Especially needed and essential to the complete program is section 6, for grants to municipalities for advanced planning and construction of sewage-treatment facilities.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay tribute to and compliment my able colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation. His presentation here on the floor of this bill has been excellent. No one could fail to understand the problem if he had listened carefully to what he had to say.

It is not pleasant, Mr. Chairman, to disagree with your chairman, and I do not disagree with him in principle. We are simply in disagreement on one section of the bill and there are good reasons for that disagreement. We, on the Republican side of the aisle, I am sure are in complete accord with the object of the bill, and the fundamental principles involved in it and the effort which the Federal Government is putting forth to see if we can solve this difficult problem of pollution of the waters of the United States. It is not a new subject. It has been here before. I have a personal interest in this bill, because 10 years ago, Mr. Chairman, in the 80th Congress there was presented to us Senate 418, amended by the House, which was the Nation's first comprehensive water pollution program enacted into law, and that became Public Law 845. A little of the history of that bill I think is in order at this point.

I might say that Senate 418 was introduced by the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, and the late Senator Barkley, of Kentucky. It was a bipartisan bill. There was no political approach to it at all. The Committee on Public Works of the House in the 80th Congress held ex-

tensive hearings on that bill as well as on H. R. 123, H. R. 315, and H. R. 470. There were several bills introduced. I had the privilege, as chairman of the committee, to appoint a subcommittee to study and bring back to the full committee recommendations for a stream pollution abatement bill. That was done, and a bill was perfected, passed, and became the first general law that we have had in the United States to deal with this very difficult subject of water pollution.

Now, I say that there are some reasons why we differ on section 6.

First of all, the water resources commission of my State is opposed to section 6 of this bill.

Secondly, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, when they filed their written report on this proposed legislation with our committee, stated in no uncertain terms that they believed section 6 should be deleted. They are opposed to it.

In addition to that, may I say that so far as section 6 is concerned, there was no great demand—certainly not before our committee—shown on the part of municipalities throughout the country indicating that it was needed or that it was necessary. So there is a basis for our difference of opinion.

As to the remaining portions of the bill, I want to join my colleagues in supporting it. I believe that every member of our committee, regardless of which side of the aisle he is on, desires to support it.

If I wanted to use the illustration that has been presented here today of the city of Cincinnati, all I can say is this. If we had 3 projects like Cincinnati, it would exhaust the $50 million provided for annual Federal aid, and that would be the end of it. This is a big country. $500 million or even $1 billion that was provided in the original bill would only scratch the surface. So that we are not embarking upon a financial program by the Federal Government with any idea that it is going to solve the problem. I can say this to the House and to every Member of the House, that during the last 10 years, since the enactment of the bill that is now on the books, and which will expire on June 30, tremendous progress has been made. I do not know what has happened in your section of the land, but in my part of the United States municipalities, large and small, have undertaken to solve this problem themselves, without asking aid from the Federal Government. And it can be done, in my opinion, without section 6 in this bill.

Here we are launching this Government upon a new program of expenditure that, when the next session of Congress comes around, will not be $50 million a year, but do not be surprised if it is increased 5 or 10 times that much, because the more that is given, the more will be asked.

I want to answer my chairman in regard to the $22½ million in the former bill. I think he was mistaken, of course not intentionally. That is in reference to the $22½ million provided in the original bill passed in the 80th Congress. Is it not a fact that the Committee on Appropriations of this House never appropriated a dollar and that is why no loans were made? If there were any demands made, I do not know of them; I have never heard of them. But that is the real truth of it, even though it provided low 2 percent interest on the loans made.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, I yield to my chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman is correct. The Committee on Appropriations never did appropriate any money. But my statement was that under the provisions of that authorization, not a single bit of Federal help was given to any of the municipalities in the last 8 years. And furthermore, if you go into the record of the Committee on Appropriations—they held hearings on this—you will find that they had such serious misgivings about the workability of the existing act that is now on the statute books that they said this enforcement provision cannot be worked out, cannot be carried out. And so they refused to make an appropriation.

Mr. DONDERO. If my able colleague believes that $50 million a year is all that is necessary to solve the problem in the United States, we would not be arguing here today very much. But this is just a door-opener. It is a foot in the door for millions upon millions and more, all to be paid by the Federal Government to do what the States, the cities and the municipalities should and can do themselves.

There are some tightening-up provisions in this bill, particularly as to the arm of enforcement. I agree with them. I want to support them. I am going to support them. And so will every member of the committee on the Republican side of the aisle as well as the Democratic side. This is not a political bill. This is a bill attempting to do something to benefit the people of the United States. I think it can be done without involving the Federal Government in untold millions of expenditures to come from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. My understanding is that the gentleman has made the statement, and I think we all realize it is true, that this $50 million will merely scratch the surface. Is there any formula by which these funds are to be allocated to the various communities that would determine which part of the surface is going to be scratched?

Mr. DONDERO. No, there is not, except that 50 percent of the amount provided in the bill will go to communities of 125,000 population or less. The other 50 percent can be distributed by the department which will administer this legislation.

I want to read to the House the language on which I base my argument against section 6. I am reading from the minority views filed on this bill. You will find this in the written report of the department. This is what is stated on page 31, referring to the department:

> We would not favor the grant proposal contained in H. R. 9540 and we would recommend amendment of the bill to delete the provisions of section 6.

There is no question on where they stand and why they think it should be taken out of this bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, not so long ago I came upon a very learned treatise on this general subject of water supply protection. May I read you one brief passage from that treatise:

> There are (areas) which can now keep nothing but bees but which, not so very long ago * * * produced boundless (nurture for civilization). The annual supply of rainfall was not lost, as it is at present * * * (but) was able to discharge the drainage of the heights into the hollows in the form of springs and rivers. * * * The shrines (of decayed civilization) that survive the present day on the sites of extinct water supplies are evidence of the correctness of my present hypothesis.

Does that sound to you as though it had been written by a Democrat or by a Republican? I am afraid I cannot tell you because those words were written by a man named Plato who lived 400 years before Christ.

If recent years have taught us nothing else, surely they have taught us that in this advancing civilization of ours there is no commodity which is more important to our future than water. For water is not merely a commodity used to float battleships and bathe children and run mills. Water is life itself. I am convinced that the time is rapidly approaching in much of the United States when that community which is blessed by an adequate supply of usable water will be in a far more advantageous position than that community with oil or gold or uranium or any other resource of the earth but lacking water.

The committee has made an effort to approach this problem of water pollution, which is presenting one of the principal deterrents to keeping pace with our growing water needs, with as broad-scale and comprehensive a plan as it could possibly devise.

The objection of the gentlemen to section 6 of the bill reminds me somewhat of a poem the late G. K. Chesterton wrote, in which he said:

> The Christian social union here
> Was very much annoyed—
> It seems there is some duty which
> We never should avoid.
> So we sang a lot of hymns
> To help the unemployed.

Of course, we all know that problems such as unemployment and water pollution will not be solved merely by the singing of hymns; nor can they in reality be solved merely by the passage of resolutions or merely by the appointment of study commissions or merely by investigations and research.

If we are going to stop pollution of the Nation's streams, we have to stop it at the source where it begins. Perhaps you may be wondering why it is that the Federal Government finds it

desirable and necessary to grant funds to municipalities. Are they not, after all, supposed to be self-supporting? Well, that is a fair question, and I think it deserves a fair answer.

Perhaps I can provide at least a partial answer from my own experience. It was my privilege for 4½ years to serve as mayor of a growing municipality in Texas and for one of those years to serve as president of the League of Texas Municipalities which represents some 672 incorporated cities, towns and villages.

The reason grants to municipalities are necessary to the achievement of the desired result is that the cities are the orphan children of American government. The reason they have not been able adequately to solve their pollution problems is that they have had neither the financial resources nor the legal means in many instances to raise the necessary revenues. The municipalities have been caught in a squeeze between rising costs and severely restricted sources of revenue. Most of our cities are growing. Growth means costly extensions of such things as sewer lines, water lines, paved streets, police protection and fire protection. Growth does not pay for itself, at least not for the first 20 or 25 years. Yet, confronted with these rising costs and the rising unit costs of providing these things for their citizens, the tax sources from which the cities of our Nation had traditionally until the last 25 or 30 years supported the needs of their communities have been preempted by the States and primarily by the Federal Government. Now, if we are going to look down the throat of a city and say, "Here, clean up your own backyard," then, we must in turn do something practical to make it possible for that city to clean up its own backyard.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I also desire to pay high compliment to the chairman of our subcommittee for the amount of work that he has done on this bill. We are thoroughly in accord with the purpose of extending the pollution act. We went along with raising the money for educational and scientific investigations. But there is a principle involved in this bill, particularly in section 6, that many of us cannot see our way clear to go along with. There is no dispute among any of us, I believe, on the proposition that we must conserve our waters. There is no dispute that we should control stream pollution and that was my thought as to the necessity for the passage of this bill. In other words, to improve the Federal control in order to enforce the proper regulations to prevent the contamination of our streams.

I believe we have accomplished that in this bill. I believe we have given to the Federal Government the authority to enforce the law and to stop States from dumping their sewage into the streams that will pollute the water of the users downstream. There is no dispute there. I think the bill will accomplish that. No one is more in favor of seeing that the water of our streams is property preserved for human use and fish and wildlife than I, but when we endeavor to embark on such a large program of more Federal grants, I think we are proceeding in the wrong direction. The original bill 8 years ago provided some $22.5 million for grants to States. The Appropriations Committee has made no appropriation in the 8 years since the bill was passed. Now we are going to authorize a new program, if section 6 remains in the bill, for a large sum of money. Not a dollar of that money will be available unless the Appropriations Committees and the Congress appropriates the money. That will mean it will be at least 2 years that all these cities that are proposing sewage disposal plants will be waiting for the money to be appropriated. We would be aggravating a situation in this country if we carry this section in the bill. I think we are going in the wrong direction. We are going to encourage pollution rather than stop it. I feel that this bill is a proper bill. I feel we should in all good grace eliminate section 6, and go ahead with the extension of this program, which will mean that we can give to the cities and States the proper amount of technical advice so as to improve the sanitary condition.

I do not believe that many of the cities have raised the amount of money they could raise. One community will take care of its sewage; another will not. The assessed valuations are different in the various cities and counties and States. If you desire to be equitable in the distribution of the Federal taxpayer's money, you should have a uniform assessed value throughout the entire country, so you will give each community or section of the State an equitable portion of the money. The cities are all willing to have a fine water system, a good fire department, and good streets, good lighting, and so forth, but when it comes to sewage disposal they say, "Well, let the fellow downstream worry about it." That is not fair. The very best measuring stick you could provide for sewage disposal are the users of the system and in each of the cities in accordance with their population. Section 6 should be deleted and the bill passed as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I think it has been truthfully established that the committee, both the majority and the minority, are entirely in accord with the provisions of this bill, and the necessity for enacting a Water Pollution Act.

I think the committee is unanimous in giving appreciation to our good chairman, Mr. BLATNIK, for the conduct of the hearings and the fairness with which everyone was heard.

I am in opposition to section 4, grants-in-aid.

There are many problems involved in this particular bill. All the emotion stresses the necessity of water; all the emotion stresses against the pollution of water streams, but I wonder how many know that when we were holding the hearings there were States that even failed to pass water pollution acts? Because of that they want Congress to appropriate money to give grants-in-aid to cities, and so forth, to alleviate water pollution.

Our good friend mentioned the city of New York, and Bob Wagner, the mayor, a former colleague of mine in the New York State Assembly. He said he endorsed these grants-in-aid. How he can do this I do not know. New York City would get nothing from this bill. Let it be known that the city of New York is greatly in debt. Through the years the city of New York finds it necessary, year after year, to go to the New York State Legislature and ask for new laws for taxing purposes, to provide facilities for the people of the city of New York. Those requests have been granted from time to time.

It was a Republican-controlled legislature and Republican Governor of the State of New York that bailed the city of New York out of its transit problem when it was losing $50 million a year or more on the city transit system. I am very happy to say that under the new transit authority the city of New York today shows a very different story and a very marked improvement. In the recent report of the transit commission they show a $10 million surplus as against staggering losses throughout the past years.

Outside of the city of New York in my own county we are spending tens of millions of dollars on sewerage-construction work obtained out of the sale of revenue bonds. How is it being done? It is being done because the State legislature, just as in the case of the city of New York, enacted special legislation to permit us to issue revenue-producing bonds outside our normal debt limit, and because of that we have been able to proceed with the necessary sewerage construction and reduce water pollution.

That same thing happened in the city of New York time and time again where the State legislature changed the law to permit the issuance of bonds by the city of New York outside its normal debt limit.

We heard testimony before this committee that various municipalities had reached their debt limit or where because of some other unknown factor they could not raise the necessary money because the State law would not permit. I asked the Representatives of one of our States if the legislature could not change the law, and they replied that they have not asked the State for a change.

There is one point I want to make clear and I think I can do so without offense to anyone if they will think the proposition through carefully and clearly. We have heard much lamentation recently over decisions of the United States Supreme Court overriding our State laws on sedition, our right to eliminate Communists or fifth-amendment Communists from holding jobs in our school system, and several other decisions of the United States Supreme Court: Wailing, lamentations, and tears over these decisions and invasions of States rights,

but when it comes to grants-in-aid, when it comes to getting money from the Federal Government, we forget our State responsibilities to take care of our own needs, to take care of our own wants, the health of our own people.

We forget about the fact that coupled with States rights is States responsibility. States rights work both ways: If we want the State to be left alone to take care of things within State borders, then, by the same token, we should also say that in respect to money needed that that is their responsibility.

I hope section 6 is deleted from the bill, in the best interests of control of water pollution.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], a member of the committee.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the members of the committee that I think this is a good bill, a very good bill; and I include section 6 in that opinion. I also want to congratulate the chairman of our committee for the excellent way in which our hearings were conducted. I consider it a great privilege to serve under him. I hope I will serve with him for many years to come, although I do not know how long I want his party to continue as the majority.

Let us take a look at this section 6. What does it do? It appealed to me very much, and I was responsible for the amendment of section 6 in the committee. It appealed to me because it is an opportunity given to aid small communities to take care of this very difficult problem of stream pollution which is becoming more intricate every day on account of the industrial wastes which are being dumped into our streams.

Now what does the section further provide? It provides that a Federal grant may be given to a community that is ready to pay for at least two-thirds of the cost of a project. The Federal grant is only one-third of the cost and no appropriation or authorization could possibly be considered unless a municipality or the State itself was ready to pay two-thirds of the cost of the project. In addition to that, let me point out section 6 provides that at least 50 percent of the overall funds so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works, and servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under. This will enable the smaller communities throughout the country to do their share in clearing up this pollution problem.

Reference has been made to the previous legislation. I may say that I served on that subcommittee which wrote that bill. Under that legislation loans were authorized. It has been pointed out that no money has ever been appropriated for loans, but no municipality or no State has really come forward to ask to borrow money for such purpose.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. It did not work because the municipalities realized that they could not proceed to finance the construction of the facilities due to the fact that the Federal proposal was not liberal enough to give them the necessary assistance?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I think so.

Mr. BAILEY. The loans were only for 10 years.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. That is a true statement.

Mr. BAILEY. They would have to have 30 years to finance it from the revenues of the installation.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. The provisions of section 6 would not permit the Federal throwing away of money. A great many steps have to be taken before any such grant is given.

I hope the committee will retain section 6 in the bill and I say that with a certain feeling of regret because I do not like to be on the opposite side of the fence from my very dear friend and colleague whom I respect so highly, the gentleman from Michigan, who has been such a great power and strength in our committee for many years. He will be missed in the days to come and I am one of those who, if reelected, will miss him more than anybody else on the floor.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with those who have paid tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee which has brought this legislation to the floor. The gentleman who serves as chairman of the subcommittee has worked diligently and has spent a tremendous number of hours in getting this legislation into the form in which it now appears and in bringing it here for our consideration. It was his leadership that caused our committee to have additional days of hearings during the present session so that everyone who wanted to be heard would have the opportunity to be heard on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to a section which has not come in for too much discussion today, but which I think is a tremendously important section so far as progress in water pollution control is concerned. That is section 8 which deals with enforcement measures against the pollution of interstate waters. The present Federal law provides that enforcement of action against a polluter at the present time can only take place if consent is given not only by the State which is polluted by the action, but also by the State which is the polluting State.

It seems to me that because of that particular provision in the existing law we have legislation which, when it comes to a test, would fail in many cases simply because the polluting State will not give the agreement that would be required. The committee has made a tremendous forward step in improving the water pollution control legislation. It has changed this provision and has now provided that the Attorney General of the United States is given authority to bring action to enforce control measures against a polluter upon the request of just 1 of those 2 States; in other words, if the request comes purely from the State which is polluted, the Attorney General can go forward and bring suit to see that corrective action is taken against the polluting agency in the other State which is involved. In my opinion, this is probably the greatest single forward step from the standpoint of enforcement that is involved in this whole bill.

Conservation groups and organizations throughout the United States have commended the committee because of their action in putting in this additional enforcement provision. I happened to have the opportunity a number of years ago as an attorney to represent a number of people who were being hurt by pollution on a stream, and to me it was an amazing thing to see how the action of a mine upstream, in this particular instance, could practically kill off enterprise downstream, including recreational facilities that might be using the water for a swimming pool or resort as well as farmers who might be using the water to water their livestock and every other person downstream who was dependent upon that stream for water. They practically had all their rights taken away by the action of one polluter upstream. That is the type of thing that this legislation is basically designed to attack. We are getting into a more complicated type of era with more and more people depending on the waters of these streams. In connection with interstate waters crossing State lines as well as lakes that border two or more States we will give the Federal Government, through this bill, the opportunity to take effective action necessary to correct pollution and make it possible for the people of this country to use the water in its natural form.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation that has for its purpose the cleaning up of our rivers from the filth and pollution which now is so prevalent in many of our streams. As this bill seeks to do that, I will support it. I am in favor of its objectives in this respect. However, I do feel that certain portions of the bill could be amended to advantage without destroying its usefulness in accomplishing the purpose of cleaning up our rivers from the pollution that now exists.

I have particularly in mind the Delaware River. At one time within my memory this was a beautiful stream with clear and unpolluted water. Today it has become a stench in certain portions as a result of the dumping of raw sewage into it. The city of Camden and other municipalities on the New Jersey side, and some on the Pennsylvania side, are engaged in expensive operation to eliminate this improper disposal of raw sewage. We can look forward to the day, although it may be distant, when the waters of the Delaware River will again be clean as it once was.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage efforts of municipalities to undertake operations such as this by a partial grant of Federal funds to meet the expense of

such projects in conjunction with local participation.

The bill as reported reaffirms the policy of the Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution.

The bill would authorize, first, continuation of Federal-State cooperation in the development of water-pollution control programs; second, increased technical assistance to States particularly on new and complex problems; third, intensified and broadened research to determine the effects of pollutants on public health and other water used and to develop better and more economical methods of waste treatment; fourth, increased aid through the conduct of and grants for demonstrations, studies, and training; fifth, broadened matching grants to States and interstate agencies for their water-pollution control programs; sixth, matching grants to municipalities, States, and interstate agencies for the construction of needed treatment works; seventh, continued encouragement of interstate cooperation; eighth, assistance in the development of improved State water-pollution control legislation; ninth, improved procedures for State-interstate-Federal collaboration on abatement of interstate pollution; and, tenth, encouragement of prevention and control of pollution from Federal installations.

In meeting increasing demands for water, the control of pollution has an essential role in the Nation's water-resources problem. Pollution is a waste of water. The greater the degree of pollution, the greater is the waste. Pollution can be just as effective in reducing a water resource for use as drought. Pollution control, therefore, is now recognized as a key to the national problem of water conservation. Pollution control will permit the use of the river water as it flows from its source to the sea.

This has been a subject that has been before Congress for many years. It should have congressional approval. It will mean much to the health and comfort of our citizens. It should not be delayed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a couple of minutes' time to discuss an amendment that I intend to offer when amendments are in proper order, and I think it is an amendment that has been approved by both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the significance of the section to which it refers, and that is section 6. In the italicized portion of section (e) on page 15 you will note there is the following wording in defining "construction" included "preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works."

In addition to that, with regard to the expenditure under this section of the $50 million a year, which is presently under some debate, as Federal grants, there is a proviso that was added on my motion in committee in addition to the previous provisc that I have just read to the following effect:

That is assuring that a fair distribution of grant funds hereunder is made available to the largest possible number of States, municipalities, intermunicipal or interstate agencies that have need for treatment works and in order that the initial feasibility of a project can be determined, the Surgeon General shall give priority to grants for advance planning in order to determine the preliminary economic and engineering feasibility of such project.

That will be clarified by my further amendment so that the minimum amount involved is 10 percent in this particular advance planning portion of the program, the reason for that being that if the words presently in the bill remain without this additional amendment, there is a question of tying up all of the funds and not permitting the Surgeon General to go ahead with the grant-in-aid program, and therefore I agreed with the amendment as proposed. I want to suggest to the House that so far as I can determine the position of some of the minority members of the committee is contrary to the suggestion that has been made by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee to the effect that the Members on the left side of the aisle have been in opposition to any Federal aid or assistance in this program. I want to call attention of the House to the fact that in the committee those on the left side of the aisle unanimously supported a compromise proposal on section 6 that would have provided, instead of the $50 million a year grant, a program of $10 million a year grant for advance planning and engineering, which is what this advance planning proviso in section 6 now does, anyway. And in addition to that it would have reinstated the $22½ million program which is in the present law and which is deleted not only by this bill but also by the Senate bill, S. 890, that was passed there and sent over to the House for our consideration.

So I suggest to you that this proviso which was inserted in the bill on my motion provides that in order to get maximum distribution of funds throughout the entire United States, to the maximum number of municipalities and Government agencies involved—and that is going to be a real problem—some substantial funds should be made available for advance-planning purposes. The significance of it is this. The municipalities obviously do not like to accept their own full responsibility in providing sewage-disposal programs anyway, because they are not glamorous enough in comparison to some other types of public works projects. I go along with the idea of trying to provide some incentive that would encourage them to accept their responsibility in this kind of a program. But they do not give needed priority to sewage-disposal programs because they do not have enough glamor. So it has been difficult to get them to go into these programs. One of the fundamental reasons has to do with preliminary, advance planning, that is, with determining whether a project is economically and engineeringly feasible, and there the agencies have to spend tax money for advance planning before they can even go into a bond issue. That is risk money. If the bond issue does not prove feasible, they lose that money and have to explain to the taxpayers why they spent that money, in effect, without getting results. This proposal which I have advanced to provide advance-planning money is intended to provide aid to local agencies in getting sewage treatment plant programs initially under way.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a fact that the Senate bill, S. 890, did not contain the provisions of section 6 of the House bill?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. It came to us without that section?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. And again with regard to the people on the left side of the aisle, the sewage-treatment program and the water-pollution program was a recommendation of the President of the United States a year ago. He recommended air-pollution legislation; he recommended water-pollution legislation. And last year we did pass air-pollution legislation and I am very glad to see us doing something about water-pollution legislation this year, in this session of Congress.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment would make certain that 10 percent of the amount authorized in this bill would be used for advance planning?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And is the gentleman's amendment limited to that objective alone?

Mr. CRAMER. It prevents the existing advance planning proviso from being limited to advance planning alone, by making a minimum of 10 percent available for advance planning in the discretion of the Surgeon General. It prevents doing the very thing the gentleman is concerned about, that is, the unnecessary limitation on grant expenditures and that I, too, was concerned about when it was called to my attention and when I agreed to this proposed modification of my advance-planning amendment which was unanimously adopted in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the Water Pollution Act in the State of Michigan for many years. I believe it was in 1930 that Michigan enacted the Water Pollution Act and put it under the control of the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

I should like to inquire of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] as to what effect this bill would have, if enacted into law, with the exception of section 6, on the Michigan Water Pollution

Act that we now have, which has been passed on by the Supreme Court, the decision there being that the Water Resources Commission had full authority to enforce the provisions of the Michigan act.

Mr. DONDERO. The general purpose of the bill, of course, is to tighten up the control and also the enforcement provisions of the antipollution law as we now have it. If the State law takes care of things within the State they would have a right to proceed under the State law. If it did not furnish the relief, they could still come under the Federal law, if this bill passes.

Mr. KNOX. The gentleman undoubtedly is acquainted with the Michigan Pollution Act, is he not?

Mr. DONDERO. Not too thoroughly; but somewhat.

Mr. KNOX. The Supreme Court handed down its decision that the Michigan Water Resources Commission had full authority to impose upon cities the duty of constructing sewage disposal plants so that I believe we now have a law in Michigan that serves all of the purposes so far as pollution of rivers and streams is concerned.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct, and I may say great progress has been made in Michigan to clean up the waters of our State under that law and the previous antipollution law of the Federal Government. They are doing a great job under that law now, I know that.

Mr. KNOX. May I say also to the gentleman from Michigan, as we are both from Michigan, that we have some international boundaries and we have waters that are known as international waters. Is there any provision in this bill which is being presented to us here today to take care of the international situation?

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt that very much. That would come under the treaty existing between the United States and Canada. Canada is the country with whom we have our territorial borders and international waters.

Mr. KNOX. Is the gentleman of the opinion there is no legislation needed to control the international waters?

Mr. DONDERO. I made no such statement, but I do say that it would come under the treaty between the United States and Canada on that subject. It has not been rigidly enforced and we know that, because both nations may be polluting the international waters. I am satisfied, however, that both nations will take steps to solve the problem.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. A question has been asked on a matter with which I happen to be familiar. We are agreed here that our State of Michigan is perhaps one of the foremost in its attacks on pollution. This bill has been given very careful consideration by the committee to preserve the rights of States, the rights of participants in interstate and intermunicipal compacts, and also not to infringe upon treaties between the United States and other countries.

The bill first of all is set up to handle pollution in waters that flow along or across State boundaries. As such, there is very little of that kind of water within the State of Michigan. But there is an adequate safeguard in this bill which provides for what is tantamount to a waiting period of almost 18 months before there is any Federal action. During that 18 months the State has every opportunity possible to act to clean up whatever pollution may exist within its boundaries or these interstate waters. There is also a provision in the bill whereby Federal action will be delayed indefinitely and at the same time the State where the pollution exists is making some effort to clean up the pollution.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, certainly this problem of pollution of our streams throughout the Nation and its effect on the recreation, sports, and health of our people has become a most serious problem. Something must be done. We certainly cannot turn our head or stick our heads in the sand and expect the problem to solve itself. I am in sympathy with a lot of the views that have been expressed here today about anything in this bill or some parts of this bill being an infringement upon States rights. Certainly, if I felt any parts of the bill were an infringement on States rights, I would oppose it, because I am a States righter myself. However, we must recognize that this problem of pollution of our streams is somewhat of an interstate matter. These streams or practically all of them run through several States and there are several scattered jurisdictions involved. Most certainly there has to be some coordinated action to tie these States and these communities in together before we will ever begin to approach any sort of solution of the problem whatsoever. I believe this bill is possibly the minimum action that this Congress can take in the direction of helping to clear some of this pollution problem all over the country. Possibly, some of the Members of this body come from areas which are not involved or which are not suffering from the problem of pollution, and they may not be too familiar with it.

The problems involved in pollution control and abatement which are drawing more and more attention throughout the Nation are focused on the situation facing us today at our doorstep. Here, in the Washington metropolitan area, with the population growing by leaps and bounds, unless coordinated remedial action is taken to insure safe and adequate water supplies for the future and provide clean rivers for recreation and other uses, we will not keep apace with the needs of either this area or the Nation. It is to invite attention to these urgent needs that I rise in support of this bill. I have introduced H. R. 8108 which is, I believe, compatible with the spirit of the national legislation being considered by the House today to extend and strengthen a cooperative program for pollution control.

This national program is now being carried on by the State and interstate pollution-control agencies with the assistance of the Public Health Service. We are fortunate to have already functioning the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, whose primary mission it is to encourage the abatement of pollution in the Potomac River Basin and through such encouragement to bring about optimum use of the basin's waters. This Commission was formulated by legislative acts of the four States concerned, the District of Columbia, and the Congress. It has worked closely with authorities or governing bodies of the District of Columbia, adjacent Maryland jurisdictions, Arlington, and Fairfax Counties, Va., and the city of Alexandria, on all aspects of the pollution problem and also with the various Federal agencies concerned.

Just a word as to why a pollution problem exists in the Washington area when there is no large-scale industrial waste as in other parts of the Nation. Washington is located at the point where tidewater from Chesapeake Bay meets fresh water from the mountains. From Three Sisters Island above Key Bridge down to the bay, the Potomac is tidal. In the summer and fall when the flow of fresh water is low, the river behaves more like a lake. The water moves upstream and downstream with the tides and wind and circles between its banks. During the low summer flows a drop of water takes 40 days to travel from Three Sisters Island to Fort Washington, a distance of only 15 miles. Thus it can be readily understood that the Potomac in the summer and fall is not like an ordinary fresh water stream. The sewage entering from Washington, Arlington, and Alexandria is not carried away downstream. It stays right here and that is our problem today.

I do not wish to minimize in any way the work that has been accomplished up to this time to control and abate pollution in this metropolitan area. Much has been done with the limited funds available toward development of construction plans for waste treatment works. The various jurisdictions have completed the greater part of the primary treatment works and are proceeding with plans and extensive construction designed for secondary treatment and interceptor works. It is appropriate to mention briefly some of the important projects:

Construction in the District of Columbia of the secondary sewage treatment facilities at Blue Plains is scheduled for completion in 1959. This plant which is to treat both District of Columbia and Washington Suburban Sanitary District sewage will, on completion, provide 80 to 85 percent treatment. Further, extensive corrective work is under way or proposed to eliminate dry weather overflows and reduce frequency of wet weather discharges into the river from the combined sewer system.

In Arlington County, a primary sewage treatment plant is in operation but can only perform a partial job of treatment. Under the present program, it is estimated that the construction of secondary sewage treatment facilities may not be completed before 1970, the starting date of construction to be determined

primarily by river conditions subsequent to the District's plant additions. Remedial measures are now under construction to eliminate certain raw sewage discharges from the Rosslyn area and to remove Alexandria sewage from Four Mile Run in Arlington County.

Fairfax County is well under way in an extensive sewer construction program designed to remove the untreated overflows from septic tanks from the natural waters of the county. Further, several primary or secondary treatment plants are in operation or planned to provide essential pollution abatement needs.

Alexandria now has under construction much needed interceptors as well as a secondary sewage treatment plant being jointly financed with Fairfax County.

In the Maryland area construction is under way to deliver all Anacostia Valley sewage to the District system for treatment at Blue Plains. Partial but inadequate treatment is provided for Rockville and Gaithersburg sewage. In several locations in Maryland counties, subdivisions are without sewage disposal facilities; however, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is undertaking extensive trunkline construction to serve such areas.

The above represents the briefest thumbnail sketch of the work under construction and programed in the metropolitan area. The value of major construction work done from 1950 to 1955 by the above-mentioned jurisdictions to abate pollution amounts to roughly $20 million. It has been estimated that $28 million to $30 million will be expended by these jurisdictions by 1960 on current pollution abatement programs.

Upon completion of the programed work now scheduled through 1960 there should be no dry weather discharges of raw sewage to the Potomac and except for Arlington, two proposed small Fairfax company plants and Fort Belvoir, all sewage discharges to the river will have received from 60 to 80 percent treatment. This is far from ideal but it shows the intensive efforts made by the local jurisdictions to improve a nearly intolerable situation and means that the backlog of acute requirements for pollution control facilities resulting from recent population expansion will be largely satisfied by these programs.

I wish to emphasize that a good job of engineering and programing has been accomplished but in a piecemeal or inadequately related fashion. The plans have not been adequately coordinated and a comprehensive metropolitan areawide plan must be developed if maximum benefit is to be obtained from the corrective programs of local jurisdictions.

I am told that the population of the Washington metropolitan area is now approximately 1,800,000. Competent authorities have estimated the population 25 years hence to be between 3,500,000 and 5 million. If this occurs, over twice as many people will be using area water and discharging wastes into area streams than do so today. I am also advised that a good part of this expansion has been anticipated at least in a general way in the programed work.

It is now apparent, however, that growth greater than considered in past studies may be expected as the central part of the area reaches saturation. For example, it is understood that a dozen or so agencies situated within the District of Columbia now have under consideration the possibility of relocating their activities to points elsewhere in the metropolitan area. Since adequate sites are scarce it is probable that the agencies when relocating will look to the generally undeveloped portions of the area.

This trend is illustrated by the selection of a site near Germantown, Md., by the Atomic Energy Commission and near Langley, Va., by the Central Intelligence Agency. Further, it is normal that new subdivisions and satellite communities develop near such installations. These all generate sewage and add to the complexity of the pollution abatement plans. The important conclusion is that the aggregate effect of such new developments, in spite of individual sewage treatment, can undermine or vitiate the beneficial effect to be expected from much of the remedial construction now planned or recently completed elsewhere in the metropolitan area.

The effect of decentralization coupled with the continued rapid growth of the area has caused greatest concern as it relates to future water supplies. There is of course a direct relationship between pollution and use of water for domestic purposes because the Potomac River and tributaries serve as the chief source of supply. I will not take time to cite detailed figures on increased use of water. I understand that because of population growth the deadline for greatly increased water supply in the area, originally envisioned for the year 2000, has of necessity been moved up to 1970. Per capita consumption, which has more than doubled in 50 years, will continue to increase. But one of the largest potential uses for water, the possibilities of which are just now being recognized, is that of supplemental irrigation. Unlike water for domestic or industrial use, a relatively small portion of water used for irrigation is returned to the stream. Furthermore, peak irrigation demands are concurrent with other maximum demands for water in drought periods.

The lowest flow of record in the Potomac, 506 million gallons per day at Great Falls, occurred during the summer of 1930. Normal maximum day requirements for the Washington water system, including Arlington County and Falls Church, are estimated to be 334 million gallons per day in 1985 with a potential national emergency requirement of 418 million gallons per day. Adding potential requirements of 43 million gallons per day for Fairfax County and up to 60 million gallons per day for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission other than the Patuxent system, it can be foreseen that the water requirements for the Washington metropolitan area will equal or exceed the minimum natural flow in the next 30 to 35 years.

Increased irrigation usage, on top of the above-mentioned increased requirements during low flow periods when the degrading effect of pollution is most acute, could lead to a serious water shortage at a much earlier date than has heretofore been generally recognized. It is important to mention, therefore, that in the preparation of a comprehensive plan most careful attention must be given to the Washington area pollution and water supply problem in relation to other uses of Potomac River water currently under consideration by the Army engineers.

All of my remarks above bear on the need for a comprehensive areawide plan for pollution control. Under H. R. 8108, the bill I proposed, Federal financial assistance in the amount of $250,000 to the Interstate Commission is authorized for the preparation of a comprehensive master water pollution control plan and $50,000 to reimburse States and their political subdivisions for expenses incurred by them in obtaining information for the study. Under such a plan all future construction needs of the various jurisdictions and the time schedule for such construction could be developed.

Why provide Federal financial help for preparation of a master plan? There are several reasons. Because Washington is the Nation's Capital, there has been a tremendous growth in the surrounding areas as well as in the District of Columbia. Because of this, the pollution problem in the Washington metropolitan area can be considered unique in that the Federal establishment is both a major economic factor in the area as well as a large contributor to the problem. Further, Federal agencies occupy large areas within local jurisdictions which have high potential tax values but pay no taxes. This limits the ability of these jurisdictions to finance local improvements.

As proposed in H. R. 8108, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin appears to be the logical agency for coordinating the development and implementation of a pollution abatement and control plan for the metropolitan area. It has ample authority under the provisions of its interstate compact to work directly with the local jurisdictions and to employ or otherwise obtain whatever administrative or technical consultation or assistance is needed. It is envisioned that the Interstate Commission would work closely with the National Capital Regional Planning Council in order that a master plan would be fully coordinated with the information and plans of the council. Information relating to future population growth, land uses, densities of occupancy and distributions of Federal establishments within the area would be secured from appropriate agencies directly concerned with the problems.

In addition to authorizing Federal financial assistance for planning, H. R. 8108 also authorizes the Surgeon General, subject to certain limitations, to make grants to the States and their political subdivisions, during the Interstate Commission's study, of up to $10 million for construction of waste treatment works.

I consider this a most important item as it would provide for an accelerated program at the Nation's Capital. In many respects this is a showplace for the world and certainly sets a pattern for action in other parts of the country.

If I may digress a moment, I wish to emphasize that every year hundreds of thousands of visitors come to Washington from all over the Nation and all corners of the earth. They find magnificent buildings, beautiful trees, miles of parkland. In contrast they also find an unclean Potomac. Whether they are picnickers, strollers or motorists close to the Potomac's banks, are fishing from the banks or are on the river in boats, they all can attest to the foulness of the water, a condition which measurably detracts from the pleasures normally associated with a clean fresh water stream.

It is the intent that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service administer the construction grant provisions of the bill. Provision in the bill for Commission approval would appear to provide assurance that works constructed under the grant provision would be compatible with the Commission's overall plan.

Considering the rapidly rising debt of all communities in the metropolitan area, much of which has been assumed for their current local abatement programs it is probable that future progress will depend on their ability to go further in debt as their credit approaches exhaustion or obtain some financial assistance from the Federal Government.

In this connection it is pertinent to mention that Federal responsibility for the Federal impact on other communities has been recognized in various enactments of Congress which have made available Federal funds for the construction of expanded public improvements.

In conclusion, may I emphasize the need for foresight by all concerned in providing authorization for financing both an areawide master plan for pollution control as a local-interstate-Federal cooperative effort and Federal construction grants for restricted use by the Public Health Service pending completion of this plan.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the chairman of the committee handling this bill, has promised me separate hearings and consideration of my bill, H. R. 8108. However, due to the lateness of the session and due to the fact that the bill we are considering today, H. R. 9540, covers in broader terms most of the provisions of my bill, I would like to urge its passage and urge the Surgeon General of the United States and the Commission on the Potomac River Basin to exercise the provisions of the bill and let us start a program which will result in a cleaner and safer Potomac.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] has expired.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, year after year the Congress appropriates millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money for the purpose of raising the living standards and improving the health standards of people in dozens of countries abroad. I think we certainly owe it to ourselves and to our future generations to provide the machinery and to authorize the appropriation of adequate moneys to meet this serious problem within our own country.

The bill under consideration, H. R. 9540, represents a real forward step in advancing the health and economic well-being of every community in our Nation. The committee is to be commended in the amendments it has recommended in extending and strengthening the Water Pollution Act of 1948, which authorizes the Public Health Service, under the supervision and direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to carry on cooperative programs with the State and interstate water pollution control agencies. I am in favor of the purposes of the bill and wish to express my wholehearted support of the provisions to provide financial and technical assistance to our States in the prevention and control of water pollution.

Federal assistance to the States for this purpose is a proper function in carrying out our constitutional obligation to provide for the general welfare of our Nation. In this regard, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its report to the Congress and the President in June 1955, in discussing the pollution problem, stated, in part:

> The Commission recommends that States vigorously enforce existing water pollution abatement laws and that they expand and improve their legislation in this field. The Commission also recommends that, as a stimulus to further action, the National Government provide technical and financial assistance to State and interstate pollution-control agencies. The Commission further recommends that study be given to the desirability of Federal financial assistance, for a limited time, to cooperative programs for the construction of pollution abatement facilities.

This is also an interstate problem, since in many cases our States are powerless to act due to the very interstate nature of water pollution. Take the Ohio, for example. It affects not only my State of West Virginia, but Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, and Kentucky, as well.

It has been estimated that by 1975 our public water use will increase from 17 to 30 billion gallons per day, and industrial use, excluding power, will increase from 60 to 115 billion gallons per day. This added use will result in increased pollution that not only presents a serious public health problem but also decreases the amount of available usable water.

Many communities find it impossible to divert their limited funds to the construction of sewage facilities in the face of other local needs, such as increased educational facilities. It is also recognized that our municipalities are limited in their tax rates, their bonded indebtedness, and their expenditures. The State governments, for the most part, are not in a position to lend the necessary financial assistance, and for this reason we have the duty and responsibility to render such aid as is necessary—at the same time being mindful of the congressional policy to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary rights and responsibilities of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution.

Of utmost importance are the provisions in section 6 of the bill, which authorize the appropriation of $50 million per year over a 10-year period as grants to States, municipalities, intermunicipal, and interstate agencies for preliminary planning and construction of treatment works. Grants are limited to 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost of the construction or $300,000, whichever is the smaller. Moreover, section 6 provides that at least 50 percent of the funds so authorized must be allocated to municipalities of 125,000 population or under, and this is certainly a worthy feature which will enable communities to undertake the necessary planning and construction of sewage systems.

The fact that such provisions were not a part of the original Water Pollution Control Act is not relevant to the argument that has been made against their inclusion in this bill, on the ground that this is a major new undertaking and there has been no demonstration of need nor any widespread requirement for Federal assistance in financing the construction of sewage-treatment facilities. Actually, the bill reflects the experience of the Public Health Service during the past seven years in administering the Water Pollution Control Act.

Since the Congress originally acted in this matter, more than half the States have improved their legislation and strengthened their pollution-control programs.

West Virginia is a member of the Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission, which is a compact of eight States devoted to the abatement of pollution in the Ohio Basin, the Ohio River, and its tributaries. The West Virginia Water Commission, as an agency of the Ohio Valley Commission, has ordered our State municipalities to put into effect measures to accomplish water-pollution control in the interest of our public health. Some of our municipalities, like those of other States, are powerless to act until financial assistance is made available to them. Through the means of the legislation here under consideration, we have the opportunity to encourage and strengthen local programs of pollution control.

Unfortunately, the present bill is not as generous as we might wish; however, there is no question but that Federal assistance measures in the bill will spearhead our local communities in their efforts to carry out much needed programs. Certainly, if we can authorize the appropriation of billions of dollars for foreign-aid programs, it should be possible to benefit our own people.

I therefore recommend, Mr. Chairman, that the bill be passed.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I was indeed happy to see the House pass H. R. 9540, the antipollution bill. As a Member of the House Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, it was my privilege to play a small part in assisting our able chairman, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, with this bill in the committee and its final passage on the floor.

The need for accelerated action to abate the pollution of streams is long over due. I would like to quote from a speech made on May 4, 1956, in Cincinnati, Ohio, by the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Roswell B. Perkins. He had this to say about the water-pollution problem:

> Water pollution is the end result of a great variety of factors which by themselves attract only local and passing attention. The difficulty is that no bells ring and no lights flash to warn the people of a community that the danger point has been reached.
>
> A new factory here, a new housing development there, a new office building somewhere—these are the symbols of our national growth and prosperity, the symbols of 20th century progress. Multiplied all up and down a river system, they are also symbols—to the sanitary engineer—of water supply and water pollution control problems. But in the clamor and clang of a busy and prosperous world, with its endless competing demands for people's attention, the warning voice of the sanitary engineer and those of his associates in the health department are not always heard. And even when public interest is aroused, needed help for constructive action is frequently a long time materializing.

I think Mr. Perkins' statement is very forthright and I am only fearful that the $50 million per year authorization for grants in this bill for sewage disposal treatment plants will not be adequate to take care of the situation. I have many municipalities in my congressional district that are in need of sewage treatment facilities, but due to their limited bonding powers are unable to construct these facilities on their own. One city, Murphysboro, Ill., a fine community of approximately 8,000 people, has been ordered by the courts to build a sewage treatment plan and would be willing, but is financially unable. Legislation such as this will be of material benefit to those communities, which for economic and other reasons are not financially able to comply with abatement orders.

I am hopeful that the amount of money authorized in the bill will be allowed by the Appropriations Committee each year to carry out this very important program, and that the Congress will insist that it be pushed as expeditiously as possible.

I deeply appreciate the time and effort expended by all of the members of the House Committee on Public Works for their diligent and untiring efforts in working out a solution to this complicated problem. I particularly want to congratulate the author of the bill, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, for doing an outstanding job.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to unqualifiedly endorse the legislation proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and that includes section 6. Some time ago I received an invitation from my State petroleum association to address them. The supposition on their part was that I would talk about the conservation of natural gas and oil. Much to their surprise, when I arrived to address them, I had a prepared address under the caption "Water, The White Gold of the Future."

The Nation is awake to the necessity for conserving and taking care of our supply of water. It is more valuable than a lot of our other resources. I ask you what value is that to the citizens if it is given to them polluted? Here is an opportunity to do something toward clearing up the pollution of our Nation's inland bodies of water, in which the Government is particularly interested, in that they control all navigable streams. I cannot conceive of an organized effort to take from this legislation the very heart of it. I am going to say to my colleagues on the left, who are showing some semblance of an organized effort to strike section 6 out of this legislation, that if you do it you are going to do it over the protests and recommendations of over 12,000 municipalities in the United States, and I propose to read them into the RECORD.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to see the Congress take steps to amend its laws with respect to water pollution, so that the country may adequately start to do the job of cleaning the water of this Nation.

I have been working for the last year with the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, in an effort to get that Commission to do more than it has been doing with respect to pollution in the Potomac River Basin. That Commission was created back in 1938, pursuant to a resolution of this Congress. Unfortunately, pursuant to that resolution, that Commission took upon itself only the power to recommend and plan. I have been suggesting for some time that that Commission should take upon itself the power to control and regulate pollution and water conservation in the Potomac River Basin. For some reason the Commission has been a bit hesitant. There may have been some doubt as to whether or not they had the power to amend the compact under which they are operating in order to take on the greater powers suggested. So I am happy to get the reply from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota, in answer to the question I directed to him a moment ago that, in his opinion, under section 3 (b) of this act, a commission already established under interstate compact could properly amend such a compact to include any broader powers it might need properly to take care of the pollution of streams over which it had jurisdiction. So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin pays some heed to the words that have been said on the floor here today and not any longer be timid about increasing its authority, so that it may properly control and regulate pollution in the Potomac River Basin.

I am sorry to be in some disagreement with certain of my colleagues on section 6 of the bill. The Federal Government has jurisdiction over navigable streams and waters of the United States. That jurisdiction is recognized in the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that pure water is as important as dams; clean water is just as important as controlling the flow of that water; I might say more so.

One of the great deterrents to many small communities to the construction of sewage-treatment plants is the tremendous cost of such plants. This seems to me to be a proper field for Federal assistance. I want to urge the support of this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, borrowing the expression we have heard a number of times from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]: "If section 6 was deleted" reminds me of the story of the fellow out fishing who had a wiggling catfish in his hand and said to the fish: "Hold still, fish; I ain't going to hurt you, I'm just gwine to gut you, that's all."

Look at these figures: Over here $172 million being spent; here, $450 million shown as needed. Each year we fall behind, year by year, when water is the most important thing in the country for industry and its cities.

Much is made of the point that Federal assistance in the construction of local sewage works would penalize the cities and towns that have already put out money for the construction of such plants.

By the same reasoning, the Federal Government should not assist in the construction of hospitals because some cities have already built hospitals.

The Federal Government assists in the construction of hospitals for the simple reason that the health of the American people is important not only to the individual citizen but to the whole country.

The same thing holds true with respect to the Nation's water resources.

Every civilization in history that has risen to a position of eminence has done so on an abundance of water and land resources.

That is true of the United States of America.

Today, the water resources of the Nation are in jeopardy. Some of the finest streams in America have been all but destroyed by sewage and industrial wastes.

It is not enough to say that this is a State and local responsibility. It is a national responsibility.

INDUSTRIAL FOCUS

The House of Representatives has before it a bill for extending and strengthening the Water Pollution Control Act. This bill would continue the authority of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, to provide Federal technical services to State and interstate agencies and to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial waste, or other substance which may adversely affect such waters.

The basic public laws of the Federal Government authorize the Surgeon General to conduct similar activities relating to the causes of diseases and impairments of man, but not relating to the conservation of surface and underground waters for the propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. Consequently, the Federal Government will lack authority after June 30, 1956, for water-pollution control other than for human consumption.

Although the quality of water for human consumption is our first concern, we cannot afford to neglect other uses of water which have a profound effect on our standard of living. The value of water-pollution control is measured not only in terms of important benefits accruing to the public health and well-being of the Nation, but in the more direct benefits related to water supplies for domestic and industrial purposes.

In all parts of the Nation today, waste discharges to streams by municipalities and industries have exceeded the abilities of many water bodies for assimilation and self-purification. Further impairment of water quality is undesirable, and this, in effect, places a ceiling on industrial development in these areas—regardless of whether the location may be advantageous from other standpoints. Certain industries have already adopted the policy of not permitting the construction of new manufacturing units until the wastes already produced could be properly handled without abusing the river receiving the wastes. Hence the economic advantage made available in many cases through plant expansion rather than by locating new facilities in other areas cannot be realized. While applicable to large industry, this is especially true for small industries where split location of facilities would increase costs to such an extent that increase in production would not be profitable.

The development of the highly industrialized sections of the North Atlantic States has been in part due to the availability of adequate volumes of water for industrial purposes. The industrial demands on water supply have in recent years become so great that future expansion may be limited unless adequate supplies can be provided and existing supplies protected from damaging pollution.

It is interesting to note that the weight of water used by industry is 50 times the weight of all other raw materials combined. In order to produce one ton of steel, 65,000 gallons of water are used in many mills. Over 31 gallons of water are needed to process one gallon of aviation gasoline. The processing of 100 pounds of hides for leather requires 650 gallons of water. It takes 180 gallons to produce a pound of rayon yarn, 510 gallons for 1 yard of woolen cloth.

The problem of supplying increasing amounts of water of satisfactory quality for industry is complicated by more and more complex types of waste compounds. Although industry is doing remarkable research in some areas, a great deal remains to be done in discovering ways to treat new types of waste and in reducing the cost of treatment methods already developed.

The Public Health Service under the legislation under consideration can add considerably to the much-needed research work. It can intensify and broaden its research program into the important phases of control of pollution caused by industrial waste whether injurious to health or not. The proposed law would permit the Public Health Service to bring to bear on the overall pollution problem available but either untapped or uncoordinated research potentials outside the Federal Government.

Among the new phases of research that can be carried out under the bill under consideration are the following:

First. Research and demonstrations into all phases of water resources development, conservation, and reclamation such as reservoir evaporation control; underground water storage; recharge of ground-water reservoirs; and prevention of salt-water intrusion along coastal areas.

Second. Research into the practicability of closed municipal water systems wherein water would be continuously recirculated after treatment to remove suspended and dissolved solids introduced by use. The only new water needed would be that required to make up losses during use. Such closed water systems may prove to be the answer to water-shortage problems, particularly in arid and semiarid regions.

Third. Develop and apply techniques and procedures for evaluating the beneficial effects of pollution control on the total economy of an area or region as a research demonstration project; also to determine monetary values for tangible and intangible benefits from pollution control.

I believe that our well-being, as will be reflected by the industrial future of the Nation, can be assured only by adequate water-pollution control. I believe the Federal Government can contribute to this industrial future if it has laws authorizing it to do so. I believe that the water-pollution control measure before this body will permit such Federal action. Therefore, I will vote for it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate with a great deal of interest, and I congratulate all the previous speakers in submitting to the committee the facts as they see them. The real reason for this particular legislation is that the existing law expires on June 30 of this year. The existing law, as you know, was enacted by the 80th Congress and we did carry certain allocations of funds in that law.

I would like to call your attention to what the existing law is and what would happen if we strike out section 6. Under existing law the communities got up to $1 million for each of the fiscal years from 1948 to 1956 for preliminary action relative to a construction program. Some of the previous speakers would lead you to believe that if we strike out section 6 you would have nothing left. The bill that has been introduced and passed by the Senate was approximately the same as existing law—S. 890.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. For a question.

Mr. BAILEY. Let us keep in mind the fact there was no money made available.

Mr. McGREGOR. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. BAILEY. Let the gentleman provide us then with figures showing there were appropriations made to implement the plan he is taking credit for adopting.

Mr. McGREGOR. We are not taking credit for adopting anything. The 80th Congress passed the existing law and fish pollution bill. There were $22.5 million for loans and that money was available if a community wanted to borrow from the Federal Government.

What does section 6 do? Does it lend? Section 6 says that the Federal Government shall give to political subdivisions up to $500 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has a greater indebtedness than all of the municipalities and all of the States in this entire Nation; yet some of my distinguished friends are saying: Let the Federal Government give us an additional $500 million.

The question has been brought up of just what will happen to some of those political subdivisions. I think the State of my distinguished friend from West Virginia has gone a long way in correcting some of the pollution problems of that State, the same as the great State of Ohio.

What are we doing to those political subdivisions that have gone ahead, that have taken the initiative, that have obeyed the law and that have even taxed their own local people? We are saying to them: It is just too bad, you obeyed the law too soon. Had you waited a few more years, Congress would have given you the entire cost of your project.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am interested in the point the gentleman is making at the present time. Did the committee consider making this retroactive?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes; the committee did consider a retroactive clause because some of us felt it is unfair to penalize a community that takes the initiative and follows the law passed by the Congress and took advantage, some of

them did, of the $22,500,000 by borrowing. In addition to that, we had $1 million a year in grants for planning.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. If we were to make this retroactive, it would take a whole lot more than the $50 million to pay up the back amounts we owe?

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it would. The gentleman from Cincinnati has stated on the floor that it has cost more than $50 million for the city of Cincinnati alone. Yet you are going to penalize the city of Cincinnati and many of the political subdivisions of your districts because they have bonded the people, they have put a tax on the local people, because they recognized, and I repeat, that there is more indebtedness by the Federal Government than all the cities, all the political subdivisions and all of the States of this Union. And yet you are going to say, "Give us more money."

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I was a city official in a city that was involved in the building of a sewage-disposal plant prior to my coming to Congress. We issued $6 million worth of bonds. Now, if I understand this bill correctly, the maximum we could have gotten from the Federal Government in behalf of that construction would be $300,000, which is actually only 5 percent of the $6 million bond issue.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the reason I said in my opening remarks that the figures in this bill are unrealistic. No $500 million is going to do this job. You ought to make it $7 billion so that you know what you are committing the Federal Government to.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is the situation. And may I call to the attention of the Members who are members of a State or political subdivision, who have paid for your own sanitary systems, you are going to have to pay for somebody else's sanitary system. This $500 million does not grow on trees. You are going to have to tax somebody to pay for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the gentleman if the city of Zanesville, which has recently voted a bond issue for a sewage system, would be able to participate in this program?

Mr. McGREGOR. Not at all, because there is no retroactive provision in this bill. I understand there is going to be an amendment offered to make it retroactive. If you do not care where the money is coming from and just want to spend it, certainly it is a fair proposition to make it retroactive.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Under section 7 there is provided a water pollution control advisory board. Under section 6 the Surgeon General of the United States is given tremendous power to locate these projects. Now, the question I want to ask is this: Does the control board have overriding authority over the Surgeon General?

Mr. McGREGOR. The man who tells you you are going to get the money is the Surgeon General.

Mr. GROSS. One man?

Mr. McGREGOR. He has the authority to make the decision. The board can make a recommendation, but the Surgeon General is the man responsible and he is going to tell you whether or not your political subdivision, your sanitation or pollution control program is in accord with his views. He does not have to follow the commission's report.

Mr. GROSS. To whom would you appeal if you felt you did not get the right treatment?

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not know, because you are giving somebody authority to spend it all.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. On the point of $500 million being unrealistic, the gentleman from Ohio is absolutely correct. Our original proposal was for $100 million a year to take care of not a backlog but just to take up and catch up at the rate we are falling behind, which is estimated at $2 billion, on a 50–50 matching basis.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sorry. I cannot yield to my chairman for a speech. I want to say in closing if this bill is passed, the entire stream pollution program, in my opinion, will automatically halt, because they will say "Congress has passed a Federal law. Why should we spend our own money?" Then they will say to the next Congress, "This crowd gave us $50 million. Now you give us $100 million." And you will be taking the control away from your locality, your State people, Mr. Chairman, when you are putting it in the hands of the Surgeon General of the United States, who will tell you what to do.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman mentioned this figure of $500 million being unrealistic. Will the gentleman participate with me in an amendment to raise the amount which could be granted to any single municipality to, say, $500,000 or $1 million?

Mr. McGREGOR. Indeed I will not, because I realize our debt is so high now, our taxes are so high, and certainly we are not in debt near as much now as we would be if we had to raise this additional money. The cities, as I said before, have more money than we have, so why should we give them more? We are all in favor of the bill with the exception of section 6. Because we realize that section 6 will cost many millions of dollars and will have a tremendous bearing on our ability to balance the budget and reduce taxes.

The present water pollution control law—Public Law 845, 80th Congress—expires June 30, 1956. Enactment of new legislation at this session of Congress is required to continue the Federal-State cooperative program. The problem of stream pollution is becoming more serious.

The President in his state of the Union and health messages in 1955 and 1956 urged enactment of legislation to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. The administration bill—S. 890—passed the Senate in 1955 in modified form. In general, H. R. 9540 incorporates the principles of S. 890 with minor modifications recommended by the States. However, H. R. 9540 includes a new provision—section 6—added by the House Committee on Public Works, authorizing Federal grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works.

The administration strongly endorses H. R. 9540 except for section 6. Authority for construction grants is not considered necessary nor desirable.

PRINCIPLES OF H. R. 9540

H. R. 9540 would continue the basic principles of the present act—Public Law 845—namely, the primary responsibility for pollution control rests with the States, with the Federal role one of research, technical assistance, program grants to States, and collaboration on enforcement in interstate problems. Seven years experience with Public Law 845 indicated the desirability of the following modifications, which are incorporated in both S. 890 and H. R. 9540:

First. Broadened research, including research grants, fellowships, and contract research. This increased effort, enlisting the support of universities and other centers, is essential for developing the information basic to the entire program—section 4.

Second. Broadened program grants to States, on a matching basis, designed to strengthen all aspects of State pollution control programs—section 5.

Third. Simplified and more practicable enforcement procedures for control of interstate pollution—section 8.

This legislation would provide a sound basis for a concerted Federal-State effort to correct and control pollution. This collaborative effort, properly implemented, should help to curb the increasing seriousness of water pollution and avoid the need for a stronger Federal role in enforcement and for large Federal subsidies for construction.

CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDIES

While recognizing the importance of a great expansion in the construction of sewage treatment works, the administration opposes the inclusion of section 6 in H. R. 9540 for the reason set forth below:

POINTS AGAINST PROVIDING FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID FOR MUNICIPAL SEWAGE TREATMENT CONSTRUCTION (SEC. 6 OF H. R. 9540)

First. With minor exceptions, there is no evidence indicating financial inability of cities to construct necessary sewage treatment works. Even in the few

exceptions, actual financial inability to construct treatment works is predominantly a result of legal limitations or physical deficiencies rather than a true lack of financial resource.

Second. H. R. 9540 establishes the congressional policy that sewage treatment for pollution abatement is a responsibility of the States. The proposed legislation includes ample provisions to cover the Federal interest and Federal responsibility involved in pollution abatement without including Federal financial aid for construction (section 6). These provisions include program grants and technical assistance to the States, Federal aid for research, and a share of the responsibility to abate interstate pollution.

Third. The provision of Federal financial aid for construction in section 6 of H. R. 9540, even if implemented with appropriations, is likely to retard rather than stimulate construction. The $50 million authorized would aid about 200 cities. Even at the present rate of construction, almost 300 cities per year build sewage treatment plants.

Fourth. Federal subsidy for construction of municipal sewage treatment constitutes a type of class legislation and would encourage many other special interests to flock to Congress for similar type of aid.

Fifth. It is unrealistic to assume that Federal assistance will end with the $500 million total authorization in H. R. 9540. Once initiated, Federal subsides would be required on a continuing basis to meet new problems and to take care of obsolescence.

Sixth. Most cities are authorized to finance the cost of sewage treatment on a revenue bond basis, with charges apportioned on the basis of water use. This places the cost where it should be—on those using the system and causing the problem.

Seventh. In 1955 there were 280 municipal sewage treatment plants constructed. Even though this rate of construction is insufficient to halt the growing pollution problem, had the $50 million authorized been available in 1955, only two-thirds of these cities would have received assistance. The net result would have been delays in construction by the other third awaiting promised Federal aid.

Eighth. If water pollution abatement is primarily a State responsibility, as this bill says, the States should take the lead in helping cities financially to handle this problem. Not more than half a dozen of the wealthier States have ever taken that course. When the States have shown concern and acted, then there might be some justification for requesting Federal aid, if need is demonstrated.

Ninth. Bad pollution situations can be corrected by adequate enforcement of State laws. All of the States have the legislative power to abate pollution. Many of these chronic offenders who would profit by this financial assistance have been under orders and directions to clean up for some time. If the States and cities are not sufficiently interested to enforce their laws and spend their money to clean up, then why should the Federal Government do it for them? Furthermore, there is a provision in this legislation whereby the Federal Government can, in collaboration with the States, take action on interstate pollution situations. What is needed is more vigorous action on the part of the States to enforce the laws already on the books rather than coming to Washington for a reward for State and local negligence.

Tenth. In 1954, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare called in a group of financial consultants to consider the advisability of recommending some form of Federal financial aid for construction in the new water pollution legislation. After meeting with the Department to explore this situation, these experts did not see fit to recommend that provision for such Federal assistance be included. When asked on the desirability of extending the construction loan provision in the present law, on balance these consultants advised it was not sufficiently important or useful to recommend the Department's requesting of Congress its continuation.

I hope we delete section 6 and then pass the bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, it is a known fact that $100 million was in the bill and the opposite side cut it one-half by their amendment.

WE CANNOT HAVE EFFECTIVE POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS WITHOUT ADEQUATE ENFORCEMENT

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has reported H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. Among the strengthening features of this bill is section 8 which provides enforcement measures against pollution of interstate waters.

This bill states categorically that it is the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution. In keeping with this policy, the purpose of section 8 is to protect interstate streams where the responsible States are either unwilling or unable to control water pollution that adversely affects the health or welfare of persons in another State.

In the Water Pollution Control Act currently in force the Federal Government must carry out certain procedures, once interstate pollution has become apparent. But the Federal Government cannot move to abate interstate pollution through court action without first obtaining the consent of the State in which the pollution is contributed to an interstate stream. Nowhere else in Anglo Saxon jurisprudence is it customary to obtain the consent of a culpable party before taking legal corrective action against an offense.

Not only is this veto provision unfair to governmental agencies but in the case of interstate pollution it does not recognize the rights of the States that are adversely affected by interstate pollution. I am glad to say that this bill as reported would rectify this anomaly by permitting court action on the part of the Federal Government upon the request of the damaged State or with consent of the State responsible for the pollution. This degree of protection of States rights is a must. I believe the committee is to be congratulated on making this change.

The committee has also greatly improved the overall procedures which the Federal Government must follow in abating interstate pollution. These procedures are reasonable and, although somewhat time consuming, appear to be equitable among the various interested parties.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service would be required, either upon the request of a State or on the basis of information that interstate pollution is occurring, to give formal notification to all enforcement agencies within the area where the pollution is taking place. He would then be required to promptly call a conference of the water pollution control agencies of the interested States. A summary of the conference would be forwarded to those attending. If he saw fit, the Surgeon General could then recommend the necessary remedial action and allow at least 6 months for this to be taken.

If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution were not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could then hold a public hearing near where the pollution originated. This hearing would be held before a nonpartisan board which would determine whether or not pollution was occurring and whether progress was being made toward its abatement. It would then submit its recommendations for reasonable and equitable abatement measures to the Secretary. The Secretary would in turn send such findings and recommendations to the culpable parties specifying a reasonable time for securing abatement. The same information would also be sent to the State enforcement agencies in which the pollution arises. Further action would be taken through Federal court if compliance with the Secretary's request was still not forthcoming.

I believe that section 8 of this bill has enough teeth in it to bring about the restoration of our water resources. This section, of course, is coupled with other provisions of the bill which make Federal financial and technical assistance available for developing water pollution control methods and constructing facilities.

The current Water Pollution Control Act will expire on June 30. I hope that the House of Representatives will act favorably on this bill and that immediate concurrence can be obtained from the Senate so that a hiatus in Federal water pollution control will not occur.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, of our natural resources, water has become the

No. 1 concern of the Nation. In testimony presented before our committee, it was brought out that during the past year more than 1,000 cities experienced domestic water shortages, and that an estimated 14 million Americans live in water-shortage areas. In most of these areas pollution is a large factor in the amount of usable water available. Many industries are finding it increasingly difficult to secure suitable water to maintain production. This is a national problem and clearly a responsibility of the Federal Government which must be met.

As acting chairman, I was most happy when the full Public Works Committee reported favorably H. R. 9540, the Blatnik bill, to extend and strengthen the expiring Federal water-pollution control law. There was overwhelming committee support for the measure. Even the section authorizing grants to municipalities for construction of sewage-treatment plants, which I wholeheartedly supported, was approved by a substantial majority. It is my earnest hope this section will be retained in the bill by the House today. In this connection, it is significant to point out that the only time that construction of sewage-treatment facilities has kept pace with increased pollution was in the period from 1933–39. This was the period when Federal financial assistance was available to municipalities for the construction of sewage-treatment plants.

I spent a large number of days in committee listening to voluminous testimony in support of this bill, all of which indicated plainly that each year we are going backward instead of forward in our fight against pollution. There is no doubt but that water-conservation policies are in the interest of the immediate and long-range needs of our Nation. In my opinion, the enactment of H. R. 9540 by the House today is the answer to this problem. The provisions contained in this bill will enable us to deal sensibly with water-conservation policies. I earnestly urge favorable action by the House on this very vital legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my remarks today by a sincere tribute to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. The bill before this Congress today, H. R. 9540, is a monument to his patience, perseverance, and hard work, and I say that when this bill becomes law, it will be due to the wonderful work which my good friend JOHN BLATNIK has done.

I want to also compliment the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee and the whole Public Works Committee for a splendid job of work, well done, in bringing out this bill.

This bill is a good bill, it deserves to be passed, and will do much to clean up an intolerable condition. Our committee took over 400 pages of testimony from people representing all forms of organizations in all phases of activity, and it is significant to note that there was not one person who denied the need for a sound and vigorous pollution-control program.

I need not remind my colleagues that this problem of pollution will continue to grow as our population grows until and unless something be done. All of our streams and waters will be nothing but open running sores, full of contagion and filth, contributing to the disease and misfortune of our people, instead of the pure sparkling waters which our forefathers found in this country when they first arrived. Indeed that sad condition is well on its way to being a reality today.

The situation is such that U. S. News & World Report devoted a whole section of its April 27, 1956, issue to a discussion "Will water become scarce?" Its conclusion, I am sad to say, is not that it will or may become scarce, but rather that water is short now, will be shorter in the future, and that if something is not done now, and I quote from the magazine, "then 20 or 25 years from now it may be too late."

What does U. S. News & World Report say must be done? It sets forth the following program, storage, conservation, cleaning up and abatement of pollution, and possibly even purification of sea water.

Listen to these figures. In 1900 America used 40 billion gallons of water per day. In 1955 the use jumped to 262 billion gallons of water a day, and by 1975 the water need will be 453 billion gallons of water a day.

My dad used to say that there are three things which man must have over and above food and shelter to live. They are pure air, pure water, and sunlight. We had all of these things before we began to have industry, and we lived. We can continue to have these things if we are wise enough to have a forceful law to compel the cleaning up of our waters and air to permit us to again enjoy pure water and air. The cost of this in the case of industrial pollution will be a legitimate business expense which can be passed on to the consumers.

In the last 55 years daily water use has increased by 222 billion gallons; in the next 20 years America's water use will rise by 191 billion gallons. To quote U. S. News & World Report:

> United States will need to drill deeper wells, clean up its rivers, and use their waters more efficiently, maybe refine sea water—or face increasing water shortages.

The sad fact is that there is not enough water for America's needs, and the wasteful use of this priceless resource must stop. While water use grows, the supply of this priceless resource remains static or even diminishes.

I need not prove to the membership of this House how foul many of our once pure waters have become. But some facts are both obvious and frightening. Today with flood comes both danger of drowning and disease. When our rivers overflow typhoid danger zooms to astronomical heights. The damage of other diseases skyrockets. Floods are often followed by outbreak of disease and even by epidemics in this enlightened country. It is a tribute to our medical profession that the outbreaks do not become more frequent or severe following floods.

Many of us will be interested to note the parallel between the increase of pollution and the incidence of polio in our own country. At the founding of our country polio was unknown, and until the time that human waste and industrial pollution began to pour into our rivers in large amounts this disease did not become prevalent. It first came to be found with any frequency in the 1870's and 1880's when pollution of our rivers began to be an important factor. By the 1920's it began to be epidemic. Today, when the pollution situation has become serious, it is a common occurrence, and I need not mention the condition of our streams. A similar parallel, identical in effect, but at different times, chronologically, occurs in other countries, among them Argentina and Russia. The time difference is caused by later development of sewage systems and later industrialization.

We are, for example, within the city of Washington, D. C., giving our sewage only 15 percent treatment during dry times. During times when storms increase the flow through the sewers the Potomac receives raw sewage which is a flow too heavy for treatment from the District's sewers.

In the course of a year Washington dumps an amount of raw sewage into the Potomac in amount of billions of gallons. The amount of sewage if in the form of a cube would be higher than the Washington Monument, and longer on each side than that edifice is high. The Potomac River at our own door step is a national disgrace. It smells foul at night, and cannot be used with safety for recreational purposes.

As great a project as this bill sets up, it will not quite keep up with the amount of sewage, municipal and industrial, which will be dumped into our waters because of the anticipated growth of population, industry, and water use. In 1920, we deposited in our streams the equivalent of municipal sewage of 40 million people, and the industrial waste equivalent of 50 million people. Today we fill our streams with the industrial waste equivalent of 110 million people and the municipal waste equivalent of 55 million people.

This bill is better than the Senate bill 890 and the previous law for a number of reasons. One is that it provides for scholarships and fellowships which can be granted at the discretion of the Secretary.

This is not philanthropic, but rather is a cold-blooded provision to get good research and good men to work for far less than it would cost to have the same high quality research done by full-time salaried people. Incidental to this a number of badly needed sanitary engineers and high quality research people will be trained. I need not say that such a program as this will make great use of existing school and research facilities either without cost or at low or nominal cost. Such a program will offer use of some of the best teaching brains at no cost at all to the Government to cooperate with those receiving the fellowships.

I do not need to tell my colleagues that there is great need for research in this program with the rapid growth of indus-

try in the country. The fact of the matter is that this subject is still one of the relatively untouched frontiers of science.

The enforcement provision is strengthened so that abatement proceedings can be instituted without the consent of the State wherein the pollution occurs. Parenthetically, I will say that the bill offers more than adequate safeguards to the rights of the State wherein the pollution occurs. In order to adequately protect this State, wherein the pollution occurs, a period of delays and safeguards is provided which provides that real abatement proceedings do not commence until better than 18 months after the first complaint. Those proceedings do not begin so long as substantial effort is being directed against this pollution within the State of origin. Nevertheless, this provision will be a huge step forward.

As many of my colleagues well know, the old enforcement provisions were so ineffectual that not one abatement proceeding was instituted during the life of the old law which expires this year.

I think it is particularly significant that the Appropriations Committee of this House denied a request for $145,000 for enforcement of the old law on the grounds that the provision was simply unenforceable. As such it would be a waste of money to try to enforce that law. This law will be substantially better. It is not only an oversimplification, but a true statement to say that those who oppose this feature of the bill oppose the cleaning up of our rivers and streams. It is interesting to note that this particular feature of the bill is particularly unpalatable to those who are the worst and most unconscionable of the polluters.

The last feature which is a very significant advance over previous law is the feature providing for grants to States and municipalities. There are two such provisions in the bill.

Grants to States will be made on a matching funds basis for pollution abatement study and work. A sum of $5 million per year is authorized for this feature.

A more important feature of this bill is the provision for grants to municipalities for construction of sewage treatment works and disposal works.

The sum authorized is $50 million per year, for 10 years for a total of $500 million. Grants will be limited to 33⅓ percent of the cost of the work or $300,000 whichever is smaller.

First of all, it is a simple fact that municipalities today cannot finance the improvements that they need. That statement holds true for cities the size of my own city of Detroit.

Secondly, municipalities are faced by legal, charter and constitutional limitations which prevent them from increasing their debt limit.

Also it is a fact that they face the simple economic facts of life, that a large number of municipal bonds and debentures are not marketable today; and for that reason they have a further difficulty in financing needed improvements, especially of the sort such as sewage treatment works with which we are dealing today in this bill.

I have heard many people say that this is not a realistic figure. I am going to tell you how realistic it is. First, it provides up to $300,000 for any single project. If you figure that we finance an even number of projects at $300,000, we can finance 166 or 167 projects a year, and over the 10-year period that is provided, we would be able to finance, or the municipalities would be able to finance, if you please, a total of 1666 or 1667 of these projects. If that will not help to clean up the streams of this country, I am sadly mistaken.

Let us go a step further. We have heard people say that it will induce municipalities not to go into this field until such time as appropriations are available for these grants. Maybe that is so, maybe it is not. The fact of the matter is that municipalities are not going into this field today. Something has got to be done.

I am going to stir this water in the exhibit for you. It is the polluted water that is going down the rivers today and that is the water that you and your people back home are going to be drinking. Perhaps you have financed some of these pollution control projects and perhaps you will be penalized a little bit for it by this bill. But remember this: You are going to get pure water for every cent you spend, and it is a good investment.

With the present state of municipal finance and the current high interest rate, construction of large capital improvements without such a provision is impossible for many of the municipalities.

Some people object to this on a number of grounds. But the fact of the matter is that such expenditures will buy pure water for us and for our children in days to come.

Construction of municipal sewage treatment and disposal works has not kept pace with the growth of the country and expansion of the population, except in one period, and that was during the days of the WPA and PWA, when very substantial grants were made by the Federal Government to help in this construction.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want merely to express my most sincere appreciation to the members of the subcommittee and the full committee on both sides for the excellent job that they have done. We have a record here of over 400 pages of printed hearings. We heard witnesses presenting all points of view. We feel we have covered the subject about as well as it has been covered to date.

We feel we have an excellent bill here. The only point of disagreement seems to be section 6, on grants in aid. I merely wanted to say that we have a well-rounded bill, for the first time, that will truly work. We have the broadest area of agreement among State organizations, State health agencies, conservation groups, Federal agencies and various geographical areas of the country that it is possible to have.

I strongly urge that H. R. 9540 be adopted by the House in its entirety, so it is not a dislocated or fractured bill which will only meet partially the minimum objectives which we have outlined in our earlier presentation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to pay tribute to the conservation organizations that have worked long and diligently for enactment of this legislation. Indeed, this House would be remiss if the RECORD did not list, in recognition of their services, such great organizations as the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, the Sport Fishing Institute, the Wildlife Management Institute, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, the National Parks Association, the Wilderness Society, the American Nature Association, the Outdoor Writers Association of America, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, and the Garden Club of America.

Along with these should be recognized the able and active conservation committees of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the League of Women Voters, and others. The ladies, God bless 'em, continue to be our most militant defenders of the public health. Always you find them exerting their charming and persuasive influence in behalf of the public welfare.

A glance at the contents of the published hearings on H. R. 9540 and S. 890 discloses the widespread and vigorous activity of the conservation groups in support of this legislation. If you listened to or read their statements, you realize their interest goes beyond the fish and wildlife and the recreational opportunities that are damaged or destroyed when human sewage or industrial wastes are allowed to flow untreated into our streams, lakes, and seashores.

Their testimony reveals a broad understanding of and concern for water-supply problems, the needs of industry and agriculture and of growing cities for clean water, the depressing effect of pollution on adjacent real-estate values, its menace to the public health, its destruction of many resource values, including natural beauty.

Mr. Chairman, the organized sportsmen of America, represented in various of the groups that I have named but notably by the big National Wildlife Federation with its State affiliates and the Izaak Walton League of America, have been in the forefront of the battle since the first stirrings of public conscience about the pollution of our public waters. The hunters and anglers have, I believe done more than any other group of citizens to bring about a cleanup. We find them active in support of pollution control and abatement measures in every State legislature. We find them crusading for bond issues when there is a sewage-treatment plant to be constructed. Certainly, we have felt the weight of their constructive influence during the considerations of this legislation.

Water pollution started in a small way, like soil erosion, and the first little gullies that marked the hillsides as a result of bad land use. It sort of sneaked up on us. No one paid any attention to it at first. But as it grew in volume and the streams became smelly, the fish started to die and the wild ducks flew away; the sportsmen were the first to take notice and to demand abatement. Let me quote from the words of Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, as he explained this phenomenon in testimony last year before the Senate subcommittee:

The hunters and fishermen of America have long been noted for their crusading and constructive interest in water-pollution abatement. More than any other segment of our citizenry, they have worked and fought for clean waters upon which the health and economic welfare of every citizen depends.

There are several good reasons why hunters and fishermen are so keenly interested in this problem. In the first place, the sportsman naturally tends to become a conservationist. He soon learns that his own sport depends upon fertile lands and clean waters.

Secondly, the sportsman gets out on the streams and lakes and along the shorelines more than the rest of the population. He gets out where he can see and smell the pollution.

Thirdly, the typical sportsman is especially endowed with the kind of energy and enterprise that make this Nation great. He isn't the kind to sit idly by and say nothing when there is a mess that needs cleaning up.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if many of us may not have a superficial mental picture of the hunters and anglers among us. Do we think of them merely as funny characters in hip boots or canvas britches, loaded down with paraphernalia and fighting off mosquitoes while trying to bait a hook in the middle of the stream? Or do we think of them huddling futilely in a duck blind during a freezing rain?

Let us take a look through the guns and tackle and under the outlandish garb and see who they really are. We will find among this army of outdoorsmen bankers and merchants, farmers and assembly-line workers. You will discover captains of industry and the janitors who sweep out their offices. You will find among them doctors and lawyers and editors and teachers. Your sportsman may be a policeman on his day off, or a white-collar worker who escapes on weekends to the woods and streams. If you happen to find your sportsman on a certain trout stream in Colorado or among the quail coverts of Georgia, he may even turn out to be the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, if you have wondered about the strength and influence of sportsmen when they get worked up about a problem like water pollution, the explanation lies both in their numbers and in the fact that their fraternity cuts a broad cross-section squarely across the population of America. Scratch any constituent and he is likely to be a sportsman.

I pay tribute to them and to all the other conservation-minded citizens of this Nation. They are first-class citizens who campaign tirelessly for better management of our natural resources.

But let us not end merely with lip service to these the conservationists of America. The bill under consideration represents a major step forward in the national program to safeguard and conserve the vital water resources of the Nation. This then is a historic occasion. Let us grasp it with an outpouring of affirmative votes for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466–466j) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. (a) In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall administer this act through the Public Health Service and under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States.

"COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

"SEC. 2. The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this section, the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may adversely affect such waters.

"INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable, uniform State laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND INFORMATION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Surgeon General shall conduct in the Public Health Service and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public (whether Federal, State, interstate, or local) authorities, agencies, and institutions, private agencies and institutions, and individuals in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, control, and prevention of water pollution. In carrying out the foregoing, the Surgeon General is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information as to research, investigations, and demonstrations relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, including appropriate recommendations in connection therewith;

"(2) make grants-in-aid to public or private agencies and institutions and to individuals for research or training projects and for demonstrations, and provide for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"(3) secure, from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of experts, scholars, and consultants as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);

"(4) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Public Health Service with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expenses, as he may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most promising research fellows and

"(5) provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution to personnel of public agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications.

"(b) The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water pollution control agency or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view toward recommending a solution of such problem.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall collect and disseminate basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality, and such other information, relating to water pollution and the prevention and control thereof as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

"GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, $2,000,000 for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"(b) The portion of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year which shall be available for grants to interstate agencies and the portion thereof

which shall be available for grants to States shall be specified in the act appropriating such sums.

"(c) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the water pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States.

"(d) From each State's allotment under subsection (c) for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (h)) of the cost of carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training personnel for State and local water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the State plan.

"(e) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to interstate agencies, in accordance with regulations, on such basis as the Surgeon General finds reasonable and equitable. He shall from time to time pay to each such agency, from its allotment, an amount equal to such portion of the cost of carrying out its plan approved under subsection (f) as may be determined in accordance with regulations, including the cost of training personnel for water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the interstate agency's plans. The regulations relating to the portion of the cost of carrying out the interstate agency's plan which shall be borne by the United States shall be designed to place such agencies, so far as practicable, on a basis similar to that of the States.

"(f) The Surgeon General shall approve any plan for the prevention and control of water pollution which is submitted by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of an interstate agency, by such agency, if such plan—

"(1) provides for administration or for the supervision of administration of the plan by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of a plan submitted by an interstate agency, by such interstate agency;

"(2) provides that such agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this act;

"(3) sets forth the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the State (or interstate) plan and in its administration;

"(4) provides for extension or improvement of the State or interstate program for prevention and control of water pollution; and

"(5) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan.

"(g) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State water pollution control agency or interstate agency finds that—

"(A) the plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of subsection (f) of this section; or

"(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement,

the Surgeon General shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State or to the interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, or to the interstate agency, for projects under or parts of the plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Surgeon General shall make no further payments to such State, or to such interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or parts of the plan in which there is no such failure).

"(2) If any State or any interstate agency is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(h) (1) The 'Federal share' for any State shall be 100 percent less than percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ percent or less than 33⅓ percent, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ percent.

"(2) The 'Federal shares' shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and September 30 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the 3 most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation.

"(i) The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(j) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State (or to each interstate agency in the case of subsection (e)) under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State (or the interstate agency) and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Surgeon General may find necessary.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall pay to the State (or to the interstate agency), from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid such State (or such interstate agency) for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State (or such agency) for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installations as the Surgeon General may determine.

"GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 6. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, intercity, or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Surgeon General or in an amount exceeding $500,000, whichever is the smaller; (3) no grant shall be made for projects under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Surgeon General for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grants shall be made for projects under this section until the applicant has made reasonable assurance satisfactory to the Surgeon General that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction of the project will not be less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended.

"(c) In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Surgeon General to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for such Federal financial aid for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof. The Surgeon General shall make Federal funds available for such treatment works, in a manner which will tend to result in a wide distribution of such funds among the several areas of the United States for which comprehensive programs have been prepared or developed pursuant to this act to the extent practicable and not inconsistent with the criteria and limitations contained in his section.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year the sum of $100,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section: *Provided*, That the aggregate of sums so appropriated shall not exceed $1,000,000,000. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That at least 50 percent of the funds so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing communities of 125,000 population or under.

"(e) The Surgeon General shall make payments under this act through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of constructing the project for which the amount was paid. As used in this subsection the term 'constructing' includes the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures and other action necessary to the construction

of treatment works; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of treatment works; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of treatment works.

"WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 7. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, composed of the Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be chairman, and nine members appointed by the President none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this act, shall be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with water pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in the field of water pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are expert in this field.

"(2) (A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1956, shall expire as follows: 3 at the end of 1 year after such date, 3 at the end of 2 years after such date, and 3 at the end of 3 years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the members appointed by the President shall be eligible for reappointment within 1 year after the end of his preceding term, but terms commencing prior to the enactment of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956 shall not be deemed 'preceding terms' for purposes of this sentence.

"(B) The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 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. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Surgeon General under this act.

"(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

"ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST POLLUTION OF INTERSTATE WATERS

"SEC. 8. (a) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such water or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, shall be subject to abatement as herein provided.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this act, State and interstate action to abate pollution of interstate waters shall be encouraged and shall not, except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to court order under subsection (h), be displaced by Federal enforcement action.

"(c) (1) Whenever the Surgeon General, at the request of any State or States or on the basis of reports, surveys or studies, has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the State water pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and shall call promptly a conference of the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, of the State or States where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originates and of the State or States claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than 3 weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Surgeon General shall prepare and forward to all the water pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of pollution of interstate waters subject to abatement under this act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Surgeon General believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take necessary remedial action. The Surgeon General is to allow at least 6 months for the taking of such action.

"(e) If such remedial action is not taken or action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least 3 weeks' prior notice of said hearing shall be given to the State water-pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, called to attend the aforesaid hearing and the alleged polluter or polluters. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement is not being made, it shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send such findings and recommendations and of such notice to the State water-pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate.

"(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the written consent of the State water-pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to give such consent) of the State or States where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or at the written request of the State water-pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to make such request) of any other State or States where the health or welfare of persons is endangered by such pollution, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(g) In any suit brought pursuant to subsection (f) in which two or more persons in different judicial districts are originally joined as defendants, the suit may be commenced in the judicial district in which any discharge caused by any of the defendants occurs.

"(h) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the Board and a copy of the Board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(i) As used in this section, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of the State.

"COOPERATION TO CONTROL POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS

"SEC. 9. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with any State or interstate agency or municipality having jurisdiction over waters into which any matter is discharged from such property, in preventing or controlling the pollution of such waters.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 10. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this act. All regulations of the Surgeon General under this act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Surgeon General may delegate to any officer or employee of the Public Health Service such of his powers and duties under this act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the United States, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 11. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'State water pollution control agency' means the State health authority, except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency.

"(b) The term 'interstate agency' means an agency of 2 or more States established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress, or any other agency of 2 or more States, having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the control of pollution of waters.

"(c) The term 'treatment works' means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alterations thereof.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(e) The term 'interstate waters' means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, boundaries between two or more States.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, county, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 12. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes', approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'Federal Water Pollution Control Act'."

SEC. 2. The title of such act is amended to read "An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes."

SEC. 3. Terms of office as members of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board (established pursuant to section 6 (b) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) subsisting on the date of enactment of this act shall expire at the close of business on such date.

SEC. 4. In the case of any discharge or discharges causing or contributing to water pollution with respect to which the actions by the Surgeon General prescribed under paragraph (2) of section 2 (d) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act, have already been completed prior to such enactment, the provisions of such section shall continue to be applicable; except that nothing in this section shall prevent action with respect to any such pollution under and in accordance with the provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by this act.

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956."

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "agencies", insert "and to municipalities."

Page 3, line 21, after "United States", insert "for."

Page 5, line 9, after "(4)" strike out "establish and maintain research fellowships" and insert "provide and maintain opportunities for study."

Line 14, strike out "fellows" and insert "students: *Provided*, That the total sum authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for students pursuant to this subparagraph shall not exceed $100,000;".

Page 6, line 13, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Line 16, strike out "Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

Page 8, line 22, insert the following: "The Surgeon General shall not disapprove any such plan without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State water pollution control agency or interstate agency which has submitted such plan."

Page 12, line 12, strike out "installations" and insert "installments."

Line 16, strike out "intercity" and insert "intermunicipal."

Page 13, line 5, strike out "50" and insert "33⅓."

Line 7, strike out "$500,000" and insert "$300,000."

Line 8, after "smaller" insert ": *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost;".

Page 14, line 16, strike out "his" and insert "this."

Line 18, strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

Line 21, strike out "$1,000,000,000" and insert "$500,000,000."

Line 25, strike out "communities" and insert "municipalities."

Page 15, line 8, after "includes", insert "preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 17, after "works", insert ": *Provided*, That in assuring that a fair distribution of grant funds hereunder is made available to the largest possible number of States, municipalities, intermunicipal or interstate agencies that have need for treatment works and in order that the initial feasibility of a project can be determined, the Surgeon General shall give priority to grants for advance planning in order to determine the preliminary economic and engineering feasibility of such projects."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER to the committee amendment: On page 15, line 22, after "shall", insert the following: "specify annually a portion amounting to at least 10 percent of the sums appropriated pursuant to this section to be used for advance planning grants to the maximum extent possible, and with regard to such portion."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is agreeable to both sides of the aisle. Its purpose is to clarify the grant proviso that makes money available for advance planning. I think that is one of the problems that is the crux of this whole water pollution control legislation. The committee unanimously approved the proviso itself. This is a clarifying amendment to that proviso, so that all funds will not be tied up.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this side agrees to the clarifying amendment. It is a good amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, in reporting on S. 890 and H. R. 9540, the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee offered an amendment to section 5, "Grants for water-pollution control program," which would increase the authorization for such grants.

The bill as originally introduced provided for authorization of $2 million annually for 5 years making grants to States and interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of pollution. The bill as reported to the full committee increased this authorization to $5 million annually.

This amendment was wisely conceived and properly supported by members of the subcommittee who understood the water-pollution problem and who wanted to deal with it realistically.

This provision is similar to one contained in the present Water Pollution Control Act, except that the Federal financial assistance in the bill under consideration is not restricted to studies anent industrial waste. It is designed to assist the States in any aspect of their water-pollution-control programs.

Experience under the present act indicates that such financial assistance not only directly aids the States but also stimulates their interest in giving increased financial support to their water-pollution control programs. At the outset of the Federal financial-assistance program, 1950, the total annual expenditure by States—excluding Federal money—for water-pollution control was about $2¼ million. The next year the total rose to $3 million, 1951, and the following year to $4 million, 1952. Then the Federal assistance was abruptly cut off. The following years, the total State expenditures not only ceased to rise but decreased.

Under the proposed authorization of $5 million for State aid in the bill reported by the subcommittee, the amount available for the respective States would vary according to population, extent of their water pollution control problem and financial need. Even under this increased amount, 11 States would receive less than $30,000 annually. But under

the amount provided in the bill as previously introduced, $2 million, 25 States would receive less than $30,000 annually. One State would receive less than $1,500.

Small amounts are not usually acceptable to States because the trouble of conforming to legal and administrative procedures of the Government is not worth the small amounts received. The larger amounts provided by the subcommittee and committee amendments will materially serve to eliminate such inhibitions.

A 5-year program of Federal aid as authorized by the subcommittee's and committee amendments would not necessarily permit States to add permanently to their professional staffs, but it would permit them to purchase needed laboratory and other equipment which would far outlast the 5-year program. Moreover, it would also help the States adjust the salary scales of technical personnel to hold and attract the kind of employees needed for successful State operation of vital water pollution control programs.

I believe we do not want to be too little and too late with a strengthened water pollution control program. I recommend the more realistic version of the subcommittee and committee in amount.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 17, line 1, strike out "None of the members" and insert "Members."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 17, line 2, after "shall" insert "not".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 18, line 6, strike out "water" and insert "waters".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 18, line 17, after "of" insert "the water pollution control agency or the chief executive of".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, strike out lines 1 to 5 inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 6, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 10, after "court," insert "giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 16, strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 10, line 9, after the word "less", strike out the word "than" and insert "that".

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this merely corrects a typographical error changing the word "than" which is now in the bill to "that" which should be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 12, line 14, strike out all of section 6, page 12, line 14, to page 15, line 24, both inclusive.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, and I hope I will not reiterate any argument made by me in general debate on the bill. I simply want to call the attention of the House to the three main reasons for opposing section 6 of the bill offered by the Department which will administer this law. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in their written report to the committee has this to say in recommending that section 6 be deleted from this bill. They say:

First, we do not believe that general municipal need for financial aid—and particularly Federal aid—for this purpose has been established. In developing our own legislative proposals relating to water-pollution control, we obtained the views of a number of municipal finance authorities and other persons familiar with this problem. We found no clear indication that municipal governments generally are unable to meet the costs of constructing waste-treatment works. The problem appears to be primarily one of the priority assigned by municipalities to the construction of sewage-treatment works in their capital financing programs, rather than one of financial inability.

Second, any justification for Federal construction grants in this field must, therefore, rest primarily on their value as an incentive to accelerate needed construction, rather than on a concept of financial aid to equalize the financial abilities of municipalities generally. Although a few States now have grant programs for this particular purpose, experience with such grants has been too limited to date to provide any clear evaluation of their advantages and limitations or of the most effective terms or conditions governing such aid.

Third, even if the need for Federal incentive grants were to be assumed, we believe that the grant provisions of H. R. 9540 are deficient in several important respects: (a) They do not provide for State sharing in the financing of the grant program or in the determination of relative needs and priorities; (b) the provisions relating to the geographical allocation of grant funds are so broad as to offer little guidance in project approval; (c) there are no criteria specified to govern the assignment of priorities among eligible construction projects; and (d) the preference given to smaller municipalities is unnecessarily great and does not conform to the relative need for construction from the standpoint of water-pollution abatement.

This brief summary of their views on this proposal is to be found on page 31 of the report. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the 6 or 7 reasons they set forth in their third paragraph. Here is a department of the Government that has gone into this matter thoroughly. They have made a thorough investigation. Now, they come forward and say to the Congress that section 6 is not needed and there is no need established, sufficiently at least, to put section 6 in the bill calling upon the Federal Government for the vast expenditures of money involved. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the issue is pretty well drawn, and apparently there is going to be an issue decided more or less on the basis of political alignments in the House.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], who preceded me that there is no information coming from the municipalities that would be affected under section 6 to indicate that they are opposed to this type of legislation.

At this point I want to read into the RECORD the position of the American Municipal Association on this particular question, and section 6 in particular. This is addressed to me as a Member of Congress:

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1956.

The Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: On behalf of the 12,000 cities who are members of this association, we urge your support of the Water Pollution Control legislation, H. R. 9540, now being considered by the House. We are particularly anxious for your support of section 6 of the bill which provides for Federal grants to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

We have set forth our reasons for favoring Federal construction grants in our testimony before the House Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors (see pp. 244–254, 268–276). Water pollution is a national public health problem and because of the interstate nature of pollution the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to assist in its abatement.

It is significant that the only time that construction of sewage treatment facilities has kept pace with increased pollution was in the period from 1933–39. This was the period when Federal financial assistance was available to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

One of our most valuable natural resources is water. Already an estimated 14 million Americans live in water-shortage areas. In nearly all of these areas pollution is a large factor in the amount of usable water available.

Each year we as a nation fall further behind in the fight against pollution. H. R. 9540 is the first bold step on the long road back to sensible water conservation policies. We urge your favorable action on this vital legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK HEALY, Jr.,
Executive Director.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow that up by asking that I be permitted to read into the RECORD the following telegrams:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *June 11, 1956.*

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Residents of Morgantown and Monongalia County will appreciate your efforts for approval of H. R. 9540 Blatnik water pollution

and sewage disposal bill. Personally urge your support.

ELMER W. PRINCE,
City Manager.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The passage of the water pollution and sewage disposal bill is important to the sanitation, growth, and welfare of many communities located on the banks of many streams in West Virginia. As mayor of Charleston, W. Va., I respectfully urge you to lend your full support and effort to the passage of this piece of legislation.

JOHN T. COPENHAVER.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the Weston Board of Trade, I urge the passage of a water pollution and sewage disposal bill that gives Federal aid to the cities to assist them in the construction of a sewage disposal plant.

HAROLD G. COTTRILL.

WESTON, W VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Congressman, Third West Virginia District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand water pollution and sewage disposal bill comes up for vote Wednesday. We urge its approval.

NETTIE V. DAVIS,
Executive Secretary, Weston Chamber of Commerce.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As mayor of the city of Weston, I urge the passage of a water pollution and sewage disposal bill that gives Federal aid to the cities to assist them in the construction of a sewage disposal plant.

GERALD L. HAYES,
Mayor.

ELKINS, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the people of the city of Elkins, we request and urge your utmost support on H. R. 9540, now pending in Congress.

E. P. PHARES,
Mayor, City of Elkins.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA., *June 13, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND BAILEY,
New Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Clarksburg Chamber of Commerce sincerely urges your utmost efforts toward including provisions in bill 9540 which enable cities to receive aid.

WALT SCHRADER.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge approval of H. R. 9540.

W. WALTER NEELY.

MOUNT HOPE, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Congressman, Third West Virginia District, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand H. R. 9540, Blatnik water pollution and sewage disposal bill up Wednesday. Passage is a must for all cities under 10,000 population. Please use every effort toward passage. Kindly write at once giving full particulars pertaining Bureau of Mines Building.

W. BERNARD ROCKE.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.,
June 12, 1956.
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

These cities need help. Would appreciate all your best efforts toward passage of water pollution and sewage disposal bill.

HUNTINGTON SANITARY BOARD.

PARKERSBURG, W. VA.,
June 12, 1956.
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Citizens of Parkersburg, W. Va., hereby strongly urge the approval of House rule, bill 9540.

FRANK W. GOVE, Jr.,
Mayor, City of Parkersburg, W. Va.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.,
June 12, 1956.
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge all maximum efforts toward passage of H. R. 9540, Blatnik water pollution and sewage disposal bill. Cities must have assistance.

GEORGE E. THEURER,
Mayor, Huntington.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.,
June 11, 1956.
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand H. R. 9540, water pollution bill, will be taken up June 12 or 13. Appreciate your favorable consideration.

Dr. N. H. DYER,
State Director of Health.

OAK HILL, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Urge passage H. R. 9540, water and sewage bill.

H. C. BROWN,
Mayor, Oak Hill, W. Va.

BUCKHANNON, W. VA., *June 12, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

We are for H. R. 9540, Blatnik water pollution and sewage-disposal bill, 100 percent.

J. D. HINKLE,
Mayor.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 13, 1956.*
Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Send copies of H. R. 9540. State ordered construction of sewage-disposal plants. Unbearable burden to small municipalities. Benefits not local but inure to both State and Nation. Urge passage of H. R. 9540.

JOHN HOLY,
City Attorney for City of Weston.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 13, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your using your influence in behalf of H. R. 9540. Please call WHAW, Weston, collect, when you can give us a report. Regards.

GEORGE YAZELL.

WESTON, W. VA., *June 13, 1956.*
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request passage of H. R. 9540, Blatnik water-pollution and sewage disposal bill.

ROBERT S. EARLE,
Weston Democrat.

These communications are all pleading for the approval of this legislation, including section 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First, I want to join in the tributes being paid to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the author of this bill. He has done a wonderful job with this legislation. When this program becomes law, especially section 6, I hope it will be recognized by the country as due to the work of JOHN BLATNIK.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that an effort is being made to strike from the bill what a large section of the country believes to be the most important part of this legislation.

This section of the bill, of course, changes existing Federal authority, but it is nothing new. As has been pointed out earlier in the debate, the only time any real progress was made in this country in establishing municipal sewage disposal plants was during that period when there were matching funds from Federal grants under the PWA program. All the real major advance that has been made in this work was in the period of the thirties through the use of PWA funds.

I was surprised by the vehemence of the opposition to this section by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the insistence by the Department that all of this program should be done by municipal bond issues. In trying to find why there was such insistence about this I looked into the hearings and found that committee members raised that same question. They asked what was one of the reasons why the Department had arrived at the conclusion that there should be no Federal assistance, but that it should all be done through municipal bond issues.

They called a meeting of municipal finance authorities to help them make a decision on it, and according to the official record of the hearings on page 148 the people who made these recommendations against the Federal participation were representatives of the Chase National Bank, a representative of Stone, Rowe & Foreham, a representative of Wainwright & Ramsay, a representative of R. W. Ramspeck & Co., investment bankers, and a representative of the Life Insurance Company of America. In other words, these were all people who wanted to handle these loans. They recommended that the municipalities and States be required to make them. I do not blame those people for wanting to prevent the grants and I do not blame them for bringing what pressures they could exert upon the administration to keep them from supporting such a program to bring it about.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If I understand the gentleman's bill correctly, his bill is to encourage communities in issuing bonds, the same as the bankers did.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I cannot understand why they do not look at it from the long-range viewpoint.

Mr. CEDERBERG. So the argument of the gentleman is not valid in this case at all.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I quite agree that it is not valid in the long-range sense that these grants will bring about these programs.

I think the best experience we have had to show the value and necessity of this program is the experience we have had under the Hill-Burton Act. All of us are familiar with areas of the country where there was a crying need for more hospital facilities, just 10 years ago. Everybody recognized the fact, everybody recognized that it was primarily a municipal responsibility to provide those hospital facilities, but they did nothing about it until the incentive was provided in the Hill-Burton Act. As a result we are meeting the hospital crisis in the country; it is a major problem no longer.

This is the same type of program; unfortunately, the grants are not great enough, and they are not based upon the same type of formula as the Hill-Burton grants were based.

I have been constrained to refrain from offering an amendment to provide that the grants be in greater proportion along the lines of the Hill-Burton Act in the interest of preserving what we have here, but I think the history of what has happened under the Hill-Burton program makes clear the necessity for this program. There are many municipalities all over the country that need these programs but that are not going to establish them until they have the incentive of the grant. That is an unfortunate fact, but true nonetheless.

We have got to put through a program like this if we are going to enable the municipalities to meet that problem. The municipalities are entitled to that Federal grant. The type of taxation program we have means that the Federal Government takes the taxes from the small towns and it goes into the big areas and it has to come from there.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out something that I think we lose sight of when we debate the amount of money involved in this legislation. Detroit, for instance, has been mentioned and the need for money for a sewage disposal plant. But how much will $300,000 do? One municipal plant, any type of sewage treatment plan, will run into millions of dollars. I know of one treatment plant in my own county that was completed a short time ago, and we have spent $32 million on that plant. Here we want to appropriate a few thousand dollars, and it is claimed that is going to be a great deal of help.

Mr. Chairman, beyond that I want to make one other point. I wonder how many Members here realize when they say municipalities and the States do not have the money what their State legislatures do? Let them check the State legislatures and their local governments and see how many States have within the past year or two increased the taxes for highways within the States, how many of the States have increased the taxes for other types of facilities that it is said here are not half as important as water is to our people and the elimination of pollution. If we can tax our people within the States for these other facilities, it seems to me quite certain we can carry out our responsibilities within our States and within our municipalities and pay our own way as we go along.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to hear the gentleman express his solicitude for the municipalities. I would like to know if the gentleman will join with me in an amendment which would raise the amount of the grant to be made to any individual municipality and the total overall amount that could be granted?

Mr. BECKER. I am sorry I could not do that. I would not be consistent in my position and in my opposition to these grants-in-aid which are absolutely unnecessary, in my opinion.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief since the things I might have said have been stated far better than I can say them.

I want to add one or two considerations, however, that I do not feel have been stressed sufficiently here today. We all agree we want conservation of our water resources. There is no argument about the goal; the argument is simply the means to be employed.

I call your attention to the bill and to the minority report. I strikes me that on the face of the bill itself we are asking for a stronger State program, more research, more technical assistance: a stronger State program. Then we say: Hold everything. We have a Federal grant coming for you. The bill is self-contradictory.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the States will be encouraged to strengthen their program if they know they can get it from Uncle Sam. Now where does this money come from? It comes out of the taxpayers' pocket. We will not have more but less money to build these plants by getting back our own money via the route of Washington.

In depression times, much was said for the public works projects which were proposed to create work and build systems like this. But at a time like the present, in the most prosperous period in our history, surely we can leave it to the localities to build their own systems. Here is another case of conflict between States rights and the huge expanding Federal bureaucracy.

The second point I would like to raise is simply this to point out the fallacy of the new grant-in-aid. If we are going to grant money who is going to get the money? Are we in each of our respective States going to start a race with each other competitively? Should I check my district and State and tell them to be on the alert so that we may get our share of the number of projects to be made available, and, of course, there cannot be many projects of this nature even with the grant money available.

I would like to call your attention to the minority report. I know you have many other things to do, and possibly you have not read it, but if you could read the minority report before the vote is taken, I believe you would find it to be of information.

Let us not lose sight of one thing: Everyone here is deeply interested in the conservation of the Nation's water resources. And I think we all agree that control of pollution is one of the major means of achieving water conservation.

Let us see what the experts themselves say about grants for sewage treatment construction.

One of the Nation's outstanding engineering publications—the Engineering News Record—recently called a group of experts together to consider this very question. Here is what one of these experts had to say about it.

I quote:

It is difficult to escape the kind of cynicism about the Federal grants-in-aid if you live long enough. As an old PWA director, I had considerable interest and considerable part in the initial legislation for public works grants-in-aid in the thirties.

And skipping a bit:

It is very interesting to compare the thirties with 1956. In the thirties we went to Federal grants-in-aid because we were literally in the dumps financially. We now talk of Federal grants-in-aid in the most prosperous period that this country has ever seen, and I confess it is a little difficult for me to prove to myself the necessity of turning to Washington for help when I believe the resources of the country are at their maximum. I myself feel that both States and others would be retarded in installations, not necessarily by the grant-in-aid but by the promise of the grant-in-aid, which is held dangling in front of you, and which in quantity is not really much of a stimulant. Unless you move to the billion dollar level you don't get the shot in the arm.

This statement was made by one of the Nation's outstanding engineering authorities in the water resources field—Prof. Abel Wolman, of Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Wolman knows better than to be taken in by the glittering promise of Federal assistance.

To quote him again, very briefly:

I would remind you—

He told the conference—

that PWA grants increased costs of construction, did not decrease them. As a matter of fact, the record would show that the 45 percent grant just about represented the increased cost, and you would have been just as well off without it.

When a man of Abel Wolman's vast experience in the water resources field sends up a warning like that, I believe we should stop to take a long hard look before plunging into a program of the kind contemplated in the construction-grants section of this bill.

And let me say that a good many experts in the pollution-control field agree with Wolman. Many of them did at the recent meeting.

Further, I submit that the construction-grants section contradicts every other provision of the bill.

What is the use of strengthening State pollution-control programs, of perfecting the enforcement procedures, of stepping up the research effort, and so on, if you turn around in the same bill and say to the cities and towns of America: "Hold everything. There are grants-in-aid on the way."

I say, let us give our States and local communities the kind of help that they do need and can use to develop more effective pollution-control programs of their own. Let us not discourage that kind of initiative with the glittering promises of Federal financial assistance.

In short, let us strike this provision from the bill. I think then we would have the basis for a sound program of pollution control in this country.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during one summer between terms of school a classmate and I undertook to sell a set of volumes on agriculture to the farmers of our area. As I say, we undertook and offered to sell that set of volumes. We did not have too much luck. This friend of mine tells this story about an episode he said occurred to him. He said he was talking to one farmer and finally became so frustrated that in desperation he asked, "Well, don't you want to learn how to farm any better?" The farmer replied, spitting out a stream of tobacco, "I do not see how it would help me much, because I ain't farming half as good as I know how now."

I know some Members have the idea that is the attitude of the cities and municipal governments. Some Members are obviously under the impression that the cities are not tending to their jobs as well as they know how. Members have intimated that the municipalities are negligent or derelict in their duty; that they have failed to provide pollution control simply because they have not been willing. Friends, that is the farthest thing from the truth that could possibly be. The reason the cities of America have not been able to keep pace with this rapid growth and the rapid need of pollution control is because they have been caught in a squeeze, a fearlessly insistent and tenaciously gripping financial nutcracker between rising costs and restricted sources of income. In some areas of our country as many as 70 percent of the municipalities have exceeded or have reached their legal limits of debt assumption.

You say to them, "Here, take care of this problem," and I say to you that it is a national problem and a national responsibility and one that we cannot avoid, when we realize that by 1975 according to the most reliable statistics available, our Nation is going to need two and one-half times as much water as we are using today and when we realize that since 1920 the organic pollution in our streams has increased by 82 percent. So what has been a local responsibility has become a national problem; and so it thereby becomes a national responsibility. We can pass pious platitudes; we can say we believe in these things, but if we cut the heart out of the bill, then we share with those municipalities the responsibility for not keeping pace by falling farther and farther behind in this struggle to keep our waters safe from pollution.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. You say the cities are not able to take care of this problem. How is it that 30 percent of the municipalities of the United States have already done so?

Mr. WRIGHT. The city which is my home has done so, and the suggestion has been made that it is not fair to those who have temporarily—and I say "temporarily" because most of these cities are growing—have temporarily solved this problem to permit aid to other cities which have not. Well, that would be like saying it is not fair to those cities which have solved their hospital problems for us to have the Hill-Burton Act, or that it is not fair to give them aid toward the construction of schools in defense-impacted areas. Any kind of of a bill could be objected to on that ground. Any time we start a new program that argument could be lodged against it, that it is not fair to those who have already taken care of their own needs. I do not object and the city I represent does not object, even though they have temporarily, at least, taken care of that problem.

It has been suggested that $300,000 would not be particularly helpful. Three hundred thousand dollars is one-third of a $900,000 installation. On the basis of average costs across the country, it may be estimated that a $900,000 installation would be adequate, wholly, to serve a population of 100,000. I do not think it is a very realistic argument, therefore, to suggest that this is an inadequate sum to help in individual communities.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is the gentleman suggesting if you have a $900,000 sewage disposal project that you can get a $300,000 loan?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; I am saying nothing about loans. The terms of the bill are that the Federal Government may grant in those cases where the State authority has approved the project up to one-third, but in no case to exceed $300,000 for the construction of a municipal sewage disposal plant.

We do not need to go any further than the Potomac River to see the sickening sight of a stream that once ran clear and fresh and pure, now contaminated by a careless civilization which has been too preoccupied with growth to take care of the preservation of the purity of that which nature gave us.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, section 6 of this bill is an idle gesture and we should recognize it for what it is. Ten years ago, when the Antipollution Act was passed, there was a provision for an authorization of $22½ million. Not one cent has ever been appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations of this House. When you get into a program as gigantic as this, I cannot imagine, knowing the members of the Committee on Appropriations, that they would ever recommend appropriation of one dime of the money that is sought to be authorized in this bill. That will mean that the entire sanitary program of this country will be delayed for at least 2 years. I have telegrams and letters from municipalities saying, in effect, sure, they want to get a free ride if they can. I have telegrams stating that they would like to know the outcome of this bill, because they are proposing a bond issue—in the case of one city, from whom I have heard in which they advise that they are calling for a bond issue of $10 million to put in a sanitary system, but, they advise "We are holding off until we know what is going to happen to this bill."

What you will be doing is this: You will be delaying the sanitary improvement program all over the United States.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BLATNIK. With reference to the gentleman's suggestion that the Committee on Appropriations has refused to appropriate money for that purpose, I should like to give him the answer to that, because I have those hearings right here.

Mr. SCUDDER. You will have to secure an appropriation in order to get the money to match or whatever the method would be to split up the money.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, to clarify that once and for all, here are the hearings on appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1957, and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is questioning a representative of the Department. It went something like this:

"Last year the committee refused a request for $145,000 for certain activities on the ground that the act was really unenforceable. Do you agree with that or were we wrong?"

Repeatedly they had contended that the enforcement provisions in the existing law were unworkable and the Committee on Appropriations refused to appropriate the money. So instead of coming through with $22½ million and other aid, they appropriated only $11 million in 8 years. We now have an enforceable law, a workable law, and we think it will work. But they must have the means with which to do that which we are trying to do and that is to provide these sewage disposal facilities.

Mr. SCUDDER. The gentleman's guess and my guess may be equally good. But my guess is that the Committee on Appropriations will not appropriate money to start a new giveaway program

to be handled from Washington at this time. We are trying to balance the budget. We are trying to economize a bit. I do not believe this Congress is in any position to embark upon a program of this sort. I seriously feel that you will not do one bit of good with this bill if you leave in the appropriation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I heard the gentleman say in general debate that the bill sent over by the Senate was almost identical with the bill passed by the 80th Congress.

Mr. SCUDDER. I did not mention that bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Somebody made that statement. Let me tell the gentleman why they have not asked for it and why there was not any appropriation. It is because it was not workable. A 10-year loan to a municipality does not mean anything because they would have to have at least 30 years to get revenues out of the use of the sewage facility to pay off the loan. It was not workable. Nobody asked for it. If the bill is not any better than that, you had better just put it in the wastebasket.

Mr. SCUDDER. The purpose of this bill was to extend the present law and amend it to give to the Federal authorities the proper law to stop pollution of our streams. I am in thorough agreement with the purpose of this bill, but feel that section 6 is an unnecessary gesture and will retard the building of proper sewage disposal plants. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Minnesota think we had better limit the time on this amendment and all amendments thereto in order to get through with the bill? I understand two other pieces of legislation are to follow this one today.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am anxious to get through as soon as possible. However, we have 3 or 4 Members on this side who have kindly consented to wait this long to speak, but they would like to be heard. I suggest a limitation of 20 minutes. How would that be?

Mr. DONDERO. Twenty minutes would be all right.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM and Mr. DEMPSEY objected.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, my object in taking the floor at this time is to support the bill. I notice Members on both sides of the aisle are for the bill, with the exception of section 6. That is where the money is provided. They will give you everything but the money needed to purify the waters of American streams, at an estimated cost of $50 million a year.

Some gentlemen have asked, "Where is the Federal Government going to get the money?" The same place it has been getting it down through the years, from the people of the respective States. The Federal Government has tapped them so severely that they are having trouble getting by in the States. The Federal Government has no money other than that which it obtains from the States, and the States, unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, do not have the same authority the Federal Government possesses insofar as levying taxes is concerned.

The greatest natural resource known throughout the world is water. The water tables of America have been going down State by State, year by year. Not too long ago in the city of New York, the greatest city in the world, there was a sign in each bathroom, "It is patriotic to avoid taking a bath on Thursday." That was to conserve water.

We are not only trying to conserve water, we are trying to purify it so that that which we have will be usable and drinkable. You do not have to visit very many places in the United States until you find yourself where you cannot take a drink of water unless it has been purified and bottled. You just cannot drink it out of the faucet. If you do, you will be stricken with some kind of amoebic infection before very long.

We have authorized projects in the various States that make this appropriation, or authority for an appropriation, look very modest. So far as the need is concerned, there is not one project we have authorized this year which is of as great value as this project we are discussing now. And under those circumstances some say that we will authorize everything except the money to build the project, while at the same time we are giving to every country on the earth that will hold its hand out many times what we are asking for here. When we come to the foreign-aid programs, some among us do not ask, "Where is the Government going to get the money?" I think pretty soon we had better be asking that question, because we have been bled white. I think the time has arrived when the people of the United States of America should at least be sure that the waters that flow through the rivers of this country will not be poisonous and death-dealing. That is exactly what we are confronted with now. I think the House should approve this bill and certainly defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to strike out the $50 million contained in the bill. This has to do with the health and welfare of the people of America. We, who are supposed to represent them—and I say "supposed" advisedly, I think, should just consider a little bit how far we should go in a matter of this kind and where we should stop. I should certainly not stop too soon when it comes to the health of the people of the United States.

As a Representative from a Southwestern State it is difficult indeed for me to understand why there should be the slightest objection to or question about the need for the enactment of this legislation. In our part of the country water is the veritable lifeblood. Whenever even a small percentage of that water is polluted or contaminated, especially during the recent years of extended drought in New Mexico and her neighboring States, it is a serious blow to virtually every phase of our economy. For that reason the people whom I have the honor to represent are perhaps more keenly aware of the vital necessity for this legislation than are most others.

We know from long and sad experience that our fight against pollution has not been very effective. In fact, I believe we are justified in calling it a losing fight up to now. This legislation proposes an extension of the present law which expires at the end of this month but, more important, it sets up a program of Federal, State and local cooperation that is essential for preservation of the health of our people throughout the Nation—for protection of human life. If it was intended to accomplish no more than that, there is ample justification for its enactment. But it goes farther. It not only will conserve our water resources but it will provide more adequate and effective protection for our wildlife resources as well—for our game and birds in the fields and the fish in our streams. It is so far-reaching in its potential benefits that it becomes one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress in this session.

There is a striking parallel between this water pollution control bill and the Federal Aid Highway bill which recently passed and is now in conference. Both are intended to provide a comprehensive, well-planned, long-term program to correct a condition that has become an increasingly dangerous threat to our country over the years. Experience has taught us that our previous approach to development of the Nation's highways has been ineffective. They have constantly deteriorated under the piecemeal policy we have followed. The same is fully true of the water pollution problem. It is just as vital to attack that problem with the same well-planned, thoroughly coordinated utilization of the combined resources and machinery of the Federal, State and local governments. Only in that way can we overcome this threat to our national health and welfare. And so I say there is a direct parallel in regard to development of the Nation's highways and protection of its water resources. The same basic reasoning should apply in both cases.

While this legislation has been pending, which is a long time in view of the urgency of its enactment, I have received from health officials, conservationists, farmers and ranchers and many others who are cognizant of the situation, fervent pleas for its passage. Those pleas were not based upon selfish interest. They were made by those who are in a position to have full understanding of the enormous toll in lives and resources that pollution of our waters is taking. The facts and the records that they present, based upon their firsthand knowledge, are so stark that they cannot be accepted with complacency. The losses incurred are even more disastrous

than those occasioned by the ravages of war, but they are not as spectacular, therefore we have not regarded them with the same concern.

There is every justification for the participation by the Federal Government provided in this legislation. Pollution of the waters of our streams does not stop at State lines. It cannot be controlled by the individual States or local communities, acting alone. Until we take action and provide the program set up by this bill we will not have met the responsibility with which we are charged. The only reason we are here, the only reason why the people of our respective districts send us to Congress, is to protect their welfare, their lives, their property and the security of their Nation—in short, the public interest. This legislation encompasses every one of those reasons. In my opinion, we are morally and legally bound to enact it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time would that give each Member standing?

The CHAIRMAN. That will allow approximately 2 minutes each.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was amazed a moment ago to hear the gentleman from Texas state that 70 percent of the communities of the country were already bonded to their complete limit of indebtedness and, therefore, he was making the argument that they could come to Uncle Sam for some money. I think Uncle Sam is going to come before the Committee on Ways and Means one of these days and ask for some more power to go over the debt limit right now. I believe, perhaps, Uncle Sam is having difficulties on his own. So, we should think in terms of Uncle Sam as well as in terms of our own communities.

Mr. Chairman, while I am in favor of the pending bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, I am unalterably opposed to section 6. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] to strike the section from the bill.

There is no question as to the value of the Water Pollution Control Act, originally enacted in the 80th Congress, as a Federal-State cooperative program to conserve our water resources and to promote national health. But, Mr. Chairman, the entirely new program proposed by section 6 is an absurdity.

This section would have the Federal Government make grants to States and municipalities for the construction of sewage-disposal plants. While the bill before us would authorize only $500 million in Federal grants for this purpose, we surely know that this would only be the beginning. If a few States or a few municipalities are given Federal aid, are not all the States and all the municipalities entitled to such aid? Once you begin, where do you stop? Where and how do you draw the line that there may be at least some equality of treatment?

Over the years we have seen any number of Federal grants-in-aid programs initiated. Once initiated we have seen them grow and grow, with the appropriation demands for this program and that increasing year by year.

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt the program proposed by this section we will embark the Federal Government not only upon an entirely new activity, which is a State or local problem and responsibility, but we will initiate one of the most gigantic Federal spending sprees we have ever seen.

Perhaps there can be a showing that some States and some municipalities have not adequately provided for waste-treatment facilities. But that does not mean they need, or should be given, financial aid from the Federal Government. On the contrary, the fact is that the respective States and municipalities are in much better financial condition than the Federal Government. Because some States and some municipalities have been negligent in meeting their sewage treatment needs is no valid reason why the Federal Government should undertake to grant them funds they can provide for themselves to meet the need.

There are any number of cities, some in my District, who have recognized their responsibility for pollution control and have raised the funds to build adequate disposal plants. Some have an existing bonded indebtedness. If we are to have a Federal-aid program of this character, is it not logical that the aid should also be extended to those who have met their local or State responsibility in this respect? Are the communities in my District now to be called upon to help others construct such plants while they struggle to pay off the debt on the plant they themselves out of their own funds constructed?

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge the adoption of the pending amendment to delete section 6 from this bill.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize it is getting late in the afternoon and the day has been very hard and trying on the Members of this body. After 18 years of service in this House, this afternoon is the first time I have ever objected to a unanimous consent request to limit debate on an amendment. I dislike especially to do this because I have such a high regard for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], whose service is going to be greatly missed in this body, as he is retiring after this sesison of Congress. His views and advice on all matters pertaining to flood control and related matters that come from this great Public Works Committee, I have always taken seriously; so I have no intention of needlessly detaining the House. But I think Members who are vitally affected by this legislation should have the opportunity of expressing their viewpoints.

I know the importance of this legislation; therefore I am opposing the amendment to strike out section 6, which provides some help in the way of matching funds for those communities throughout the country that are not in a position financially to meet the requirements laid down by this legislation and also by State laws. I am in such a position in my own State in North Carolina. There is a river running through my district which serves a community of approximately 300,000 people. This river has become so filled with organic matter that the pollution problem has become almost intolerable.

I do not think I have ever heard a better explanation of a piece of legislation than has been made here on the floor of this House this afternoon by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BLATNIK]. Certainly we all have different problems in different areas of the country. Yesterday we passed a bill primarily for water in the western part of the United States. Some 17 States will benefit from this legislation, which carries millions of dollars of authorization. I realize, of course, that it costs money to do anything of this nature; so in opposing this amendment which deletes matching funds, we are asking for an amount to at least initiate a program that we hope will not let us fall any lower in the pollution situation then we are at the present time in trying to clean up our streams here in the eastern part of the United States.

It has been shown here this afternoon by charts that we will not be gaining any ground on this problem due to the increased use of our streams by the people but we will only be able to probably remain in the position we find ourselves at the present time.

Today there is not a beach from Maine to Florida that is not involved in this pollution problem, as well as our commercial streams upstate. We are not only polluting our streams beyond the usable point, but we are running the pollution out over the recreation areas in the eastern part of the country and it is creating a serious problem from coast to coast.

We all are aware today of what recreation means to the dense populations here in the East. How long are we going to let this go on is the number one question.

I believe and have thought for many years that the efforts to meet this problem should be coordinated between the local communities, the State, and the Federal Government, if we expect to be successful in our efforts.

Those who have presented this amendment this afternoon to strike out the matching funds have given as their reason for not supporting section 6 the fact that a Government agency, namely, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has come before the committee and asked for no matching funds. I have never heard of a Government agency coming in here to Congress and asking us to adopt a policy on any problem and not requesting implementing funds to carry out the program. That is a strange procedure to me. So why should they come in here today and ask us to adopt a water policy for the entire country and then object to putting at least as a beginning sufficient funds to start the program off.

I hope this House this afternoon is not going to support an attempt to refuse at least sufficient funds to initiate a program which I feel will be appreciated by the whole country over the years to come. We can implement it later on if this is not sufficient, but let us lay down the policy completely as to what our intentions are so the country at large will know what the policy really is.

As I have mentioned before, I have a lot of small communities up and down Haw River, which traverses Alamance County and Orange County from one end to the other in my congressional district. If this enforcing provision in this act forces them to do certain things, these communities cannot meet the requirements of the act without assistance from some source.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman is quite familiar with the bill, but I might call his attention to page 6, section 5 where funds are allocated to the extent of $5 million.

Mr. DURHAM. I know it does carry some money, but the amendment will knock out all of the matching funds. I am primarily interested in these funds, and I am opposing the amendment presently before us for this reason.

Mr. McGREGOR. I beg to differ with the gentleman. The amendment that is before us for consideration applies only to section 6. I am speaking of section 5.

Mr. DURHAM. The Dondero amendment applies to section 6, to which I addressed my remarks.

Mr. McGREGOR. But this money I am talking about is in section 5 and would not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. DURHAM. I am aware of the fact that the gentleman is speaking of section 5, which does nothing for these communities except offer advice and probably some research in trying to solve their problem. I ask the House to vote down this amendment for the reasons I have outlined to you this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay this House, at this late hour, any longer. This committee has brought out in my opinion a very sound measure and has implemented the measure of 1948 adopted by the 80th Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to use this 1 minute to ask the chairman of the subcommitee a question. As the gentleman knows, I introduced the bill, H. R. 8108, to provide for a study of pollution here in the metropolitan Washington area and authorize an appropriation of $250,000, and also an authorization of $50,000 to assist the States in research and surveys along the lines of the study and assist in that study. Am I correct in my understanding that this bill would authorize such a survey, such a study by the Surgeon General in connection with an existing interstate compact, namely, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is my understanding; that is what it would do.

Mr. BROYHILL. It also provides funds to assist States in research and surveys in connection with the problem?

Mr. BLATNIK. Research and in enforcement, demonstration, and so forth.

Mr. BROYHILL. I think that is very important, and should encourage the Interstate Commission to proceed with this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] is recognized.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, permit me to join my colleagues in tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee on the splendid way in which he has handled this problem and the hearings on this bill, H. R. 9540. The committee also deserves much credit. This is a very important problem and this legislation is greatly needed. I support enthusiastically the bill before us with the exception of section 6. My interest and concern with this problem goes back a number of years when I served in the New York State Legislature and the chairman of the New York Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation. Together with the members of that committee, we participated in the creation of such interstate agencies as the Ohio River Valley Interstate Commission, the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the Interstate Sanitation Commission, and the Lake Champlain Commission. All of these interstate organizations actively working in our section of the country have concerned themselves with the problem of water pollution and our water resources.

Under the guidance of our New York Interstate Committee, the State of New York enacted the Ostertag law which provides for the machinery of the State's water pollution control act. We are making progress under this law and I want to point out that it concerns itself with not only the health aspects but the conservation and industrial aspects as well. Primary responsibility rests with the municipalities under this statute.

Mr. Chairman, there is little disagreement that clean water is a natural resource precious to the physical and economic well-being of the Nation. The need for conservation of that resource through control of pollution also has unanimous support.

As with any legislation that affects all people and all levels of government, however, there has been healthy discussion as to the best methods by which the Federal Government can assist. The water pollution control agencies of the States deserve great praise for their cooperative and helpful role in the development of legislation to extend the present Water Pollution Control Act.

Beginning with the hearings in the Senate in April of last year, representatives of many of these agencies cooperated with the committees of the Senate and House in defining a proper Federal role in the national pollution control effort. I am confident that their assistance along with that of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been invaluable to the Committee on Public Works in their deliberations on this bill.

Between sessions of this Congress, leaders in the pollution-control field, including many administrators of State and local programs, met in Atlantic City, New York, and Washington to coordinate their views on the amendments to the existing act. Instrumental in the conduct of these three meetings were such able administrators of State pollution-control programs as David B. Lee, director bureau of sanitary engineering, Florida State Health Department; Milton P. Adams, executive secretary, Michigan State Water Resources Commission; and Dr. Daniel Bergsma, State commissioner of health, New Jersey State Department of Health.

The latest of the conferences, which took place last February, in Washington, included members of the executive committee of the Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers and representatives of independent State and interstate water-pollution control agencies, the Council of State Governments, national conservation organizations, industry, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This conference resulted in the development of a common position by the participants on proposed amendments to the existing act. The recommendations of the conference, representing the efforts of some of the best medical, legal, and engineering minds in the water-pollution control field today, were incorporated in the bill H. R. 9540.

These recommendations dealt specifically with the sections on assistance to States, the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, and enforcement of pollution-abatement measures in interstate waters. The wisdom of the recommendations was soon proven. During the extensive public hearings held by the Committee on Public Works, 58 witnesses appeared to give statements. These witnesses included Members of Congress, representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, administrators of State and interstate water-pollution control programs, and representatives of conservation organizations, municipalities, industry, and other groups interested in water conservation through pollution control. The amendments recommended by the Washington conference was approved almost unanimously by these witnesses in their testimony. Thirteen administrators of State water-pollution control agencies were among those who testified orally and gave their wholehearted endorsement to the amendments. Most of the other State water-pollution control agencies submitted statements confirming their support.

Protection of the Nation's water resources against degradation by pollu-

tion is the issue before us today. The primary role of local and State governments in a nationwide effort to conserve water quality is recognized in H. R. 9540 as it is in the existing Federal law enacted in 1948. The Federal role of support and assistance to State and local governmental agencies has been established as a vital one during the life of the existing act. Extension and improvement of this authority is now uniformly supported by the representatives of the States and others deeply concerned. Future pollution-control progress in the United States, aided by the passage of this legislation, will be a fitting tribute to the conscientious efforts of these people and the States which they represent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] stated that the position of the State of Michigan was in opposition to section 6 of the bill. I am going to cite to you a letter from Mr. Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

In the middle paragraph of that letter to me, Mr. Adams states:

> Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DONDERO, and the Public Works Committee have given earnest and extended consideration to this bill. Any remaining differences of opinion on section 6, or other details, should be compromised if possible, but in no event prevent your favorable consideration and vote on the bill as a whole.

I also call attention to the following statement by the assistant attorney general of the State of Michigan, Mr. Olds, who appeared on behalf of the bill before our committee and testified in favor of the whole bill, including section 6.

Under this bill, in a 10-year period there will be 1,660 of these facilities built, or a program at the rate of 166 a year if we pass this particular bill with section 6 included. That is substantial progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I intend to support H. R. 9540, which is a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

It is important that there be proper exercise of jurisdiction of the waterways of the Nation as a benefit to public health and welfare by the prevention and the control of water pollution. I will not develop further the purpose of the intention of the program which has been fully covered in the debate today.

I arise at this time for the purpose of opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, which proposes to strike out section 6 of the act, which is the section which authorizes Federal grants to municipalities for construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage, or other waste, into any waters, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

Time after time it was stated here today that municipalities in the Nation do not need any Federal help for such purposes. Let me say to you that my congressional district is a classic example that the contrary is the case beyond the peradventure of intelligent debate. In the State of Pennsylvania there is a so-called Clear Streams Act, and as a result of that legislation, many municipalities in my congressional district, particularly those bordering the Susquehanna River in the Wyoming Valley, are under citation of contempt issued by the attorney general's office of our State, because of alleged failure to comply with the provisions of the State law on this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I will not belabor the point again as to the distressed economic condition existing in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania. Many of the municipalities in that area are bankrupt and in many other cases have reached the constitutional limit of their borrowing power. Crushed between the two millstones of rising costs of municipal government, and no additional sources of revenue, at the same time faced with compulsory legal action by the Commonwealth to erect sewage disposal plants, these municipalities are between the "devil and the deep blue sea."

Section 6 of this bill is absolutely essential as a single ray of hope; a straw at least, at which these municipalities may grasp to comply with mandatory State directives for construction of the necessary treatment works.

There now exists in my valley a joint committee of honest and sincere municipal officials and civic community leaders working together to solve a seemingly insoluble problem on the financing of such facilities construction. For months and months these municipal leaders and officials have been meeting and planning and hoping to comply with the law of the State.

No one debates or disputes the value of this legislation; we all know the essentiality of conserving our national water supply and to clean up and prevent the pollution of existing supplies; but I say to you Mr. Chairman, in my district the municipalities simply cannot pay their way if they are forced to share the burden of the total cost of the necessary construction; either by themselves as single municipalities, or jointly with other adjacent municipalities.

That is why I opposed the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, that is why I shall support this bill, including section 6, for there is no section in the country more directly in point as the provision of section 6 of the act, than my own district. This is not just a question of large cities, or of cities even over 125,000 in population, but it affects seriously many small boroughs and townships, as well as smaller cities in the Nation, and specifically in my congressional district.

This problem in my district has been under study for several years. Our municipalities have contributed to a general fund to find the most reasonable, and the best plan or plans to comply with the State law; so there will be no danger of our municipalities going halfcocked in such a construction program. At the same time the municipalities in my district will not hold back on the issuance of bond issues for such construction, waiting for Uncle Sam's handout. If we could afford to do this ourselves we would not want any aid from the Federal Government, but we cannot afford, and we cannot raise the money, and that is that. This bill does not eliminate the home rule, it is not an extension of absolute Federal control over our municipalities; if it were, I would have nothing to do with it, but it is not. Nor does it deprive the State waters pollution control agency of jurisdiction. The bill provides for Federal participation and for local participation, as it should be. And no grant shall be made under the Federal law to any project in an amount exceeding 33⅓ percent over the estimated reasonable costs, or in an amount exceeding $300,000, whichever is the smaller. There are other and proper safeguards upon local control in the municipality and proper State jurisdiction.

Under all the provisions of this act, this is the very best kind and most desirable kind of association between the different governments to which each contributes for the good of all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

THE NEED FOR CONSTRUCTION GRANTS TO MEET OUR POLLUTION MENACE

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, after hearing and participating in the Public Works Committee debate on H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, I have been trying to understand why certain members of the Committee were so determined in their opposition to section 6. This section would simply make small Federal grants-in-aid available to municipalities for the construction of waste treatment works. The amount of money which could be given in support of any one project could not exceed $300,000 or one-third of the cost of the project whichever were the smaller. Obviously, these small grants would be most beneficial to smaller communities or for the improvement or addition to existing facilities of the larger communities.

In view of the large amounts of Federal tax money which have been expended on the conservation and development of water resources, it is difficult to understand the motive of those who oppose this minimal program to conserve water resources by keeping our rivers and streams reasonably free from pollution.

I cannot help but suspect that certain manufacturers, notably the pulp and paper companies, have opposed this section of the bill for their own selfish reasons. We suspect that these companies would like to continue to use the Nation's waters for waste disposal purposes without properly treating the damaging effluent from their mills. I cannot help but feel that they do not want our municipalities to set a good example in pollution abatement because this would make it even more apparent that all industry must follow suit by providing adequate waste treatment measures. It should be noted that some industries have played a role of leadership in development of pollution abatement facilities and that those who

have opposed this legislation are not supported by some of our most outstanding industrial concerns. Certain fallacious arguments were offered in opposition to section 6 in the minority report of the Public Works Committee on this bill. This incidentally is the only section which the minority chose to oppose publicly. In its arguments the minority claims that most of our municipalities are in better financial condition than the Federal Government. This statement is denied by the American Municipal Association, a group which should know as much about the financial condition of our municipalities as any other agency. The same argument might be raised against the expenditures of Federal money for protection against flood damage. I cannot believe that the minority is sincere in raising this kind of an objection to a program for Federal financial assistance which is designed to do a job and to fill a need that States and cities have been unable to meet.

The minority also objected to section 6 because people of certain municipalities, who have already paid for the construction of waste treatment works, will be taxed a few cents individually for helping other communities to construct much-needed treatment facilities. I am completely dumbfounded by this kind of argument for several reasons. One is that any city is benefited by the construction of treatment works upstream. Moreover, this line of reasoning ignores the fact that cities which now have treatment plants may find that these have to be expanded or altered. Federal grants would be available to the cities of this country for such improvements, remodeling, and necessary alterations.

The opponents to section 6 and to other provisions of this bill certainly must have only a subjective basis for their arguments. Anyone who wants a high standard of living for his children wants clean streams. We know from wide experience that we can conquer the water pollution menace only by making up for the losses that we have experienced in years past. We must go on the offensive with a realistic program for control of water pollution.

Everyone claims to be against pollution just as they are against sin. The time has passed to let George do it. We need action not platitudes. We know from experience that Federal action coupled with the cooperative programs of the States is the only way we can hope to get the job done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9540, the bill we are considering to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. This bill would authorize, first, continuation of Federal-State cooperation in the development of water pollution control programs; second, increased technical assistance to States particularly on new and complex problems; third, intensified and broadened research to determine the effects of pollutants on public health and other water uses and to develop better and more economical methods of waste treatment; fourth, increased aid through the conduct of and grants for demonstrations, studies, and training; fifth, broadened matching grants to States and interstate agencies for their water pollution control programs; sixth, matching grants to municipalities, States, and interstate agencies for the construction of needed treatment works; seventh, continued encouragement of interstate cooperation; eighth, assistance in the development of improved State water pollution control legislation; ninth, improved procedures for State-interstate-Federal collaboration on abatement of interstate pollution; and, tenth, encouragement of prevention and control of pollution from Federal installations. These are all most worthy and needed programs.

My interest in this legislation has been deepened by the several letters I have received in support of section 6 of H. R. 9540, which would provide Federal funds to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants. Also, a letter from the American Municipal Association points out that water pollution is a national public health problem and because of the interstate nature of pollution the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to assist in its abatement.

The association also makes the point that the only time that construction of sewage-treatment facilities has kept pace with increased pollution was in the period from 1933 to 1939. This was the period when Federal financial assistance was available to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

As an example of the support H. R. 9540 has received from municipal officials in my district, I quote from a letter from the Honorable C. V. Jackson, mayor, town of Pulaski, Va.:

> We here in Pulaski have followed with considerable interest the activity in the Congress with regard to the possible establishment of Federal funds to localities for assistance in sewage treatment plant construction. The cost and necessity of treatment plants is currently being forceably impressed on us inasmuch as Pulaski is now in the process of developing plans for the calling of a bond issue which will amount to a total of $1 million.
>
> * * * We have delayed our work here in this direction, realizing the tremendous expense involved and the burden which would be placed upon property owners and sewer users to finance such a project.

Mayor Jackson explains that the Virginia Water Control Board has expressed concern over the pollution of the New River, and then points out that this river is a tributary to the Ohio River.

> It is our feeling that since the construction of a sewage treatment plant by a municipality in the situation that we in Pulaski find ourselves is a matter of concern well beyond our corporate limits, and is a matter of equal concern even beyond the limits of the State, that it should become a subject of Federal interest—

The mayor states.

I have other letters of a nature similar to Mayor Jackson's.

Mr. Chairman, one of our Nation's most valuable resources is water. Already an estimated 14 million Americans live in water-shortage areas, and in nearly all of these areas, pollution is a large factor in the amount of usable water that is available.

Federal financial aid for the building of sewage-treatment works will provide an incentive to local municipal officials to take immediate action to eliminate pollution from the waters of the Nation. This cost-sharing plan will make it possible for towns and cities that are already hard-pressed for funds to build sewage plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the strength of this Nation does not depend exclusively upon the endurance, the staying powers of its pocketbook nerve. Contrary to a somewhat widely held viewpoint, our ability to defend ourselves is not confined solely to the number of aircraft we are able to purchase—the number of hydrogen bombs we can afford to stockpile—and the billions we manage to contribute to foreign aid.

Its real strength flows from the hearts, the blood, and the sinews of the American people. And the source is their physical well-being, their social contentment, and their economic stability. To advance and maintain these, gentlemen, is our responsibility.

It is, therefore, a continuing source of amazement to me that when so vital an issue as the health of this Nation is before us, we debate the cost of essential safeguards as though this richest of all nations was teetering on the brink of bankruptcy. We authorize the expenditure in a single fiscal year of $3.8 billion from our Treasury for foreign aid without a shudder. We see the wisdom of spending $51.5 billion over the next 13 years to improve our roads.

But when it comes to the one thing no man can live long without—a glass of drinkable water—we haggle over the pennies.

Many of our colleagues, Mr. Chairman, have traveled abroad extensively during the past 3½ years. I should like to inquire how many of them were warned not to drink the water in this or the other country until they were sure it was boiled. And, as they then thought longingly of the safe taps in their own kitchens, I wonder if this did not seem further convincing proof of the superiority of our American way of life.

This conviction would, however, be somewhat shaken, I fear, by a simple inspection tour of our Potomac River Basin here at home.

The legislation we are considering today, Mr. Chairman, is a bill entitled "to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act." It has been described as an improved water pollution control bill, passed after 8 years of experience under the old Water Pollution Control Act. But to my mind, it is the first really adequate legislation the Congress has yet considered to protect the vital water supply and to safeguard the health of the Nation. I am supported in this view by such responsible sources of public opinion as the American Municipal Association, the Conference of Mayors of the United States, State and interstate water pollution control administrators, conservationists, industries,

municipalities, and other affected interests.

There is no single doubt in my mind but that West Virginia, as well as the rest of the country, will benefit immeasurably from the enactment of this legislation.

The provisions of the bill strengthening research, technical assistance, and State programs are essential prerequisites to the cleaning up of the Nation's water. In particular, I wish strongly to endorse its construction grant provisions. These, to a large extent, incorporate the provisions of bills which I have introduced in previous sessions of the Congress.

We must recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there is a Federal obligation here. The waters of this country are no respectors of State boundaries. If we consider that the rivers of this country total 3 million miles and that the treated and untreated wastes of 95 million people are being discharged into these waters daily, we must see that pollution is not completely a local matter. Of course it affects local people. But it also affects the people below—on rivers hundreds of miles from the point where pollution takes place.

West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, is a State of winding rivers and fast-flowing streams. Consequently, it is a member of two interstate commissions founded under the Water Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948—the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. In accordance with the provisions of these compacts, the West Virginia Legislature has enacted effective measures to abate the pollution of streams and rivers.

Most of the cities in my district are on the Ohio River or its tributaries. The West Virginia Water Commission, as an agency of the Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission, has ordered all these cities to construct sewage facilities to halt pollution of the Ohio River. I am proud to say that many of them are in various stages of compliance with this order.

Some communities, however, find themselves unable to act because they do not have the financial resources; because they have exhausted their constitutional debt limit; or because they are experiencing difficulty in finding a market for sewage revenue bonds, even though the interest rates here are relatively high.

As examples, the city of Benwood has been unable to interest a bonding company in financing a sewage system; the city of Weirton has been experiencing difficulty in securing advance funds for engineering services from HHFA; and in the city of Follansbee, I am informed, State limitations on bonded indebtedness prohibit the city from floating a bond issue sufficient to finance a sewage system.

As the American Municipal Association brought out during its excellent testimony on the bill, H. R. 9540, before the House Public Works Committee, thousands of municipalities which do not own their water systems cannot find money to construct sewage treatment plants, because bonding houses are uninterested in a revenue producing bond issue unless it is tied in with the water system.

Follansbee, Wellsburg, St. Mary's, and Sistersville, W. Va., find themselves in this predicament. All of these communities and their officials are now subject to citation for noncompliance with the order of the West Virginia Water Commission to build sewage plants. Yet, they are powerless to take remedial action until financial assistance is made available to them. This assistance will either come from the Federal Government through the enactment of this bill, Mr. Chairman, or there will be no sewage plants built in these municipalities—to the endangerment of the health of their populations.

To those who would argue that responsibility for water pollution control must rest with the local community, I should like to point out that this bill accomplishes just that. It undertakes to place responsibility upon the local community to initiate projects. So that while the Federal obligation is recognized, it has created a partnership between the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities in the effort to clean up water pollution, which, as the testimony before the Public Works Committee has shown, has become a menace to the health and progress of this country.

The record will show that the only one time in our history, during the 1930's, when there was Federal aid available under the WPA and PWA programs, did construction of treatment works keep pace with the need.

If we are to begin to meet this serious problem of water pollution now, such Federal aid must again be made available. As I have pointed out, in many of the communities of my State, and, I am sure, in every other State, there is the will to clean up, but these communities just cannot afford it. The construction grants authorized by section 6 of H. R. 9540 would enable these communities to get the job done. If we postpone this urgently needed action, the alternative will almost certainly be much larger Federal expenditures in the near future—and possibly under the dire circumstances of the serious impairment of the public health in key production areas essential to the national defense.

There is one other thought which I would like to offer for the consideration of our colleagues. I have the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman, for the banking industry. I am deeply aware of the service it has rendered the Nation in providing the capital and the financing which has enabled the country to become the greatest industrial nation on earth.

Nevertheless, it would seem to me that this present legislation falls into the same category as highway and school construction. When a municipality is compelled to issue revenue bonds to construct sewage treatment plants, the interest paid on these bonds over a period of years is often double the actual cost of construction of the plant. I do not believe that the banker who, along with the baker and the candlestick maker, will also benefit from this construction in his community, desires to enrich himself at such cost to his fellow citizens.

The abating of pollution of the Nation's waters is not merely a dollar-and-cents proposition. It is a sound investment in the health, recreation, agriculture, and industry of our people—precious intangibles, immeasurable in terms of money.

I believe the enactment of this legislation, particularly the construction grant provisions, will enable the Federal Government and the States to initiate a long and urgently needed, aggressive program to abate the disgraceful pollution of this country's waters, so that we may, as part of our children's heritage, pass on to them, in usable condition, our most vital natural resource—clean water.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX.]

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call to the attention of the House the interpretation as I understand section 6, and I refer to page 24, and I quote:

> The term "interstate waters" means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, boundaries between two or more States.

There is no relief for any city that is now polluting international waters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment. The same amendment was defeated in the Committee on Public Works by a decisive vote of 26 to 8 and I hope it will be defeated at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONDERO) there were—ayes 98, noes 109.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. DONDERO.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 21, line 19, strike out "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take any substantial part of the 5 minutes to debate the amendment. It is self-explanatory. I ask the Members to turn to page 21 and look at line 19. My amendment simply proposes to strike out the word "or", the fourth word on that line, and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

As the paragraph now reads, the Attorney General is authorized to bring an action on behalf of the United States to abate a pollution nuisance upon the written consent of the State agency of

the State where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or upon the written request of the State which complains.

In my opinion it would be unwise to authorize the Attorney General to bring such an action in the name of the United States at the request of only one of the States affected. I think both of the States ought to concur in any such request.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment was considered very carefully in the committee. It was rejected by the States themselves, by all of them except 4, as I recall, 3 or 4 of the 44 that were involved.

The situation now is that neither party's rights are protected, the party discharging or originating the pollution or the party being harmed by the pollution, which may request the enforcement machinery to go to work. This means that if I am on a lower stream or downstream being polluted by you upstream, I can only request help from the Surgeon General if you agree to go along; and if you do not agree to it, there is nothing I can do. The States themselves have overwhelmingly turned this veto power of the polluting State down and by unanimous vote they adopted the language we now have in this bill.

I will say, not to be too facetious, that even though you own your own house you do not have any special right to throw garbage out of the second-story window onto the street below.

I do hope this amendment is rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were adopted it would take the heart right out of the enforcement provision of this bill. This amendment if adopted would mean that before you could bring an enforcement action by the United States Attorney General you would have to get the consent of the State where the polluter is located as well as the State that is being polluted. That would mean for all practical purposes that all the State where the polluter is located would have to do would be to refuse to give consent and we would have no enforcement.

I hope very much the Committee of the Whole rejects this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Is this not proof that that is what is wrong with the watershed compact now? You never could get an agreement and you could not in this case.

Mr. BALDWIN. If this amendment were adopted, for all practical purposes we would have no enforcement of water pollution measures.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman's analysis of the amendment now pending before the Committee, I hope the amendment is rejected because if it prevails the enforcement section of the bill will be entirely lost.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just to say that if this amendment is adopted it will destroy the enforcement provision of the bill, which is the heart of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: On page 5, strike out all of the lines 9 through 17.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offered this same amendment in committee when the bill was under consideration. The committee rejected my amendment 9 to 10. Because of the closeness of the committee vote on this amendment, I feel I should offer it here to allow the House an opportunity to work its will on the amendment.

My amendment in striking out lines 9 through 17 on page 5, if adopted, would remove from the bill authority for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to spend taxpayers' money to provide scholarships or fellowships to bright pollution engineering students. The funds would pay the traveling, tuition, and sustenance of these students while they were being educated to become pollution engineers.

The reason the Department wants to give these free scholarships or fellowships to students, officials of the Department told the committee, is because there is a shortage of pollution engineers and through scholarships the country could develop more competent pollution engineers.

The way to obtain pollution engineers, in my opinion, is not by providing free scholarships at taxpayers' expense to some students who want to study pollution engineering. The way to remedy the shortage is to pay pollution engineers adequate compensation to attract engineering students into that field of effort.

The bill as originally drawn had no limit on what could be expended in providing these scholarships. When I offered my amendment in committee, the committee did place a limitation of $100,000 a year on the amount that could be expended for these scholarships. That may be helpful, but it fails to meet my main objection to the Federal Government going into the new field of providing free pollution engineering scholarships.

There is an old-fashioned legislative practice here that is commonly called the technique of "getting the camel's nose under the tent" or "the foot in the door."

Under this technique, a department of Government gets a very small, often trivial amount into a bill for some new purpose. Then in following years the department comes back for larger and larger amounts until annual expenditure for the project which at first was very small grows into a gigantic annual cost to taxpayers. The final results of these many tiny items which eventually grow into giants digs deep into taxpayers' pocketbooks.

The present Federal income tax law is an example of how "the foot in the door" and "camel's nose under the tent" technique works.

The income tax grew from a tiny baby when it was first born in 1913, in the brains of Government officials, until today it is of gargantuan proportions.

The first income tax proposal of 1913 must have sounded unimportant and something not to be feared by taxpayers. This first income tax of 1913 provided that all incomes of single persons above $3,000 a year and married persons above $4,000 should be taxed 1 percent and that incomes about $20,000 to $50,000 a year should pay an additional surtax of 1 percent.

Under this income tax of 1913, a single person with an income of $20,000 paid an income tax of $170 a year and a single person with an income of $50,000 was taxed only $770.

Today, however, the tiny baby income tax law of 1913 has grown so large that the single person with a $20,000 annual income, instead of paying an income tax of only $170, as he did in 1913, now pays $6,412, and if his income is $50,000 he now pays $25,667 a year, instead of the $770 he paid in 1913.

The national "foot in the door" and "camel's nose under the tent" income tax law of 1913 yielded the Federal Government a total of only $71,381,275 in its first year. Last year, this original law with its taxes amended and increased year after year yielded the Federal Government $49,914 million which was 698 times, or 69,800 percent, the amount collected by this tax in its first year.

The gasoline tax is another example of how the "foot in the door" and "camel's nose under the tent" technique results in trifling items growing to enormous size by year after year additions to them. The first gasoline tax, a 1 cent a gallon tax, was adopted in Oregon in 1919. This 1 cent a gallon Oregon gas tax collected only $290,796 in its first year.

Now all States are levying this tax and have added to it and the Federal Government also collects gasoline taxes. Last year, the motorists of the Nation, instead of paying only $290,796 in gasoline taxes, as they did in 1919, paid a total of almost $5 billion in gasoline taxes to the States and Federal Government.

Congress should move slowly in entering into new fields of expenditures and taxation and not be lured into them by the siren's song that proposed new ventures in the beginning will cost little.

The item in this bill to provide free scholarships with travel and sustenance allowances to students who will study pollution engineering can open a new field of Government activity that eventually may cost many millions or even hundreds of millions annually.

Qualified engineers to carry on stream pollution engineering, admittedly, are scarce. Therefore it is argued Congress should vote taxpayers' money to provide a few special students with free tuition, free lodging, free food, free travel allowances, and free textbooks while they study pollution engineering. You may be sure the amount requested for this work now will be 2, 3, 5, or 10 times as large next year as the first request made in this bill.

Furthermore, if we start providing free scholarships to pollution engineers we may be sure we will soon be asked to provide free scholarships for prospective highway engineers, for engineers in the highway field also are scarce.

Then, also, there ought to be spent, and will someday, huge sums for flood control and river and harbor works. If we provide scholarships for pollution and highway engineering students representatives may be sure Congress will be asked to supply scholarships to students who want to become flood control or river and harbor engineers.

Starting these little new programs in new fields should not be undertaken by Congress lightly and without the fullest study of what these may lead to.

I am opposed to this proposal to provide free scholarships to prospective pollution engineers because I think such a new program eventually may establish a precedent that will result in a program that will cost the Nation's taxpayers an enormous sum annually.

The committee, when considering this bill, rejected my amendment by a 10 to 9 vote. Because of the closeness of the committee vote I offer my amendment to the consideration of the House.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this section was recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as being one that would return probably 20 to 1 on your investment. You know that we are quite short of scientists, chemists, and physicists. This will help to train chemists and physicists. In my district alone in one plant, we are short 200 chemists. We cannot get them. The committee was very much in favor, as I remember it, of this research program. In a research program, this is what happens. A fellow may be working on a master's degree. He gets the direction of a number of Ph. D.'s to direct him in his research. Now with the doctor's dissertation he has his work directed where he gives a great amount of time and gets the very best attention by the best experts. The Government gets all that at a very, very low figure. I asked some of the members of the Department who came over to the committee, what ratio would we have, and they said about 20 to 1 ratio.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 22, line 6, strike out lines 6 through 9.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the great Committee on Public Works, and I have the highest respect for that committee, are here invading the realm of the Committee on the Judiciary. They are proposing to provide in this bill what shall be admissible evidence in a court of law, and with all due respect to the Committee on Public Works, I think such a matter should receive the attention and consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary. I really think those four lines should be stricken from the bill and that we should not undertake in a public-works bill to say what should be admissible in evidence in a court of law.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, that is another section which was discussed at quite some length. Mr. Minchner of the State of New Jersey was counsel for the Association of State Health Officers. They went over this point over and over and over again. They felt it should be retained. The vote was almost if not unanimous. There were, perhaps, 2 dissenting votes out of about 44. Then, in further consideration of some of the worries which the gentleman from North Carolina has, the committee went along and I urged it to add the additional language which follows on line 10 and I quote the language:

The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement

The health officers were opposed to this section. But, the industry people, primarily the paper and pulp industry people, were for it. We made a compromise and inserted that language at the request of the industry people to allay what fears they might have about the language of the bill.

Mr. JONAS. I am not opposed to the provisions of that section from line 10 through line 15. My only point is the question of the advisability of the committee deciding what should be admissible evidence in a court of law.

Mr. BLATNIK. I know the gentleman is not opposed to the language that follows. The industry people asked for language to safeguard them, and to consider the practicability and the physical and the economic feasibility of any abatement order. So, we balanced it all. We put in a section which the State health agencies wanted and we counterbalanced that with a section that industry wanted, and we made a compromise. If you strike out the section that the health agency passed over, and leave only that which industry wanted, then the other should be stricken also.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The language which the gentleman seeks to strike out did not originate with the Committee on Public Works. It is my understanding that it came over as a part of the bill passed by the other body.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If we are going to take out any provision as to how the court should act on this matter, we should strike out the part that the gentleman does not object to, because that is a direction to the court also.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the construction that the gentleman from North Carolina has is not necessarily proper, because in line 9 it says "evidence which the court in its discretion deems proper."

So it leaves it in the discretion of the court, whatever it wishes to receive.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it is most pleasing to me that there is a large group of Members present today. The little farmer at last gets a break.

I have here an article appearing in the Denver Post of June 11, "Wheat Acreage Suit Dismissed by Breitenstein":

WHEAT ACREAGE SUIT DISMISSED BY BREITENSTEIN

Federal District Judge Jean S. Breitenstein has dismissed a case in which the Federal Government sought $616 damages from two Durango farmers who allegedly planted more wheat acreage in 1954 than they were allotted by Uncle Sam.

The Government contended that Frank and John Bucovec, brothers, were allotted 20 acres but actually planted wheat on 42 acres.

Judge Breitenstein threw out the case in agreeing with Bentley M. McMullin, Denver attorney representing the farmers, the wheat was raised for use on the farms and had not been marketed under the Government parity laws.

So, at long last the little farmer is getting a break.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I wish to direct my remarks to the enforcement measures in section 8 which, although some improved over the expiring law, are entirely too weak. I sincerely hope this bill works. I hope that with the research and education and the grants proposed to help the States build up their own control programs, we can begin to make real progress toward halting and then removing this creeping cancer which threatens our economy and our security by destroying our vital water supplies.

The privilege of dumping municipal and industrial wastes untreated into the public waters amounts to a great, vested interest in this country. That is why any kind of pollution-abatement legislation, even the mildest kind, always has tough sledding, whether in a State legislature or in the Congress of the United States. That is why the mild and reasonable enforcement provisions of this bill have been attacked and misrepresented and amended in committee until they are larded with delays and entangled with redtape.

Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at the procedures under section 8 of this legislation:

First, a stream or lake or seashore that is polluted within the boundaries of a single State would not come under the

purview of this legislation. Pollution which arises in a State and damages the waters and the public welfare within the same State remains a cleanup task for that State, or for the local community. That is as it should be. I agree with the basic philosophy of H. R. 9540 which, like the Senate bill, S. 890, recognizes, preserves, and protects "the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution."

Section 8 (b) further declares that State and interstate action shall be encouraged and shall not, except as provided for cumbersomely by this act, be displaced by Federal enforcement action.

This law would apply correctly only to cases of interstate pollution, instances where pollution arising in one State flows through or across interstate waters and endangers the health and welfare of persons in another State.

But can the Federal Government simply move in and take direct action, after determining that such pollution does exist? Oh no, Mr. Chairman, the public is provided no such protecttion.

The first thing the Surgeon General must do is call a conference of the State or interstate agencies that should have acted long ago to bring about abatement. If they wish, the participating agencies can pack the meeting with outside persons and filibuster the conference to death.

Following the conference, can the Surgeon General take direct action? Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. Next he must prepare and send to the other conferees a summary of the conference, and he may recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take remedial action. And before doing another thing, the Surgeon General must wait 6 months to see if the State agency is going to move. Meantime, Mr. Chairman, the poisonous and contaminating wastes continue to pour into the stream, and the public continues to suffer.

After 6 months, if the State agency fails to move, can the Surgeon General then take direct action to require abatement?

Oh no, Mr. Chairman. Now he must call a public hearing and go through all the redtape of selecting a hearing board, making the necessary local arrangements, giving 3 weeks' notice, reporting and summarizing the proceedings, and waiting for the board to make its recommendations. Here, Mr. Chairman, is a place where a State agency that is inclined to drag its feet can delay action almost indefinitely. First it can delay by failing to select its representative for the hearing board. Then it can use a variety of tactics to delay an agreement on recommendations.

So finally, Mr. Chairman, the hearing board agrees on recommendations for abatement. Now the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can transmit the findings and recommendations to the person or persons causing the pollution. But the notice sent by the Secretary must specify a reasonable time—not less than 6 months—during which the poison can continue to pour into the streams and the public continues to suffer.

At last, after expiration of the reasonable time, the Secretary may resort to the courts, and bring suit to secure abatement. But he cannot go to court unless he is requested to do so by the State receiving the pollution or with the consent of the State in which the pollution originates. He must prove the pollution and that it is damaging the health or welfare of persons in another State. He must get around the loophole that directs the court to give "due consideration to practicability and physical and economical feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved."

Mr. Chairman, it could very well take 2 years at best to bring about abatement of interstate pollution under the provisions of this legislation. That is, 2 years after the situation becomes smelly enough to force the Surgeon General to call the first conference. Two years of delay and redtape while disease-laden sewage or poisonous chemicals continue to flow down the river, endangering the public health, destroying wildlife and recreation, depressing real estate values, eliminating business and industrial opportunities—because new industries cannot be established without clean water—destroying vital water supplies.

Two years, I say, at best. Let us add up the delays. Weeks or months setting up the first conference. Six months following the conference waiting for a State to act. More months selecting a hearing board and holding a public hearing. More weeks or months waiting for the board to make its recommendations. Another 6 months or more waiting for the polluter to secure abatement. Then, finally, all the delays of prolonged court proceedings that in themselves could take months or years.

Two years or more of redtape and delay, while the public suffers. Gentlemen, your tears for States rights under this legislation are crocodile tears. The rights really safeguarded by this bill are the vested rights of the polluters. What about the right of the general public to have clean water?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it would be utterly impossible to execute an injustice under this legislation, except the very grave injustice of interminable delay while the public welfare suffers.

Mr. Chairman, I support this measure because it does represent some little improvement over the expiring law and because the public welfare demands some kind of program for abatement of interstate pollution. I hope it works and that the States and interstate agencies really cooperate. Because if it does not result in real progress toward pollution cleanup, Mr. Chairman, I predict the Congress will be writing much stronger legislation within very few years. The water-supply situation of this country is becoming that critical.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] for his masterful presentment of one of the most important legislative measures that have come to the attention of the 84th Congress.

It will not be long before we are in our home districts making reports to our constituents. If this measure should pass, which I feel confident it will, and should come unscathed from the conferees, we indeed will have a legislative accomplishment to the credit of the 84th Congress that we can take with pride to our constituents.

I was much impressed by the facts brought out in the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota. He has made it crystal clear in my mind that to a large extent the future of these United States depends on how well we develop and guard our water resources. It has been pointed out that at the present time we consume 17 billion gallons of water a day and that by 1975 the consumption will be 30 billion gallons a day. Pollution, it has been well said, is a waste of water. Pollution can be as deadly to water resources as the severest of droughts. This bill is aimed at minimizing that pollution.

It is a bill that reaches into and prepares for the future. But more than that, it gives protection to the health and the well-being of the men and women of today. Again I commend the able statesman from Minnesota for a great legislative contribution. His presentment has been outstanding. No one could have managed the floor fight with more earnestness or with more brilliant clarity.

During recent months I have received many letters from my constituents urging my support of this measure. I would say that the number of letters on this subject has been as large if not larger than that on any other matter. I have received no letters in opposition. Everywhere there has been shown an enthusiastic popular support.

Legislation providing for Federal participation in water pollution control was enacted in 1947. Almost 9 years of experience have shown the need of significant improvements over the legislation which will expire June 30.

Water pollution control is the key to water conservation. One of our greatest needs in the field of pollution control is to learn more about the complex substances that are reaching our streams and affecting the continued safety of our water resources for human consumption and other vital uses. The answer is in the broadened research which this legislation will provide.

State and interstate agencies will be supported by matching grants-in-aid to help them develop their programs to meet water pollution problems which are growing in magnitude and complexity.

The legislation under consideration incorporates several significant improvements over existing legislation, all based on experience gained since 1948. First, the new legislation permits the application of State grants to all essential phases of State programs on a matching basis. Secondly, research authority is broadened to permit contract research, research grants, and fellowship grants; and, thirdly, Federal enforcement procedures are clarified.

I trust the bill will pass by an overwhelming vote and without amendments weakening its purposes or narrowing its scope.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, 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. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, pursuant to House Resolution 528, he reported the same back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is qualified. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGREGOR moves to recommit H. R. 9540 to the Committee on Public Works, with instructions to report the same back forthwith to the House of Representatives, with the following amendment: On page 12, line 14, strike out all of section 6, down to line 24 on page 15, inclusive.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 213, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—165

Abbitt	Church	Haley
Adair	Clevenger	Harden
Alger	Cole	Harrison, Nebr.
Allen, Calif.	Colmer	Harrison, Va.
Andresen, August H.	Coon	Harvey
	Coudert	Henderson
Arends	Cretella	Herlong
Avery	Crumpacker	Heselton
Bass, N. H.	Cunningham	Hess
Bates	Curtis, Mass.	Hiestand
Beamer	Curtis, Mo.	Hill
Becker	Dague	Hillings
Belcher	Davis, Ga.	Hinshaw
Bentley	Dawson, Utah	Hoeven
Berry	Derounian	Holt
Betts	Devereux	Hope
Boland	Dies	Hosmer
Bolton, Francis P.	Dixon	Jackson
	Dondero	James
Bolton, Oliver P.	Donovan	Jenkins
	Dorn, N. Y.	Jensen
Bosch	Dorn, S. C.	Johansen
Brown, Ohio	Ellsworth	Jonas
Brownson	Fino	Jones, N. C.
Budge	Fisher	Judd
Burleson	Fjare	Kean
Bush	Ford	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Frelinghuysen	Keating
Cederberg	Gary	Kilburn
Chase	Gentry	King, Pa.
Chenoweth	Gross	Knox
Chiperfield	Gubser	Krueger
Laird	Pillion	Thompson, Mich.
Latham	Poage	
LeCompte	Poff	Thomson, Wyo.
Lipscomb	Radwan	Tuck
Lovre	Ray	Utt
McCulloch	Rees, Kans.	Van Pelt
McDonough	Rhodes, Ariz.	Velde
McGregor	Riehlman	Vorys
McIntire	Robeson, Va.	Vursell
McVey	Rogers, Mass.	Wainwright
Macdonald	St. George	Weaver
Mack, Wash.	Schenck	Wharton
Mahon	Scherer	Whitten
Mailliard	Scrivner	Widnall
Martin	Scudder	Wigglesworth
Meader	Short	Williams, Miss.
Miller, Md.	Shuford	Williams, N. Y.
Miller, Nebr.	Siler	Wilson, Calif.
Minshall	Smith, Kans.	Wilson, Ind.
Mumma	Smith, Va.	Winstead
Nelson	Springer	Withrow
Nicholson	Taber	Wolcott
Norblad	Talle	Young
Osmers	Taylor	
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	

NAYS—213

Abernethy	Forrester	Norrell
Addonizio	Fountain	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Frazier	O'Brien, N. Y.
Alexander	Friedel	O'Hara, Ill.
Andrews	Fulton	O'Konski
Ashley	Garmatz	O'Neill
Ashmore	Gathings	Passman
Aspinall	Gavin	Patterson
Auchincloss	Gordon	Pelly
Bailey	Grant	Perkins
Baker	Gray	Pfost
Baldwin	Green, Oreg.	Philbin
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Pilcher
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory	Polk
Baumhart	Griffiths	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen	Preston
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Price
Blatnik	Hardy	Priest
Blitch	Harris	Prouty
Boggs	Hays, Ark.	Quigley
Bolling	Hayworth	Rabaut
Bonner	Healey	Rains
Bowler	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Holland	Reuss
Boyle	Holmes	Rhodes, Pa.
Bray	Holtzman	Riley
Brooks, La.	Huddleston	Roberts
Brooks, Tex.	Hull	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ga.	Hyde	Rodino
Broyhill	Ikard	Rogers, Colo.
Buckley	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Burdick	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Burnside	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Byrd	Johnson, Wis.	Rutherford
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Sadlak
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Saylor
Cannon	Karsten	Schwengel
Carlyle	Kearns	Seely-Brown
Carrigg	Kee	Selden
Celler	Keogh	Sheppard
Chatham	Kilday	Sieminski
Chelf	Kilgore	Sikes
Chudoff	King, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
Clark	Kirwan	Sisk
Cooper	Kluczynski	Smith, Miss.
Corbett	Knutson	Spence
Cramer	Landrum	Staggers
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Steed
Deane	Lankford	Sullivan
Delaney	Lesinski	Teague, Tex.
Dempsey	Long	Thomas
Denton	McCarthy	Thompson, N. J.
Diggs	McCormack	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	McDowell	Tollefson
Dodd	Machrowicz	Trimble
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Tumulty
Donohue	Madden	Udall
Doyle	Magnuson	Vanik
Durham	Marshall	Van Zandt
Edmondson	Matthews	Vinson
Elliott	Merrow	Walter
Engle	Metcalf	Watts
Evins	Mills	Wier
Fallon	Mollohan	Williams, N. J.
Fascell	Morano	Willis
Feighan	Morgan	Wolverton
Fenton	Moss	Wright
Fernandez	Multer	Yates
Flood	Murray, Ill.	Younger
Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.	Zablocki
Forand	Natcher	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—54

Allen, Ill.	Bell	Davis, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bow	Dawson, Ill.
	Carnahan	Dolliver
Anfuso	Christopher	Dowdy
Ayres	Cooley	Eberharter
Barden	Davidson	Flynt
Gamble	Lane	Rivers
George	McConnell	Roosevelt
Gwinn	McMillan	Scott
Hale	Mason	Sheehan
Halleck	Miller, Calif.	Shelley
Hays, Ohio	Miller, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Hébert	Morrison	Smith, Wis.
Hoffman, Ill.	Moulder	Thompson, La.
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Hara, Minn.	Thornberry
Horan	Patman	Westland
Kelley, Pa.	Phillips	Wickersham
Kelly, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.	
Klein	Richards	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Hale for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.
Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Bell against.
Mr. Phillips for, with Mr. Carnahan against.
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Cooley against.
Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Moulder against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.
Mr. George for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Patman with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Horan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 338, nays 31, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—338

Abbitt	Belcher	Brownson
Abernethy	Bennett, Fla.	Broyhill
Adair	Bennett, Mich.	Budge
Addonizio	Bentley	Burdick
Albert	Berry	Burnside
Alexander	Betts	Bush
Allen, Calif.	Blatnik	Byrd
Andresen, August H.	Blitch	Byrne, Pa.
	Boggs	Byrnes, Wis
Andrews	Boland	Canfield
Arends	Bolling	Carlyle
Ashley	Bolton, Frances P.	Carrigg
Ashmore		Cederberg
Aspinall	Bolton, Oliver P.	Celler
Auchincloss		Chelf
Avery	Bonner	Chenoweth
Bailey	Bosch	Chiperfield
Baldwin	Bowler	Chudoff
Barrett	Boykin	Church
Bass, N. H.	Boyle	Clark
Bass, Tenn.	Bray	Colmer
Bates	Brooks, La.	Coon
Baumhart	Brooks, Tex.	Cooper
Beamer	Brown, Ga.	Corbett
Becker	Brown, Ohio	Coudert

Cramer	Hull	Powell
Cretella	Hyde	Preston
Crumpacker	Ikard	Price
Cunningham	James	Priest
Curtis, Mo.	Jarman	Prouty
Dague	Jenkins	Quigley
Davis, Ga.	Jennings	Rabaut
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Rains
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Wis.	Reece, Tenn.
Deane	Jonas	Rees, Kans.
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Dempsey	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Denton	Judd	Rhodes, Pa.
Derounian	Karsten	Riehlman
Devereux	Kean	Riley
Dies	Kearney	Roberts
Diggs	Kearns	Robeson, Va.
Dingell	Kee	Robsion, Ky.
Dixon	Keogh	Rodino
Dodd	Kilday	Rogers, Colo.
Dondero	Kilgore	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	King, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Donovan	Kirwan	Rogers, Tex.
Dorn, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Rooney
Doyle	Knox	Rutherford
Durham	Knutson	Sadlak
Edmondson	Krueger	Saylor
Elliott	Laird	Schenck
Ellsworth	Landrum	Scherer
Engle	Lanham	Schwengel
Evins	Lankford	Scudder
Fallon	Latham	Seely-Brown
Fascell	LeCompte	Selden
Feighan	Lesinski	Sheppard
Fenton	Lipscomb	Short
Fino	Long	Shuford
Fisher	Lovre	Sieminski
Fjare	McCarthy	Sikes
Flood	McCormack	Siler
Fogarty	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Forand	McDowell	Sisk
Ford	McIntire	Smith, Miss.
Forrester	McVey	Smith, Va.
Fountain	Macdonald	Spence
Frazier	Machrowicz	Springer
Frelinghuysen	Mack, Ill.	Staggers
Friedel	Mack, Wash.	Steed
Fulton	Madden	Sullivan
Garmatz	Magnuson	Talle
Gary	Mailliard	Teague, Tex.
Gathings	Marshall	Thomas
Gavin	Martin	Thompson, N. J.
Gordon	Matthews	Thompson, Tex.
Grant	Meader	Thomson, Wyo.
Gray	Merrow	Tollefson
Green, Oreg.	Metcalf	Trimble
Green, Pa.	Miller, Md.	Tuck
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Tumulty
Griffiths	Minshall	Udall
Gross	Mollohan	Utt
Gubser	Morano	Vanik
Hagen	Morgan	Van Pelt
Haley	Moss	Van Zandt
Hand	Moulder	Velde
Harden	Multer	Vinson
Hardy	Mumma	Vorys
Harris	Murray, Ill.	Wainwright
Harrison, Nebr.	Murray, Tenn.	Walter
Harrison, Va.	Natcher	Watts
Harvey	Nelson	Whitten
Hays, Ark.	Nicholson	Widnall
Hayworth	Norblad	Wier
Healey	Norrell	Wigglesworth
Henderson	O'Brien, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Herlong	O'Brien, N. Y.	Williams, N. J.
Heselton	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams, N. Y.
Hess	O'Konski	Willis
Hill	O'Neill	Wilson, Calif.
Hillings	Osmers	Winstead
Hinshaw	Ostertag	Withrow
Hoeven	Passman	Wolcott
Holifield	Patterson	Wolverton
Holland	Pelly	Wright
Holmes	Perkins	Yates
Holt	Pfost	Young
Holtzman	Philbin	Younger
Hope	Pilcher	Zablocki
Hosmer	Poff	Zelenko
Huddleston	Polk	

NAYS—31

Alger	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Burleson	Kilburn	Taber
Chase	McCulloch	Taylor
Clevenger	McGregor	Teague, Calif.
Curtis, Mass.	Mahon	Thompson, Mich.
Dorn, S. C.	Pillion	Vursell
Hiestand	Poage	Weaver
Jackson	Radwan	Wharton
Jensen	Ray	Wilson, Ind.
Johansen	St. George	
Jones, N. C.	Scrivner	

NOT VOTING—63

Allen, Ill.	Anfuso	Barden
Andersen, H. Carl	Ayres	Bell
	Baker	Bow
Buckley	Gwinn	Morrison
Cannon	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Carnahan	Halleck	Patman
Chatham	Hays, Ohio	Phillips
Christopher	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Cole	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Cooley	Hoffman, Mich.	Rivers
Davidson	Horan	Roosevelt
Davis, Wis.	Kelley, Pa.	Scott
Dawson, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheehan
Dollinger	King, Pa.	Shelley
Dolliver	Klein	Simpson, Pa.
Dowdy	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Eberharter	McConnell	Thompson, La.
Fernandez	McMillan	Thornberry
Flynt	Mason	Westland
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Gentry	Miller, N. Y.	
George	Mills	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Horan.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Doliver.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. George.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Cannon with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466–466j) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. (a) In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall administer this act through the Public Health Service and under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States.

"COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS FOR WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

"SEC. 2. The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this section, the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may adversely affect such waters.

"INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 3. (a) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable, uniform State laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND INFORMATION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Surgeon General shall conduct in the Public Health Service and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public (whether Federal, State, interstate, or local) authorities, agencies, and institutions, private agencies and institutions, and individuals in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, control, and prevention of water pollution. In carrying out the foregoing, the Surgeon General is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information as to research, investigations, and demonstrations relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, including appropriate recommendations in connection therewith;

"(2) make grants-in-aid to public or private agencies and institutions and to individuals for research or training projects and for demonstrations, and provide for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"(3) secure, from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of experts, scholars, and consultants as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);

"(4) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Public Health Service with such stipends and allowances, including traveling and subsistence expenses, as he may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most promising research fellows; and

"(5) provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution to personnel of public agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications.

"(b) The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water pollution control agency or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view of recommending a solution of such problem.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall collect and disseminate such information relating to water pollution and the prevention and control thereof as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

"GRANTS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

"SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, $2 million for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution.

"(b) The portion of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for a fiscal year which shall be available for grants to interstate agencies and the portion thereof which shall be available for grants to States shall be specified in the act appropriating such sums.

"(c) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the water pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States.

"(d) From each State's allotment under subsection (c) for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under subsection (i)) of the cost of carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (f), including the cost of training personnel for State and local water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the State plan.

"(e) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Surgeon General shall from time to time make allotments to interstate agencies, in accordance with regulations, on such basis as the Surgeon General finds reasonable and equitable. He shall from time to time pay to each such agency, from its allotment, an amount equal to such portion of the cost of carrying out its plan approved under subsection (f) as may be determined in accordance with regulations, including the cost of training personnel for water pollution control work and including the cost of administering the interstate agency's plan. The regulations relating to the portion of the cost of carrying out the interstate agency's plan which shall be borne by the United States shall be designed to place such agencies, so far as practicable, on a basis similar to that of the States.

"(f) The Surgeon General shall approve any plan for purposes of this section which is submitted by the State water pollution control agency or, in the case of an interstate agency, by such agency, and which meets such requirements as the Surgeon General may prescribe by regulation.

"(g) All regulations and amendments thereto with respect to grants to States and to interstate agencies under this section shall be made after consultation with a conference of the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies. Insofar as practicable, the Surgeon General shall obtain the agreement, prior to the issuance of any such regulations or amendments, of such State and interstate agencies.

"(h) (1) Wherever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State water pollution control agency or interstate agency finds that—

"(A) the plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement prescribed by regulation as a condition of approval of the plan; or

"(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Surgeon General shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State or to the interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, or to the interstate agency, for projects under or parts of the plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Surgeon General shall make no further payments to such State, or to such interstate agency, as the case may be, under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or parts of the plan in which there is no such failure).

"(2) If any State or any interstate agency is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(i) (1) The 'Federal share' for any State shall be 100 per centum less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 per centum and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ per centum.

"(2) The 'Federal shares' shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and September 30 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided*, That the Federal shares promulgated by the Surgeon General pursuant to section 4 of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1955, shall be conclusive for the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1957.

"(j) The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(k) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State (or to each interstate agency in the case of subsection (e)) under the provisions of such subsection for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State (or the interstate agency) and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Surgeon General may find necessary.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall pay to the State (or to the interstate agency), from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid such State (or such interstate agency) for any prior period under such subsection was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State (or such agency) for such prior period under such subsection. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Surgeon General may determine.

"WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board to be composed as follows: The Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be Chairman of the Board, a representative of the Department of the Army, a representative of the Department of the Interior, a representative of the Department of Commerce, a representative of the Department of Agriculture, a representative of the Atomic Energy Commission, a representative of the National Science Foundation, and a representative of the Federal Power Commission, designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, respectively; and seven persons (not officers or employees of the Federal Government) to be appointed by the President. One of the persons appointed by the President shall be an engineer who is expert in sewage and industrial waste disposal, one shall be a person who shall have shown an active interest in the field of wildlife conservation and recreation, and, except as the President may determine that the purposes of this act will be better furthered by different representation, one shall be a person representative of municipal government, one shall be a person representative of State government, one shall be a person representative of affected industry, one shall be a person representative of interstate agencies, and one shall be a person who shall have shown an active interest in the field of agriculture. Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occuring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1955, shall expire as follows: two

at the end of 1 year after such date, 2 at the end of 2 years after such date, and 3 at the end of 3 years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the members appointed by the President shall be eligible for reappointment within 1 year after the end of his preceding term, but terms commencing prior to the enactment of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1955 shall not be deemed 'preceding terms' for purposes of this sentence. The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 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. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to, the Surgeon General on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Surgeon General under this act.

"(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

"ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST POLLUTION OF INTERSTATE WATERS

"SEC. 7. (a) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, shall be subject to abatement as herein provided.

"(b) Whenever the Surgeon General, on the basis of reports, surveys, and studies, has reason to believe that any such pollution is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution and shall advise the water pollution control agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate of such notification. The notification shall specify a reasonable time to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(c) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notification pursuant to subsection (b) is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originate, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary, who may be officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or of the water pollution control agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate (except that the water pollution control agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate shall be given an opportunity to select at least one member of the Board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the Board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the Board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring. If the Board finds such pollution is occurring, it shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send a copy of such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send a copy of such findings and recommendations and of such notice to the water pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate.

"(d) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice prescribed in subsection (c) is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall send a further notice to such person or persons, and shall send a copy thereof to the water pollution control agency, and to the interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate. Such further notice shall specify a reasonable time (not less than 3 months) to secure abatement of such pollution. If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in such further notice is not taken, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, with the consent of the water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to give such consent) of the State or States where the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged or at the request of the water pollution control agency (or any officer or employee authorized to make such request) of any other State or States where the health or welfare of any person or persons is adversely affected by such pollution, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(e) In any suit brought pursuant to subsection (d) in which two or more persons in different judicial districts are originally joined as defendants, the suit may be commenced in the judicial district in which any discharge caused by any of the defendants occurs.

"(f) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the board and a copy of the board's recommendation; and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(g) As used in this section, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of the State.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 8. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this act. All regulations of the Surgeon General under this act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Surgeon General may delegate to any officer or employee of the Public Health Service such of his powers and duties under this act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the United States, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'State water pollution control agency' means the State health authority except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency.

"(b) The term 'interstate agency' means an agency of two or more States established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress, or any other agency of two or more States, having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the control of pollution of waters.

"(c) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(d) The term 'interstate waters' means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, State boundaries.

"(e) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, county, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 10. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 11. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 12. This act may be cited as the 'Federal Water Pollution Control Act'."

SEC. 2. The title of such act is amended to read "An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes."

SEC. 3. Terms of office as members of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board (established pursuant to section 6 (b) of the Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) subsisting on the date of enactment of this act shall expire at the close of business on such date.

SEC. 4. As soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act the Surgeon General shall promulgate Federal shares in the manner provided in subsection (i) of section 5 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by this act (and without regard to the date specified therein for such promulgation), such Federal shares to be conclusive for the purposes of section 5 of such act for the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1957.

SEC. 5. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with any State or interstate agency or municipality having juris-

diction over waters into which any matter is discharged from such property, in preventing or controlling the pollution of such waters.

SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1955."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 9540 as passed.

The 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.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. DEMPSEY, Mr. DONDERO, and Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 9540 was passed be vacated and that that bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. LONG. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the farm problem.

The President may veto a farm bill, but he cannot veto the farm problem. It just will not go away. I know that most of the newspapers have told you that the Democratic farm bill was bad. They have told you that the President was right in vetoing it—it would not help the farm problem. But, most of the provisions which the President termed "unacceptable," in his veto message, were income-raising provisions. Because of what you have read and heard on the radio and TV you may have decided that this is a black-and-white issue with all the white on the President's side and all the black on the Democrats' side. Let me assure you that this is not true. It is not a black-and-white issue and the black is not all on the Democrats' side.

Many of you do not farm for a living. You live in the big cities and the large towns. You probably think that the farm problem does not touch you. Many of you think about the farmer only when you go to the grocery store and spend more and more of your pay checks for groceries. Your thoughts then are harsh ones. You do not realize that the farmer gets a very small portion of the dollars you pay for your food. And that portion is getting smaller. The farmer's share of the dollars you pay for your food was 53 percent in 1945. It was 41 percent in 1955. The farmer's share of your food dollar has been steadily declining, and so has his income. Our great American economy consists of many different groups, but they are all bound together. What hurts the small-business man in New Orleans is bound to hurt the farmer in Kansas. And when the farmer in Kansas is hurt, the rest of us will be in trouble.

Sometimes I think the city man has trouble with the farm problem because of words like "parity." But let us look at the word "parity." All it means is this: If a farmer could buy a hat 20 years ago for a bushel of wheat, the farmer ought to be able to buy a hat today for a bushel of wheat. All parity really means is a fair price. Now, we do not say that the farmer must get a fair price for his crop. All we say is that the farmer should get 90 percent of the fair price. Would you settle for only 90 percent of a fair wage? Do you think your telephone company would be happy with only 90 percent of the fair rate? They feel they are entitled to 100 percent. Parity is just an insurance policy. The Government has been issuing similar insurance to us for decades. Your social security payments are a kind of insurance. The protective tariff for business, the subsidies to airlines and to the shipping industry; the land grants which made our railroads great, the minimum wage for workers—all of these are Government insurance policies designed to protect you and keep our economy healthy. Ninety percent of parity does the same thing for farmers.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND DEPRESSIONS

Since 1952, wages have been going up. Corporate dividends have been going up. National income has increased $33.1 billion, from $289.5 billion in 1952 to $322.6 billion in 1955. But during this same period of time the income of the farmer has been going in the opposite direction—down. If the farmer cannot make a living he cannot buy the things he needs—the things produced by the other groups of the economy. We know that when one part of our country or our economy remains in a depressed state, the depression will ultimately fan out into other parts, seriously affecting continuing prosperity. The worker who is making automobiles, televisions, agricultural machinery and tractors must have a market for his product. If the farmer cannot buy, the size of the market for these products is reduced. This means that the workers—in the automobile, television, and agricultural machinery factories—will be thrown out of jobs. When they are unemployed, they cannot buy. The market is therefore reduced still further—thus more workers will be thrown out of work. And so it goes. Those of us who are over forty years of age know this from experience. We know that now is the time to do something about the depressed state of the Detroit, Mich., area and other industrial areas where so many workers are presently unemployed. We know that now is the time to stop the decline of the farmer's income, so that he may continue to buy the things he wants and needs. We know that now is the time, because soon it may be too late. Yes, we know that depression or threatened depression in any part of our economy is like a cancer. It will spread to all of the other parts of the economy.

There was a national depression in 1929. All industry was paralyzed until the Democrats came into power in 1933 and put the country back on its feet. But we older people remember that the farm depression started long before 1929. In fact, it started in 1920 and the agricultural economy remained depressed for the next 9 years in the midst of prosperity for the rest of the country—a prosperity which closely resembled the prosperity we have today. Those of us who have studied the farm problem are aware that this period of farm depression was due in large measure to changes in the world market and the inflation and speculation brought about by the war. But, we also know that the right kind of help to the farmer in the early 1920's would have stemmed the tide of depression. It would have helped to slow down the shrinkage in consumer buying power, and the enormous reduction of nonfarm production which led to the 1929 depression. For the past 7 years, the agricultural economy of our country has been sinking deeper and deeper into a state of depression. Farmers' income is declining. The costs of the things the farmer must buy have been increasing. He is caught in a squeeze between the high cost of goods to him and the low price he receives for his products. That is why we have worked so hard to help the farmer. His income must be bolstered, not only for his own sake but for our own sake; otherwise, we may well be on our way to another depression.

Under the leadership of Senator ELLENDER, the Agriculture Committee has traveled all over the United States exploring the farm problem. The House Agriculture Committee under the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has taken much testimony. Both committees have held hearings in an effort to determine what the farmer and farm experts thought should be done. The farm bill which we passed, and which President Eisenhower vetoed, was the product of years of hard work and searching study. Many Republicans who live in the farm areas supported the bill. They knew that something had to be done. They knew that by 1955 the average per capita income of farm people, from all sources, had fallen to $860 a year and to only $584 a year from farming alone. The 1955 average per capita income for city and town dwellers was $2,000 a year. The Democratic farm

bill was designed to bolster the farmer's income. Experts say that a level no lower than 90 percent of parity will halt the slide of farm prices.

REPUBLICAN PROMISES

Do you remember that last year, with the approval of President Eisenhower, the minimum wage was raised to $1 an hour? What would happen if this year it should be cut to 80 cents an hour? President Eisenhower campaigned for 90 percent of parity as the best thing for the farmer. During the campaign of 1952 when he was running for the Presidency he went up into the farm country in Kansas and Minnesota and made a farm speech. On September 6, 1952, he said he was "a 90 percent parity man with no ifs and buts." I want you to know exactly what President Eisenhower said in this speech in 1952—and this is exactly what he said—I quote:

> And here and now without any ifs or buts I say to you that the Republican Party stands behind the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic Farm Act passed by the voters of both parties in Congress to continue through 1954 the price support on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have it as a Government handout, and a fair share is not only 90 percent parity, but is full parity.

But once the Republicans were in office their promises were forgotten. President Eisenhower's administration did away with 90 percent supports for the farmer. In its place was substituted something called the sliding scale. Farmers have been sliding down that scale ever since. The Republicans claimed that his sliding scale would do away with agricultural surplus. They said it was the way to get the farmers' income up—doing away with surpluses at the same time. That was their theory. The crop surpluses we have today are largely built up under the Republican administration. They cannot deny this.

Take wheat, for instance. The day before the Eisenhower administration took office we had enough surplus wheat on hand to last us less than 6 months. On the last day of 1955 we had enough wheat to last us more than a year. We had more than twice as much surplus corn and 12 times as much cotton as we had when this administration took office. Prices dropped, even on the farm products for which there was no Government surplus. Between January 1953 and January 1956 beef cattle prices fell 30 percent, and hog prices dropped 40 percent. In 1952 the average hog sold for $42. On March 15, 1956, the average hog sold for $29. In 1952 beef cattle sold for an average of $228 per head. In March 1956 the price was $135 a head. The farmer had lost $13 on hogs and $93 a head on beef cattle. Hogs and cattle are not supported at 90 percent of parity, but they, too, share in the farm decline. That is why the Congress wanted to go back to the 90 percent of parity. It worked in the past and will work again.

The President has completely abandoned the flexible supports, his sliding scale. The very day that he vetoed our farm bill, because it provided for 90-percent of parity he departed from the sliding scale and gave the farmer 82½ percent for cotton, 83 percent for rice, 84 percent for wheat, and 86 percent for corn. And he put into effect the same price support on milk and butterfat, which he had criticized the Congress for passing.

If the past is any guide to the future, I predict that should the Republicans be successful in this election, we will be back to the 75 percent of parity level next year. The Democrats feel that price-support programs should be consistent. They believe the programs should be such as to enable the farmer to plan his operations in election, as well as nonelection years. The administration promised 90 percent of parity in the last election year, but has since devised every conceivable means to grant farmers less than 90 percent of parity.

THE COST TO THE FARMER OF THE INCONSISTENCY OF THE REPUBLICAN FARM PROGRAMS

President Eisenhower's veto cost the farmer $2 billion for this year. The farmers' income in the last 3 years of the Republican administration has dropped from $15 billion to $11 billion. Corporation profits have increased 35 percent since 1952. Dividends are up 24 percent; landlords get 17 percent more; wages are up 13 percent. The farmer is not opposed to such splendid gains. He just wants to share them. But the farmer has not gained. His income has gone down more than 26 percent. The country prospers and the farmer goes deeper and deeper into debt. At the end of 1952 the total farm debt stood at $6,588 million. As of the end of 1955, it was $8,176 million—an increase of almost $2 billion.

The farm bill and the Presidential veto are only one chapter in the Democratic Party's fight for the farmer. We will fight for a more favorable credit for the farmer. We will fight to keep his interest rates low. And I promise you, my friends, to fight—with renewed determination—for 90 percent of parity. We will fight to stop this decline in farm income—and I predict that we will win.

THE SOIL-BANK PROGRAM

The soil bank was not a new idea of this administration. We have known for a long time that the cure for surpluses was to reduce crop acreage. But, if the farmer lets acreage lie idle he does not get any income from those acres. Under the soil bank plan the Government will pay the farmer to reduce his acreage of commodities which are now in surplus supply. Thus, the farmer will receive an income even though he does not plant these acres with crops to be harvested.

The Democratic Congress has favored this type of program for years. Since 1954 the President's Secretary of Agriculture has been calling the idea unworkable. It seems that a lot of things are workable in election years that do not work in other years. If the President had really wanted a soil-bank program he could have used the power already in existence under the provisions of the Soil Conservation Act of 1935. He now has the new soil-bank provisions and $1.2 billion with which to carry out its provisions but this will be of practically no benefit to the farmer this year. It is a case of too little, too late.

THE REPUBLICANS AND DEPRESSIONS

The first farm depression came to the United States under President Harding. The second depression came under President Hoover. The Republican Party is now pushing us into a third farm depression. This happens because of the basic differences between the aims and objectives of the two parties. The Democrats are concerned about the individual. The Republicans forget the individual and worry only about economizing. Since 1952 the farmer has been on the economic downgrade. The harder he has worked the deeper he has gone into debt. As I have indicated earlier, if the farmer does not prosper, you will not.

The Democratic Party is the party of many interests. Under its great tent gather people from different regions and people from different ways of life. No one interest can dominate, but all must have their rightful day in court. Today the farmer, faced with declining income, needs his day in court, not only for the farmers' good, but for the good of all.

In the days ahead, I hope that all of you—those of you who live in our big cities, in our large towns, on our broad prairies and our fertile fields, farms, and ranches—will give thoughtful consideration to the plight of the farmer and what each of us must do to protect him, and to protect our great economy.

A DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1956, the American people heard, from 19 Members of the Senate of the United States and 77 Members of the House of Representatives, through the agency of Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, a declaration of constitutional principles. With the exception of a few members, the congressional delegations of 11 Southern States signed the statement.

What did they so declare?

These signatory members declared to the Senate, the Congress, the Nation, and the world:

> We regard the decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power.

They drew the shield of the Constitution about them to protect them from a decision of the Court established by that Constitution to uphold and preserve the great principles of the Government of the United States of America. Because—they say—education is not mentioned in the text of the Constitution, the Supreme Court has no right to consider any question respecting it.

In the matter of desegregated schools, the facts have been with us for a long time. It was thought, by the adoption

of the Fourteenth Amendment, that a method of handling these facts had been given to the Nation within the framework of the Constitution. In fact, in the school case of May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court invoked this amendment and particularly the "equal protection of the laws" clause contained therein, as the basis for prohibiting any further action on the part of the States to maintain segregated schools.

The declaration is a grave matter. In the background, and, as it were, conjoined to it, are the resolutions passed by the legislatures of 5 of these 11 States, holding that the Supreme Court has trespassed on the reserved powers of the States. And behind both the declaration and the resolutions is a sharp echo of nullification, the political doctrine at large just a short century ago in the days preceding the Civil War.

In contrast to these dark portents is the fact that these Senators and Representatives have also solemnly stated:

> We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.

This declaration is an incredibly important incident in our national life. The stresses that brought up to the Civil War of a century ago are still subsistent and still have the same potential explosive force they did then. A nation may survive one civil war successfully, but it can never afford the "luxury" of another.

THE NEGRO AND EQUAL RIGHTS

When the Constitution was adopted, over a century and a half ago, the right to own Negroes as property was existent in all the Thirteen Colonies, but was little exercised except in those from Maryland south. We also had indentured servants, but these, once they either earned or worked their way out of service, both of which things they were free to do, became free citizens and merged readily with the totality of citizens of the Nation. Negroes, however, even when emancipated, either through some efforts of their own or through the generosity of their masters, continued under the stigma of their former servitude. Why? Because the Negroes, who were on the far side of the pigmentation chart from the Anglo-Saxon whites among whom they worked, were easy to differentiate by a color contrast. It was practically forgotten that these were people with the normal complement of ears and eyes, hands and feet, emotions, and intellects. Practically forgotten, but not quite.

Even in the Constitutional Convention there were lingering questions as how to handle the Negro question. Mr. Wilson, it is reported, "did not well see on what principle the proportion of three-fifths could be explained. Are they admitted as citizens? Then why are they not admitted on an equality with white citizens? Are they admitted as property? Then why is not other property admitted into computation?" Gouverneur Morris declared that reduced as he was to the dilemma of doing injustice to the Southern States, or to human nature, he found that he must do it to the former. Luther Martin of Maryland explained why the clauses respecting the three-fifths computation and the prohibition on importation of slaves were adopted after all:

> I found the eastern States, notwithstanding their aversion to slavery, were very willing to indulge the southern States, at least with a temporary liberty to prosecute the slave trade, provided the southern States would in their turn, gratify them, by laying no restriction on navigation acts.

He followed this statement with an impassioned oration that—

> We had appealed to the Supreme Being for his assistance as the God of freedom * * * [and] now, when we scarcely had risen from our knees, from supplicating his aid and protection, in forming our government over a free people * * * to have a provision not only putting it out of its power to restrain and prevent the slave trade, but even encouraging the most infamous traffic by giving the States power and influence in the Union in proportion as they cruelly and wantonly sport with the rights of their fellow creatures, ought to be considered as a solemn mockery of, and insult to that God whose protection we had then implored.

As you read the records of the convention, you find that the general tenor of thought was that only Georgia and South Carolina needed great numbers of slaves, and these for their rice fields. The facts of history turned this picture upside down. The cotton gin brought a new economic value to the Negro slave, and the great economic rise of the slave-owning cotton States began. The original unhappy compromise was followed by a series of equally unworkable compromises, the Missouri Compromise, and the Kansas-Nebraska Act. There were also counter proposals such as the Wilmot Proviso. The long 60 years ended in the Civil War and the freeing of the slaves.

But the mood of compromise did not end there. Although the Congress after the conclusion of the war set out immediately to insure the protection of the freedom and rights of the Negro, his newly found freedom traveled a rocky road in the courts.

In 1865, the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing slavery, was ratified. In 1866, the Congress passed the first of the Civil Rights Acts, making it a misdemeanor to deprive any person or inhabitant, under color of law, of any of the political rights mentioned therein. In 1866 the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified, which outlawed discrimination by the States in principle. In 1868 the Fifteenth Amendment, protecting the right of suffrage from discriminatory action because of race or color, was ratified. All of these are still in effect.

In 1875, the second Civil Rights Act was passed, prohibiting discrimination by any person against any citizen with respect to accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of amusement. This law was immediately challenged in a series of cases, all of them decided together by the Supreme Court in 1883 under the name civil-rights cases. The Court held that the Congress had no right to pass such legislation, since the Fourteenth Amendment was prohibitory only on action by the States. They drew a parallel between the prohibitory power of the amendment and the impairment of contract clause, holding that the power given the courts by the Judiciary Act of 1798 to "review final decisions of State courts, whenever they should be repugnant to the Constitution or laws of the United States" was the remedy in this situation, not an act of Congress.

When, however, a discriminatory State law did come up before the Court in Plessy versus Ferguson, in 1896, the Court, although it stated that the object of the Fourteenth Amendment was "undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law," took refuge in the "separate but equal" doctrine, which it based on the Massachusetts decision of 1849 in Roberts versus City of Boston, making it compatible with the uniformity of regulation that best assists interstate commerce. Mr. Justice Harlan, who fought the good fight to the last in all these cases, dissented, stating:

> In respect to civil rights, common to all citizens, the Constitution of the United States does not, I think, permit any public authority to know the race of these entitled to be protected in the enjoyment of such rights.

He said further:

> The fundamental objection, therefore, to the statute is that it interferes with the personal freedom of citizens.

He ended:

> In view of the Constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant ruling class of citizens. There is no caste here. Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens.

In 1917, in the face of a contention by the defense counsel that Plessy versus Ferguson was controlling, the Court held in Buchanan versus Warley that an ordinance of the city of Louisville prohibiting sales of residential property to Negroes in blocks containing a majority of whites, and vice versa, was in direct violation of the Fourteenth Amendment preventing State interference with property rights except by due process of law.

In 1946, a State law within the scope of the separate but equal doctrine of Plessy versus Ferguson was held inapplicable to interstate carriage by rail in Morgan versus Virginia.

In 1948 came what has been called the new rule in Shelley's case, when the Supreme Court held that while the making of racially restrictive covenants was not prohibited by the 14th amendment, it was a real violation of the "equal protection" clause for State courts to enforce them.

THE QUESTION OF THE SCHOOLS

The Senators and the Representatives from the South have stressed the fact that—

> The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the Fourteenth Amendment nor any other amendment.

We can ask them quite simply: Why should it be mentioned?

The States themselves had not assumed the responsibility of education at the time of the Constitution. The New England States had, for the most part, schools supported by the townships, the

closest approach then extant to the public-school concept, although their roots in church schools are seen in the fact that the local minister was still an official visitant; the Middle States most frequently had church related schools; and the Southern States, for the most part, relied on private tutoring for children of the wealthier classes, and did little if anything for the poorer classes.

It was not until 1825 that it may be said to have been clearly recognized by thinking men that the only safe reliance of a system of State schools lay in the general and direct taxation of all property for their support. Concomitant with this rise in the public character of the schools was the diversity of opinion between those preferring centralization—meaning State control—and those in favor of local administration. This problem resulted in a working compromise at the beginning of the 20th century whereby the local school boards had charge of details, such as teacher hiring, and the States set the broad qualification standards, such as teacher training requirements. In the 50 years since then, the Congress has shown a willingness to share the responsibility for the school systems with the other two layers of control. It has, in the slight instances in which laws have been passed regarding it, erected a further effective compromise through certain Federal aids to education.

Surely, the Constitution is, and was intended to be, adaptable to the various social structures, such as public education, which the advancing times have brought into existence. The framers of that great document were planning not for their day alone, but for a future with unknown possibilities. In the debate on the Tenth Amendment, James Madison stated:

> There must necessarily be admitted powers by implication unless the Constitution descended to recount every minutiae.

Considering, now, the question of the Supreme Court and the theory of segregated education, we find that the Court never once made that theory the basis of a decision respecting the schools. There have been decisions of lower Federal courts and State supreme courts which did so; but in the Supreme Court, on such occasions as it was mentioned with approval, it was within dictum of certain cases. And as early as 1908, the Court, by implication, questioned whether it could be approved as consistent with the guaranty of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The first instance in which the theory was mentioned by the Supreme Court was in 1877 in the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Clifford in Hall versus DeCuir. This very case, together with Plessy versus Ferguson, was reversed by the decision in Morgan versus Virginia in 1946.

In Plessy versus Ferguson, relied on by the gentlemen from the South, the separate but equal doctrine was applied to travel in interstate commerce, and during the course of the opinion, the State school segregation theory was recited with approval. The decision itself, however, turned on the question of a burden on interstate commerce, not on segregation in education. The remarks concerning education were purely illustrative.

When in 1899, in Cumming versus Board of Education, the Court considered a question of separate schools for separate races, it expressly excluded from its consideration the validity of the statutes providing for racial segregation, and went ahead with its decision without referring to the Fourteenth Amendment.

In 1908, in the Berea College case, where the State contested the right of the college to conduct an integrated school, the Court stated that a "corporation is not entitled to all the immunities to which individuals are entitled" and distinctly presaged its action in the decision of May 17, 1954, with the following statement:

> Such a statute [Kentucky's compulsory school segregation act of 1904] may conflict with the Federal Constitution in denying to individuals powers which they may rightfully exercise, and yet, at the same time, be valid as to a corporation created by the State.

In the Gong Lum case in 1927, although the Court upheld the right of the local school board in an area of segregated schools to assign a Chinese student to the Negro instead of the white school as within the equal protection clause, it did so in reliance on its 1899 decision, which had not really decided the issue. Moreover, the facts show that the plaintiff did not question segregation in the schools, but merely wanted his daughter assigned to the white instead of the Negro school. The Court again assumed rather than decided the question.

The higher education cases which have arisen in the last 10 years have found the Court scrutinizing the facts much more carefully than in the earlier cases. Thus we find in Missouri ex rel Gaines versus Canada and in the Sipuel case, the Court decided that no student should be compelled to leave his State in order to get advanced education, but it did not controvert the concept that the State could, if it wished, erect a separate graduate school to supply the training. In Sweatt versus Painter, its glance at the situation was even sharper, and it held that the student could not possibly acquire the same professional proficiency in a newly established totally segregated school. Both the lack of accreditation and lack of access to the most renowned professors, and the lack of a normal body of acceptable students interested in the same type of education, militated against the Negro student's profiting to the maximum from his training.

And so we come to the case in 1954 which requires integration, in as reasonable a time as possible, in all the public schools. The concept negatively expressed in the Berea College case, that the individual's right to equal opportunity to education in unsegregated schools was within the "equal protection clause" may be within the purview of the Fourteenth Amendment; and the further concept expressed in the lucid analogy propounded by the Court in the Civil Rights case in 1883, that "the remedy which Congress actually provided was that giving the Supreme Court of the United States jurisdiction to review final decisions of State courts whenever they should sustain the validity of a State statute or authority alleged to be repugnant to the Constitution or laws of the United States" were fused into an epochmaking decision in behalf of the freedom of the individual, protecting and sustaining the rights of all citizens under the Constitution.

THE RIGHT OF THE COURT TO ADVANCE WITH THE TIMES

I shall not say too much on this point, but would like to point out that the Constitution is adaptable to changing times. I might also add that it is due to that adaptability that we have—although we seldom realize it—the oldest written Constitution under which a government is still actively functioning in the world.

Justice Stone once said:

> In determining whether a provision of the Constitution applies to a new subject matter, it is of little significance that it is one with which the framers were not familiar. For in setting up an enduring framework of government they undertook to carry out for the indefinite future, and in all the vicissitudes of the changing affairs of men, those fundamental purposes which the instrument itself discloses. Hence we read its words, not as we read legislative codes which are subject to continuous revision with the changing course of events, but as the revelation of the great purposes which we intended to be achieved by the Constitution as a continuing instrument of government.

And thus, about the same period that all these civil rights cases were coming to the courts, various cases under the Interstate Commerce Act were being decided, such as the Addyston Pipe and Steel case in 1899 which upheld the Sherman Act; the Minnesota rate cases of 1913 which held that State powers which affect interstate commerce may do so only incidentally and indirectly; and the 1937 case of West Coast Hotel Co. versus Parrish which upheld a State minimum wage law, holding it not a breach of freedom of contract. None of these ideas would have been within the purview of the framers of the Constitution, who did not dream of industrial combinations, extensive State taxation or other regulation of commerce; or in those days when the employers did all the dictating as to wages, that the State had any right to set a minimum wage of any sort.

CONCLUSION

Neither these gentlemen from the South nor any other persons can say that the court has substituted naked judicial power and personal political and social ideas for the established law of the land.

In the first place, as I have demonstrated in my comment on the civil rights cases, the power was given the court as far back as the Judiciary Act of 1798, to render an opinion in these premises. And it has, with restraint and justice, only carried out the great tasks that the oaths of the individual justices require them to carry out—the upholding of the Constitution of the United States and the rendition of equal justice under the law.

As for these concepts being personal political and social ideas, so long as the Constitution is adaptable to the new forces of life which spring up from age to age, these judges have done no more than carry forward the great principles of equality and justice into the present day. In the Boston school case, Mr. Sumner, who argued the brief for plaintiff said justly: "A public school, by definition, was for the benefit of all classes meeting together on terms of equality."

In the 1948 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, entitled "Education for American Democracy," this idea is developed further:

If education is to make the attainment of a more perfect democracy one of its major goals, it is imperative that it extend its benefits to all on equal terms. We must renounce the practices of discrimination and segregation in educational institutions as contrary to the spirit of democracy. Education leaders and institutions should take positive steps to overcome the conditions which at present obstruct free and equal access to educational opportunities. Educational programs everywhere should be aimed at undermining and eventually limiting the attitudes that are responsible for discrimination and segregation—at creating instead attitudes that will make education freely available to all.

The Court did not ask immediate desegregation. It asked only that as plans were worked out that would be effective they be put into effect. But the desegregation case is a real benchmark in the onward march of true democracy. No longer can we say that the Court has not spoken; that the States may go on as they have in the past; that things that are equal but separate are also equal and identical.

The United States is committed to its destiny; to be and to demonstrate the ideal of a God-fearing democratic nation in the eyes of the whole world.

Fulfilling this destiny is a matter which has now taken on even more widespread ramifications than those of moral imperative and democratic tradition. It may now well be a condition for the survival of freedom in many parts of the world. The totalitarian rulers of the Soviet Union have carefully exploited the issue of segregation and discrimination in the United States and will continue to be successful in doing so as long as glaring examples of inequality actually exist in the United States and are not simply figments of Soviet propaganda.

A graphic demonstration of this fact came to my attention quite recently. An adolescent girl who only some weeks ago emerged from behind the Iron Curtain was in my office. I asked her many questions about the educational system behind the curtain and got the usual answers about the emphasis on the glorification of Lenin and theories of Soviet communism. I then asked her what was the first thing that came to her mind when she was asked what she had learned about the United States in the Czechoslovakian school she had attended. Without hesitation, her answer was, "You don't treat the colored people the same as you treat the whites." She then recited in detail the history of the Autherine Lucy case.

The only way we can successfully meet this Soviet propaganda abroad is to face the facts of discrimination and segregation at home and act to put our house in order. This is not an easy task, nor can it be accomplished instantaneously. Continuous progress is essential, however; retrogression could be seriously damaging. The Supreme Court decision did not insist on immediate compliance; it asked that plans for gradual compliance be inaugurated. This decision, coming 86 years after ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment and 84 years after ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment, is not unreasonable from a practical point of view. It is clearly in accord with the basic constitutional guaranties and must be complied with in spirit as well as letter, if the true promise of equal opportunity for all, set out in the Constitution, is to be meaningful to all—regardless of race or creed.

STATEMENT ON AMENDMENT TO THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since the act of June 10, 1922, dependents of members of the uniformed services have been reimbursed, or otherwise privided transportation, when the member has been ordered to make a permanent change of duty station. Currently, such authority for payment of travel expenses is authorized in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Not only must there be a change in permanent duty station and not only must the dependent have performed the travel for which they seek reimbursement, but, the Comptroller General has additionally ruled, the travel must have been incident to the establishment of permanent residence.

It is frequently the practice of dependents of members of the naval service to return to family homes in the Midwest when their husbands go to sea. After a separation of many months, these families quite naturally want to return to the home port when the ship comes in and the serviceman is to receive orders to a shore duty station. Under these conditions, the dependents, unless they have a permanent residence in the home port, are not eligible for reimbursement for travel expenses to the new permanent duty station. The imposition of the additional requirement that there be a permanent residence is, I believe, superfluous and is not in keeping with the legislative intent of the Career Compensation Act.

Thus I have today introduced a bill which would clearly and unequivocally establish as a basis for reimbursement requirements that there be a permanent change of station and that the dependents' travel, for which reimbursement is sought, is performed, but without regard to permanent change of residence. Passage of this legislation will, I believe, leave no doubt in the minds of these service families as to the attitude of the Congress toward travel of this type.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, very recently a bill was reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs granting certain benefits, pensions, and compensation to our veterans. I believe it will come up under a privileged resolution. I hope it will be taken up at the very earliest moment because, as I understand, the House is likely to adjourn about the middle of July. If this bill is not passed quickly, I fear the other body may not act.

SENT $1.5 BILLION SURPLUS BACK TO STATES FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks there has been a great deal of speculation and suggestion as to what should be done with the estimated $2 billion Treasury surplus anticipated for this fiscal year. I can well understand the reason for so much comment, because the novelty of having a budget surplus is a rarity to most of us.

However, if we turn the pages back far enough, all the way back to 1836, history shows that our predecessors in Congress had a similar problem at that time.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, despite the absence of economic and excise taxes our young American Nation found, much to its dismay, that the Treasury would yield some $40 million in surplus at the end of 1836. As a result, troubled and indignant Congressmen took the floor warning against this "evil" and pleaded the necessity of an immediate reduction. They felt, to use the words of one legislator, "that the reduction would be a less evil than that extraordinary and dangerous state of things, in which the United States should be found laying and collecting taxes for the purposes of distributing them among the States of the Union."

It would be interesting to note the reaction of these legislators to many of our subsequent Federal-assistance programs, despite my firm conviction that our great country has developed and prospers under most legislation of this nature.

But to return to this surplus of 1836, I have noted with interest that Congress passed an act ordering the distribution of this anticipated surplus, namely, $37,468,859.47, to the several States according to their respective numbers of Representatives in Congress. The sum finally amounted to $28,101,645, paid to 27 States.

Although the aim of this distribution was primarily to reduce the surplus, many States used the money to support local education. I include for the record, a chart showing this distribution and the use made of the grant by individual States. It is taken from the United States Office of Education, History of Federal and State Aid to Higher Education, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1890, LC 173.B6:

	Number of electors	Amount received	Objects to which applied
Alabama	7	$669,086.78	Education.
Arkansas	3	286,751.48	General purposes.
Connecticut	8	764,670.61	Education one-half, general purposes one-half.
Delaware	3	286,751.48	Education.
Florida			
Georgia	11	1,051,422.09	One-third education, two-thirds general purposes.
Illinois	5	477,919.13	Education and internal improvements.
Indiana	9	860,254.44	One-half education, one-half general purposes.
Kentucky	15	1,443,757.40	Education.
Louisiana	5	477,919.13	General purposes.
Maine	10	955,838.27	Do.
Massachusetts	14	1,338,173.57	Do.
Maryland	10	955,838.27	Education and general purposes.
Mississippi	4	382,335.31	General purposes.
Missouri	4	382,335.31	Education.
Michigan	3	286,751.48	Internal improvements.
New Hampshire	7	669,086.78	General purposes.
New Jersey	8	764,670.61	Do.
New York	42	4,014,520.71	Education.
North Carolina	15	1,433,757.40	Education in part, internal improvements.
Ohio	21	2,007,260.36	Education.
Pennsylvania	30	2,867,514.80	Education in part.
Rhode Island	4	382,335.31	Education.
South Carolina	11	1,051,422.09	Education one-third, general purposes two-thirds.
Tennessee	15	1,433,757.40	General purposes.
Vermont	7	669,086.78	Education.
Virginia	23	2,198,428.04	General purposes.

My own State of Connecticut used half its share for education and the other half for general purposes.

Regarding the money used for Connecticut education, a very unique town deposit fund was set up and is still in operation today. Under this system, each Connecticut town received a proportionate share of the $380,000 based on a population census, which fund was entrusted to a town custodian. The custodian is essentially a trustee for the corpus of the fund and must appropriate the entire annual income for the support of public schools. The corpus may be used as a loan fund but the money must be repaid within a year, or the town must forfeit a like sum to the State. The custodian, who is usually the town treasurer, has a duty to manage the fund wisely, and may invest, but must make annual reports to the State treasurer.

And so, in a sense, we have today, a situation similar to 1836, namely, a treasury surplus and a need for education improvements. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, what I propose is that the surplus, not all of it, but approximating the amount deemed necessary for school construction by the House Education and Labor Committee, be utilized as a direct "one shot in the arm" grant to the States for the sole purpose of constructing local schools.

Based on the type of administrative machinery created in 1836, I can see no reason why Federal aid could not be extended to public education. Clearly such a system of financial assistance would eliminate a popular criticism, that is, excessive Federal control. True, there are difficulties in a plan of this nature and although lack of time prevents the exhaustive discussion of them, here are a few:

Opponents of this plan may claim the bill would defeat the present aim to equalize national education because if distribution were made according to congressional representation, the States with larger populations would benefit more, and those are the States with the best school systems. But this disadvantage could be remedied by setting up some equitable standard of allocations to the States needing aid more critically.

Another contention: Since not all the States set up town deposit funds, as did Connecticut in 1836, the bill could not utilize the administrative framework. But the town deposit method could be set out and integrated in the bill, thus making it mandatory for each State to establish before the money is granted. There would be variations, since the Western States have differently controlled school systems.

Many will claim the surplus is mainly a result of money paid in by the individual taxpayer, and should be accordingly refunded since every taxpayer will not directly benefit by the construction of schools. But, although every taxpayer will not directly benefit, education furthers the progress of the entire Nation, including every citizen whose obligation it is to lend reasonable support. I am sure every citizen realizes this, and would be willing to support education in this manner.

Naturally, the element of Federal control superseding the existing local control over school systems is a main issue. The question is: How much supervision will the Federal Government retain in order to insure wise spending of the money? Of course, this is a procedural question and is relative to many factors. But based on the precedent of the act of 1836, I see no reason why funds could not be given directly to the States without strings, so long as they are used for school construction.

As it now stands, the Federal-aid bill grants $400 million a year for school construction and allocates this money to the States according to the number of schoolchildren, that is, 5 to 17 years. There are many among us who find it confusing and unacceptable without material alterations.

Admittedly, there are apparent mechanical difficulties in my proposal but the success of a workable solution to the Nation's educational plight insists on exhaustive but expeditious examination into all possible avenues of approach.

SPECIAL ORDER POSTPONED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated and that I be given permission to address the House for the same length of time on tomorrow following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAILEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE MICHIGAN DECLARATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, in Grand Rapids, Mich., the Democratic Party of the State of Michigan in formal convention assembled, deliberated upon and adopted the Michigan Declaration, a statement of fundamental principles and political goals. Although, by the nature of its origin, it is addressed first to the Democratic Party throughout the Nation, it is in fact written for all who have faith in democracy because it is a renewal of the spirit of America, and a militant call to action. Every American who is seriously concerned with the great turmoil of the times in which we live will recognize it as a spark that ought to start a fire in the hearts of men and women everywhere concerning a new realism about human values in worldwide economic, social, political, and spiritual relations. The pronouncements of the declaration reassert the Christian doctrines and constitutional mandates which undergird the greatness of America and ought to result in a rekindling of the zeal and resourcefulness of a great people in resolving their own problems and then reaching beyond to progress.

The Michigan Declaration is a 20th century emancipation proclamation for the entire American people. It covers foreign policy, segregation, civil rights, civil liberty, labor policy, atomic energy, automation, economic policy, agriculture, natural resources, health, education, and social security. It is a vitalized political philosophy whose diligent application can hasten us toward goals of justice, peace, and harmony, releasing Americans from the many inequities which shackle opportunities and fulfillment of needs for the family farmer, labor, minority, and other groups.

Already this statement has provoked wide comment across the Nation. We think: the Democratic Members of Congress from Michigan think it is a great document, worthy of a great political

party. It is a credo for today which we hope every American, North and South, East and West, will read well and ponder its meaning to our time. We therefore are proud to present the text of the declaration:

THE MICHIGAN DECLARATION

The Democratic Party of Michigan, in convention assembled on this June 2, 1956, declares its belief that the world is embroiled in total revolutions of great peril or promise in the affairs of men and of nations. In the true tradition of the Democratic Party, we issue a call and a challenged to meet these total revolutions with zeal, courage, and vision, with bold programs adequate to the opportunity and the need, with policies firmly based on unchanging principles of moral law.

We urge the Democratic Party in the several States and in its national entity, through the national platform we will adopt in August and through the voices of its leaders everywhere, to reject complacency and to relight with living thoughts and burning words the zeal and ardor of the American people for great accomplishments.

The mission of the Democratic Party, as the people's party, is to assess and report the needs and aspirations of the people and to be their instrument to achieve the greater tomorrows of true peace and real prosperity possible for all mankind.

The revolutions of peril and promise of which we speak are these:

The revolution of atomic energy, which, if harnessed to the benefit of all peoples, can furnish the means of achieving a goal sought by mankind from the beginning of time, namely, the end of degrading poverty and inhuman drudgery for all people everywhere.

The revolution of automation, by which material goods can be made in quantities inconceivable, and the leisure of workers to enjoy the fruits of their labor increased many fold. Through mechanization of farms, and greater seed and animal yield, food and fiber for all mankind can now be produced.

The revolution in the weapons of war. The annihilation of whole nations is possible with the weapons of today. Total war means total disaster for all contenders, aggressor and defender alike.

The revolution of anticolonialism. Since World War II millions of people have emerged or are emerging from colonial domination into national freedom. The course of history depends on whether these nations develop in the democratic philosophy of the dignity of man as created by God.

The revolution of conquest by Soviet imperialism, under which subjugated peoples from Czechoslovakia to China groan in misery and servitude. The industrialization and militarization of China under Soviet control is radically tilting the balance of power against the Western World.

The revolution of atheistic communism, an ideology which seeks the destruction of religion, the subversion of democracy by internal conspiracy and the conquest of the whole world.

The revolution of integration, as the evil pattern of segregation yields to the hammer blows of justice. This generation of Americans can and shall see the day when segregation in practice is as rare as human slavery, and as promptly prosecuted in due process of law.

The revolution of time and space, by which communications and travel have shrunk the world to such size that all men are neighbors.

The peril or promise of these revolutions cannot be met by part-time administration of half-way programs under indifferent leadership with lukewarm concern for the needs of the people.

The national Republican administration feeds Americans an opiate of complacency in these times of vast scientific and ideological turmoil. It commits a psychological betrayal of the people by not informing them of the true nature of events.

The national Republican administration has no sense of mission in world affairs, no sense of urgency in meeting the vast scientific and technological changes rolling on us, no sense of a call to greatness for the people.

Under the Republican national administration, workers are unemployed, the family farms go bankrupt, small business is depressed, public power programs wither, conservation policies are sabotaged, the aged are neglected, the education of our youth is frustrated by inadequate facilities and severe shortage of teachers, national highways are paralyzed with traffic, health needs are given lipservice, slum housing is tolerant, and from Tripoli to Shanghai peoples are in turmoil as American leadership of the free world falters.

America needs, and in her heart she wants, the fervor of our forefathers to meet the awesome challenge of a world teetering between a golden age of brotherhood and freedom on one side, and on the other, the dark night of Communist tyranny.

So long as one human being is hungry and we can feed him and do not, so long as one person is naked and we can clothe him and do not, so long as one person is sick and we can minister to him and do not, so long as one worker or farmer is deprived of a just living and we can remedy it and do not, so long as one person is unwillingly illiterate and we can educate him and do not, so long as one nation is subjugated by another against its will and we can work for freedom and do not, the American task is not done.

This Michigan declaration therefore asserts certain principles which we believe can guide the people through the perils and promise of the revolutions about us to the end of justice, freedom and peace for all mankind. Among these principles are:

1. God established the nature of man in wondrous dignity. This dignity is inherent in man and gives him certain rights—to life, to freedom, to the pursuit of happiness, rights independent of race, color, creed or national origins. These rights include ownership of property, justice under law, and the individual's right to a virtuous reputation among his fellow men unless he by specific action forfeits it. These rights apply every place in the world. They are not given by the State nor by society, and neither the State nor society can in justice take them away.

2. Man is his brother's keeper, responsible for the welfare of his fellow man to the limit of his ability.

3. The proper role of government, as Abraham Lincoln said, is to do for the people those things needing to be done which the people cannot do at all, or do as well for themselves. Conversely, government should leave to other associations of people, associations of labor and management, for example, or of consumers, and to individuals, those things which the people concerned can better do for themselves.

4. Communism and all other forms of totalitarian suppression are intrinsically evil and cannot be made right by historical or current circumstance.

5. The goods of the earth belong to the peoples of the earth. Neither any man nor any nation has the right to exploit the goods of the earth solely to his or its own aggrandizement.

6. The right of nations to democratic national existence, independence and self-determination shall be recognized by the United States, while concurrently we work ceaselessly to strengthen the United Nations, and to increase its influence and power to act.

7. A political or social policy of segregation is evil and is not made morally right by circumstances.

8. The fulfillment of man's rights requires civil order; civil order requires obedience to law; the decisions of the United States Supreme Court are the law of the United States, unless changed in proper process. The clear words of Gov. G. Mennen Williams precisely express this point:

"In our Democratic philosophy, the ringing words of the Declaration of Independence are more than pretty phrases. All men are created equal, are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. We can have no part of the corrosive doctrine that any American, rich or poor, colored or white, native-born or naturalized, north or south, east or west—can be one whit less than a full citizen. * * *

"We know that this is an ideal toward which we strive, not a condition which we enjoy. But this idea can never be realized unless we stand unrelentingly for the principles that the Constitution must be the law of the land, everywhere in the land; that no part of the Nation may be permitted to say it is not the law for them; that the President may not ignore enforcement, nor Congress support evasion."

On the foundation of these principles, and in the light of the great revolutionary changes for good or for evil apparent about us, we declare that the Democratic Party should assert bold, aggressive leadership through its national platform, and through the voices of its leaders to achieve these ends in these areas:

FOREIGN POLICY

The moral leadership of the Democratic Presidents of this century, from the fourteen points of Wilson and the four freedoms of Roosevelt to the point 4 program of Truman, gave new hope for the better life to the people of every land. We need now a forceful and meaningful reaffirmation of the great truths of our Declaration of Independence and of our Bill of Rights. Freedom, material sufficiency, and government by law for all peoples everywhere on earth should be the clear goal of our foreign policy.

SEGREGATION

The total elimination of segregation in the United States and the immediate end of discrimination in immigration.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Full rights of citizenship without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, and immediate prosecution of any person who violates the civil rights of another any place in the land.

CIVIL LIBERTY

Protection of men and institutions against false smears and slanders; reaffirmation and support of the right of dissent, and of the right of the accused to face his accuser.

LABOR POLICY

The Republican philosophy expressed in the Taft-Hartley law that unions are barely to be tolerated shall be reversed and the growth of unions shall be encouraged to achieve equal bargaining power with management.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Since atomic energy was developed by the people at large through their Government, private exploitation of atomic energy shall be rigorously controlled in the public interest, and the incalculable potential of this power shall never be used for private advantage over public good. The export of atomic energy for peaceful use to underdeveloped nations of the world shall be energetically pursued.

AUTOMATION

For the welfare of all our people individually, and for the strength of the Nation, we welcome automation for the good that it can

do, and we believe government must facilitate the transition of industry and workers into an automated economy as rapidly as possible, and with the greatest possible protection against dislocation of individuals and business. The prodigious wealth of goods and services available through automation must be fairly distributed. A total review of all existing labor legislation, business legislation, and taxation should immediately be undertaken to assure to the people the advantages of the current revolution in energy and production.

ECONOMIC POLICY

Government has a dynamic responsibility to assist all the people to achieve the economic growth made possible by new science and skills and to see that there is equitable participation in that progress. In the expanding economy we anticipate, there is need for government to maintain competitive balance between business, labor, farmers, and consumers; between large enterprises, which are especially benefited by automation and atomic energy, and small ones; between areas benefiting from new developments and areas that may suffer disadvantages. We must protect small and independent business establishments against the crushing power of economic giantism. Tax policy needs to consider requirements for investment funds for new technical developments, the encouragement of small enterprises, and the purchasing power of consumers. The growth of industry will create great demands for credit, which, unless care is taken, will go to large enterprises and leave small ones at great competitive disadvantage. Expansion, taking place in waves, tends to create booms and subsequent recessions; government will need to supply the balance wheel to avoid both. Above all, we need a climate of opinion wherein growth is welcomed because there is assurance that there will be equitable participation in economic progress by every segment of the population.

AGRICULTURE

Competitive equality for the family farmer with the giant corporate farmer and programs to assure farmers of the opportunity to share in a rising standard of living. Recognition in farm policies of the unique nature of the farmer's risk and the need of others for his work in providing food and fiber.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The technological and power revolution requires planning for a century ahead in the development and conservation of natural resources. Protection of public domains, judicial use of mineral resources, and promotion of public power, flood control, irrigation, forest and soil conservation, public recreation, all must be geared to best judgments of a hundred years' needs.

HEALTH

Adequate hospital and medical care for everyone, for any illness, including mental illness, with the cost to be met by public and private insurance, supplemented by public reinsurance of disaster-type losses. Multifold increases in national expenditures for medical research, with particular attention to preventive medicine; expansion of medical training in all forms.

EDUCATION

Complete opportunity for every child to a full education commensurate with his ability at public expense in modern, safe schools staffed by teachers and administrators paid in proportion to the immense importance of their vocation. Federal aid to achieve this goal in any school district obeying the laws of the United States.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The aged, persons unable to work because of illness or injury, widows and minor children shall be provided through private and public insurance with adequate income to maintain their dignity as human beings, their health, and their opportunity to happiness and comfort. We assert that social-security programs are a proper function of Government and should be expanded in every aspect.

In conclusion, in this century the Democratic Party brought about fundamental reforms in the role of government in American life. These reforms were more than mere political stopgaps to meet emergencies; they were a peaceful revolution of everlasting consequence for this Nation and for the world. Among the many such reforms we cite these representative examples:

The concept that government has a deep responsibility in the social security of the people.

The concept of the Wagner Act, rightly called labor's Magna Carta, that free associations of workingmen into unions should be encouraged as a national policy to the end that labor and management might bargain on equal footing.

The concept that the family farm must be protected against the impersonal workings of the market.

The concept that government has a fundamental responsibility to the people in maintaining and advancing a full economy with full employment.

The concept that isolationism is basically defective as a foreign policy and that the United States must participate in the world community of nations for the advancement of freedom and the protection of human rights throughout the world; and the concept of the United Nations as a means to achieve these ends.

The concept that public power development where needed is a proper and necessary responsibility for the Government in the name of all the people.

The concept that recessions and depressions must be remedied by prompt Government action in the name of the whole people.

Many young Americans have no personal memory of how comprehensive a turnabout of American policy these concepts represent. In each instance, the Republican Party worked under policies of exactly opposite concepts. In result, the United States experienced its worst economic depression; and in the world arena, the American voice was muted by the narrow, restrictive, selfish policy of Republican isolationism, expressed in actions ranging from withholding support for the League of Nations to gigantic tariff walls barring foreign trade.

The Democratic Party must renew the great concepts with which it is identified, protect them against betrayal and reversal, enlarge their scope to make Government grow in service to the people. And we must go further:

To a new foreign policy, based not on mere reaction to the changing masks of Soviet imperialism and communism, but based on dynamic application of our Declaration of Independence and of our Bill of Rights to all mankind, on the export of our freedom and of our moral principles.

To a regearing of economic policies and programs for the second industrial revolution of atomic energy and automation. "We are in the midst of the greatest scientific and technological revolution ever known," Governor Williams said in January. "The face * * * of our whole continent will be made over within the next few years—made over for good or for bad, depending entirely upon the vision and the courage with which we face up to the challenge which confronts us, the greatest challenge ever to face any people anywhere in all history."

To a full facing of the integration of peoples, in the United States and in the world, not only because morality requires it, though this be reason enough, but also because it is inseparably a part of achieving material progress and a just and lasting peace.

The choice lies "not in our stars but in ourselves" to fulfill our destiny.

"As God gives us to see the right" in Lincoln's words, let us rise to the great tasks yet undone. Let justice be our shield, freedom our garment, brotherhood our strength, and peace on earth and well-being of mankind our constant goal.

Adopted by the Democratic Party of Michigan, Democratic State convention, June 2, 1956, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the principles asserted by the Michigan declaration touch upon a number of subjects with which I have been very closely related. My work with the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has made me particularly aware of the impact that the harnessing of the atom will have upon all of our lives.

Unfortunately, many people think our atomic-energy program is devoted principally to the design and production of weapons and military devices. While it is true that the military program has consumed the major portion of the expenditures to date, the Government has also spent sizable sums for the development of reactors for research and industrial uses; for physical research and for applications in biology and medicine. When I speak of sizable sums, I am talking about millions of dollars which even today is a large amount of money. By the end of this coming fiscal year, the Government will have spent in excess of $15 billion for work with the atom.

This force, which this expenditure has produced, has already done much for us from the security standpoint. What it can do for us in the future defies imagination. There are miracles within our reach in medicine and science, production, and power. I am convinced that our investment will pay us off by giving us great medical and agricultural benefits and by revolutionizing industrial methods.

The contribution already made to health, one of the revolutions of promise, already has been tremendous. Brain tumors can be pinpointed by tracers, radio iodine arrests thyroid disorders, liver ailments can be detected and atom radiation curbs cancer. Atomic diagnosis has given hope to people with ailments once thought to be fatal. An intravenous injection of isotopes into a man's arm makes the functioning of the entire blood system visible. Though atomic science's contribution to our health has been great, there is no question but that it is in its infancy. Its future possibilities are immense.

Industry has already used radiation to toughen plastics, and tracers to help industrial efficiency by making measurements economically and quickly that once were costly and time consuming. Food preservation without refrigeration may soon be commonplace. Already it has been estimated that a billion dollars has been saved in the area of industrial use alone.

When or how soon economical atomic energy will be developed is not a question on which there is complete agreement.

There is nearly unanimous agreement that it is inevitable. We do have the comforting knowledge that if our coal and oil supplies are exhausted, we have a potential source of power that is practically limitless. We have the hope and a very reasonable one that a very cheap source of power is, in relative terms, just around the corner.

I personally am confident that we will have the wisdom to use for the benefit of all this law of nature which God has permitted us to discover. Surely He intended the unselfish to use it for the benefit of all.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I join with my Democratic colleague from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] in urging the Members of the House to seriously consider and approve the Michigan declaration of policy. It is based on forward-looking democratic principles and is designed to give our Nation a progressive program designed to produce true peace and real prosperity for our country and for all mankind.

Other Members from Michigan have or will comment on some of the many important features of this declaration. I would particularly like to call to the Members' attention the clear, forthright and indisputable position taken on the important problem of civil rights.

Segregation has been outlawed by the Supreme Court of the United States. Its decisions are the law of the land and there can be no legal or moral excuse for failure to abide by those laws unless and until they are changed through proper processes.

The Michigan declaration calls for action for restoration of the inalienable God-given rights of every individual "to life, to freedom, to the pursuit of happiness, rights independent of race, color, creed or national origin." Can anyone sincerely dispute that right?

Governor Williams, of Michigan, has said about this:

> We know that this is an ideal toward which we strive, not a condition which we enjoy. But this idea can never be realized unless we stand unrelentingly for the principles that the Constitution must be the law of the land, everywhere in the land; that no part of the Nation may be permitted to say it is not the law for them; that the President may not ignore enforcement, nor Congress support evasion.

How can we in Congress justify our position if we fail to act on the civil-rights bill, H. R. 627, which has been voted out of the Judiciary Committee? That bill does not contain all the provisions needed to bring about all the progress that is needed in the field of civil rights. But it is a step in the right direction. It provides for a Commission on Civil Rights which would be empowered to investigate injustices. It provides for an additional assistant attorney general to take charge of civil-rights work and authorizes him to bring civil actions in Federal court to prevent or redress practices which violate civil-rights statutes.

On June 5, our colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has filed a discharge petition which would in effect make it possible for the House to take a decisive vote on this legislation. I am happy to say that I have placed my signature as the second on that petition, immediately after that of Mr. ROOSEVELT.

I urge my colleagues, regardless of party, to sign that petition. This is our opportunity to demonstrate how sincere we are when we speak of our faith and adherence to the lofty principles of our Nation, whether we really do believe in equal rights for all. If we are to keep faith with the millions of Americans and with all the free people of the world who look to us for leadership, we should demonstrate our sincerity by action. This is the time for all true believers in civil rights to stand up and be counted.

Once again, I wish to state that I am proud of the fact that the Democratic Party in Michigan has, by adopting the Michigan declaration, demonstrated its adherence to all those principles which have made that party a great party and a party of the people.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the money and credit policy of the Federal Government plays a vital role in the economic health of the Nation. We are now witnessing the unfortunate effects of a wrong decision on credit policy by the Federal Reserve Board—a repeat performance of the hard-money policy that meant misery to so many families in this country in 1953 shortly after this administration came to power.

We now see residential housing starts sharply reduced, an increasingly high discount rate for mortgages eliminating many families from the housing market, an unusual difficulty on the part of small business to obtain expansion loans at moderate interest rates, a severe recession in the auto industry because, among other things, credit policies have put potential buyers out of the market.

These hardships would have been avoided had the principles of the Michigan declaration been followed.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recent events highlight the timeliness of the civil-liberties principle of the Michigan declaration issued 2 weeks ago. This is a most appropriate time to examine the conduct of loyalty, security, and suitability programs with respect to Federal employees.

The last time I looked, the Bill of Rights was still a part of our Constitution. Yet, the spirit, if not the letter, of this great charter of human rights has been ignored in the so-called security program of the present administration.

There is spread on the record of the last 3 years a shameful blot on the Federal civil service. The myth of the notorious numbers game has been exploded. False and misleading statistics, put forth by public officials, reflected on the loyalty of not only the individuals involved but our great body of civil servants. They have been exposed and proved false. Willfully or through ignorance, it was a patent attempt to confuse loyalty, security, and unsuitability with political figures.

The technique of the "big lie" is a well-known tool of those who would destroy individual liberties.

Unfortunately, though the numbers racket is thoroughly repudiated, the harm it did is irreparable. No one knows how many innocent people will go through life under the shadow of suspicion of their loyalty—simply because of overzealous and indiscriminate labeling of all Federal employee separations in a manner reflecting on loyalty, to gain political advantage.

To achieve this result, laws enacted to protect the United States and at the same time guarantee against unjust invasion of individual rights have been maladministered. Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress is one such law. This legislation was reported by our House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Its history shows that it certainly never was intended for this purpose.

The recent Supreme Court decisions and statements of Mr. Harry P. Cain, of the Subversive Activities Control Board, are final proof of the manner in which the present administration has garbled the loyalty and security program in regard to Federal employment. The right to be heard in answer to charges and to face one's accusers is fundamental to our democratic way of life.

The administration has made no clear distinction between those separated for disloyalty, security, and unsuitability. Lasting misunderstandings have been created in the public mind and in official circles. There still exists a widespread and unhealthy state of public misconception that "security risk" and "disloyalty"—and even "unsuitability" imply one and the same thing.

To use the security program for political purposes, as the present administration has done, subverts our basic American principle of justice for the individual and raises serious concern about the future course of our country, for when justice is thrown out the window, fascism and communism are more likely to come in the door. The Federal employee security program was enacted for the protection of the Nation, not for the purpose of punishing and stigmatizing those who do not think the same as another individual or one political party. It was never meant to be the punitive law that it has become under the present administration.

I hold no brief for those who would truly endanger the security of our Nation, but we must be ever alert not to destroy our personal civil liberties by condoning the actions of the present administration in its handling of the security program. We have seen too many alarming signs that the present officials at the head of our Government appear to be more concerned with their political futures than with the basic principles upon which our country was founded. We have seen one sign in the recent action of the Post Office Department which tried to impose a gag rule, although it is now claimed to have been inadvertently done, on its employees to prevent them from exercising their rights to freedom

of speech and to petition for redress of their grievances, rights which have been guaranteed them under our Constitution. However inadvertent this may have been it reflects a basic thinking which bodes ill for the individual.

The present situation is intolerable. There may not be time remaining in this session to clean up the mess. Therefore, I strongly urge that corrective legislation for our loyalty and security program be the first order of business in the next Congress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a Michigan citizen and as a Representative of the Sixth District of that State, I am proud of the Michigan declaration which our distinguished colleague [Mr. DIGGS] has drawn to the attention of the House. I would like to mention one point of especial interest to me as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That is the matter of health, including mental health.

Over the Nation today there is a general recognition of the fact that we need more doctors. We hear, perhaps, of a family that cannot find a physician willing to come to their home. Perhaps we know of a community of some size, or perhaps a county, with no resident doctor at all. But, unfortunately, the typical citizen is not greatly alarmed. He may look upon certain situations as being unfortunate, but, for the most part, he puts the need for more doctors in the same class of social inconvenience as the underdevelopment of our highway system.

We ought not look on the shortage of doctors as the mere growing pains of a burgeoning civilization. The increase in the number of doctors being graduated is not keeping up with the growth of our population. At the same time, however, our need for trained medical personnel is increasing. Take, for example, the whole field of psychiatry. To be a psychiatrist, one must first be trained as a doctor of medicine. For all practical purposes we may say that there were no psychiatrists fifty years ago. Until very recently society scarcely knew how to make use of psychiatry. But, today, the field is coming into its own. Society could make good use of ten times the number of psychiatrists that we now have.

We have urgent need for doctors of medicine in the field of public health. Thousands of positions are budgeted over the country in public health for which there are no available candidates.

Consider, also, the field of industrial medicine. Large industrial concerns are coming to find more and more need for doctors in their plants—not merely to do first-aid work. That is a minor part of industrial medicine. Enlightened management wants to know scientifically the effects of certain jobs and certain working conditions on the health of workers. Management would like to know more specifically what physical tests should be given candidates for jobs. Management wants to know more about the effect of increasing age upon the ability to do various kinds of work. In spite of the fact that there's a great new field of industrial medicine, it can scarcely be touched because of the shortage of doctors.

But perhaps the greatest increase in the need for doctors is that our population wants, and feels it is entitled to have more medical attention. Throughout most of the world today children are brought into the world with the aid of midwives. In America we take for granted the need for skilled obstetricians. When I was a boy and stepped on a rusty nail, it never occurred to do more than wash the wound and perhaps wrap a strip of cloth around my foot. Today we look for some protection against infection—perhaps even inoculation.

Each year millions of Americans are given physical examination of one kind or another by well qualified physicians—perhaps it is in connection with their jobs, or their school; perhaps it is a widespread effort to discover tuberculosis or cancer in an early stage, or perhaps it is a regular, yearly checkup so widely advocated.

So it is that we in America are constantly raising our standards of health. We feel the need for doctors of medicine in more and more ways. But despite this increasing need, there is no comparable increase in the supply of doctors. And for the foreseeable future we shall continue to see public health, industrial medicine, and psychiatry continue to be throttled—to say nothing of the increasing needs of our families. Our State and National Government should develop more medical schools to supply these pressing needs.

But I should like to draw special attention to the great national need for attention to mental health. Recently I have read that outstanding book by Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Mental Health Committee, entitled "Every Other Bed." Legislators both in the State and National Governments ought to be familiar with the message of this book. The point of the title, "Every Other Bed," is that every other hospital bed in the United States is occupied by a mental case. On the jacket of this book is the statement, carefully documented throughout the volume, that mental illness costs this country 2½ billion dollars a year. In addition many people are suffering from mental disturbance, but for whom there is no room in any mental hospital.

We now know that there are vast possibilities for improvements in the treatment of mental illness. Tens of thousands of individuals who not only suffer themselves, but whose families likewise suffer, could be relieved, if not remedied, if only we had the skilled workers and the facilities to reach them. And many more tens of thousands could undoubtedly be treated with success by methods which now lie partly discovered, and need only further research to verify, to refine, and to make available for wider use.

And this is where Government comes in. I am proud of what the Democratic Party has done in the many fields of health. Traditionally ours has been the party of leadership in this legislation. I am glad to see in the Michigan declaration a continued concern for an ever-deepening interest and activity in this field so vital and so important to the happiness of our people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIGGS. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to wholeheartedly associate myself with the statements made on the Michigan declaration by my colleague from our beloved State of Michigan.

That document is an expression of the Democratic Party of our State in the principles of the Constitution as construed by the Supreme Court, the body lawfully and constitutionally charged with the construction of that great document and the laws of our beloved country.

The Michigan declaration pledges our Democratic Party in the State of Michigan to unending efforts by constitutional and lawful means to secure full equality for all of our citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or country of origin. It further commits us to seek legislation, at the earliest date possible to implement the recent so-called school cases where the Supreme Court overthrew the separate-but-equal doctrine. Under its language, with which I completely agree, we are going to seek such other implementing legislation as will guarantee full and equal rights to all our citizens in all fields.

It is pursuant to that policy that all our delegation has signed the discharge petition recently filed by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to bring before this Congress H. R. 627, the civil-rights omnibus bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

But the document goes further, it apprises the world of our position on foreign affairs, the approach to the problems of the new and developing world, among them automation, and the use of the new science of the atom.

It declares that we intend to make the policy of our party to serve to the fullest the needs of all our citizens. To do this we propose more housing for our people, more and better social-security benefits for the protection of our aged, and wise, and careful use of national credit and fiscal policy which promises prosperity if wisely used.

In conclusion, I hope that all will read this document, and I hope further that the Democratic Party of the Nation, and the Congress and people of our beloved country will espouse the principles of the Michigan declaration, and use it as a guidepost for peace, prosperity, and happiness for all our citizens for all time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. ROGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HESELTON, for 20 minutes on Friday and on Tuesday of next week.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 20 minutes, on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY of New York and include extraneous material.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. ALLEN of California and include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 40. An act for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 911. An act for the relief of Eftalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Zoltan Klar and his wife, Vilma Hartmann Klar, and their minor son, Tibor Klar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Salvatore di Morello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1869. An act for the relief of George Papoulias and Irene Papoulias (nee Birbilis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1921. An act for the relief of Ileana Issarescu and her children, Maria Ileana Habsburg-Lothringen and Alexandra Habsburg-Lothringen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2229. An act for the relief of Nina Greenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2294. An act for the relief of Oscar Beregi and Margareth Leiss von Laimburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2342. An act for the relief of Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2530. An act to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2586. An act for the relief of Annie Feig Hildebrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2793. An act for the relief of Waclaw Tadeusz Nowosielski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2800. An act for the relief of David Chih-Wei Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Harriet E. Van Tassel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2827. An act for the relief of Hazel Elizabeth Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2842. An act for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2864. An act for the relief of Waltraud Grete Schramm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2943. An act for the relief of Moses Rakocinski (Rakoczynski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2954. An act for the relief of Christina Arutjuenjan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2959. An act for the relief of Edith Johanna Augusta Kienest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2999. An act for the relief of Modesto Padilla-Ceja and his wife, Maria Toscano-Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3000. An act for the relief of Francesco Zammuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3009. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3024. An act for the relief of Donald Shang-Pek Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3032. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3100. An act for the relief of Marianne Eder Dunbar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3120. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3145. An act to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3208. An act for the relief of Moses Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3212. An act for the relief of Sita Koppaka Rao and Vijayalakshmi Koppaka Rao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3235. An act for the relief of Cleopatra Vasiliades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3344. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3402. An act for the relief of Roberto C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3527. An act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 3559. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3620. An act to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 3681. An act to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3698. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3723. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land in the county of Alameda, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3907. An act to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace";

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

H. R. 4873. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

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

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

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen;

S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tilbor Horvath; and

S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace";

H. R. 1402. An act for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3744. An act to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service;

H. R. 4873. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

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

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

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 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:

1962. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 17, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Ohio River and its tributaries requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 26, 1952, with a view to determining what protective works are advisable at this time to prevent further erosive action at and in the vicinity of Gallipolis, Ohio (H. Doc. No. 423); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1963. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the government of American Samoa"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1964. A letter from the Attorney General, relative to the awarding of the Young American Medal for Bravery to Miss Patricia Ann Strickland, of Atlanta, Ga., by the President of the United States at the White House on April 6, 1956, for bravery in rescuing her mother from the wreckage of a burning airplane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1965. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to additional information relating to the case of Victor Wen-Hwa Chu, A-6986548, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1966. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to an order entered in the case of Ashun Yung, A-4196469, relating to rescission of adjustment of status granted this individual, pursuant to section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1256 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1967. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 and prior fiscal years in the amount of $3 million as increased Federal payment to the District of Columbia and $18,358,310 out of District of Columbia funds (H. Doc. No. 424); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1968. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Army industrial fund, Maintenance and Industrial Division, Jeffersonville Quartermaster Depot, Quartermaster Corps, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1952, to March 31, 1955; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1969. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1957"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11611. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas, without amendment (Rept. No. 2346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9591. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes, with amendment (Rept. No. 2347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 584. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Customs Court, without amendment (Rept. No. 2348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 977. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of judges of the United States Court of Claims, without amendment (Rept. No. 2349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK. Committee on the Judiciary. S. 218. An act for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex., without amendment (Rept. No. 2353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9500. A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, Wash.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 10964. A bill to provide for municipal use of storage water in Benbrook Dam, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 11695. A bill to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions; without amendment (Rept. No. 2357). 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. House Joint Resolution 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. 2352). 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. COOPER:

H. R. 11740. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 11741. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 11742. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11743. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 11744. A bill to amend the act providing for the construction of the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma in order to authorize additional flood storage and pool elevations as approved by the Chief of Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 11745. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 11746. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 11747. A bill to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 11748. A bill to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services under the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, and by the Postmaster General under the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11749. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the State Forest Board of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 11750. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the State Forest Board of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 11751. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11753. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 11754. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11755. A bill to determine the need for boat basins in the Apalachicola River, Fla., in the vicinity of Bristol and in the vicinity of Blountstown; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 11756. A bill to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 11757. A bill to amend Public Law No. 298, 84th Congress relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Commission and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 11758. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land by the United States to the Cape Flattery School District in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 11759. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that allowances may be paid thereunder for the transportation of dependents in connection with a permanent change of station whether or not a change of residence is involved; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 11760. A bill to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 11761. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 11762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of aiding small- and medium-sized business, encouraging industrial expansion, encouraging competition, counteracting forces growing out of the present tax structure which are bringing about widespread corporate mergers and consolidations, and for the purpose of discouraging the growing concentration of business into a few giant corporations, by substituting for the nearly uniform tax rates now applicable to corporations of vastly differing sizes a moderate graduation of tax rates on corporate incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 11763. A bill to exempt from the tax on club dues amounts paid with respect to any nonprofit neighborhood swimming pool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 11764. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 11765. A bill to amend subchapter B of chapter 28 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 11766. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Horse Shoe Bend National Military Park, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 11767. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11768. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 210 of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to review the foreign military and economic assistance programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to review the foreign military and economic assistance programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. Res. 536. Resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. Res. 537. Resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. Res. 538. Resolution to provide for the creation of an international food and raw materials reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. Res. 539. Resolution establishing a flag for each Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 11769. A bill to provide for the advancement of W. O. Charles Burger, United States Army (retired), to the grade of chief warrant officer on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11770. A bill for the relief of Way Tong Jung, Kin Koo Jung, Chor Yen Jung, Koo Ming Jung, and Poy Kee Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 11771. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine M. Castle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 11772. A bill for the relief of Ramon R. Minjares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11773. A bill for the relief of Pilar A. Centeno, M. D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 11774. A bill for the relief of Eric Forsyth Burtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 11775. A bill for the relief of Jose Guadalupe Gonzales Rodriguez, also known as Lupe Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11776. A bill for the relief of Maria Crocitto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11777. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Inga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11778. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 11779. A bill for the relief of Alberto Teodoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 11780. A bill for the relief of Mikiko Uemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11781. A bill for the relief of Salamon Jakab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 11782. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Prano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11783. A bill for the relief of Alphonsus Ludovicus Rosalia Van Den Berghe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11784. A bill for the relief of Miguel Barrenechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 11785. A bill for the relief of Jang Ngoon Tom, also known as Doon Wee Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11786. A bill for the relief of Ismael Carrillo-Robles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 540. Resolution to provide for sending the bill H. R. 7740 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; 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:

1136. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 241 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in favor of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1137. Also, petition of 37 persons of Greene County, Ind., in favor of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1138. By Mrs. CHURCH: Petition of the Advisory Board of Livestock Commissioners of the State of Illinois urging the Congress of the United States and the United States Department of Agriculture to locate the proposed animal disease laboratory in the State of Illinois and more specifically in the vicinity of the University of Illinois College of Veterinary Medicine and the agricultural experiment station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Problem of East Prussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian American Council in America has furnished me with the following facts which I feel are noteworthy.

In his speech of February 8, 1956, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] called attention "to one of the great tragedies and gross injustices in the wake of those agreements of Yalta and Potsdam, resulting in the present separation from Germany of East Prussia and the expulsion of its population of 2,519,000 people."

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the vital interests of one nation in the problem of East Prussia which the gentleman from Tennessee has omitted in his remarks; namely, those of the Lithuanian nation. East Prussia was, at Potsdam, not only separated from Germany, but also divided into two parts—the southern part being placed under the administration of the Polish state, the northern part under that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Although this decision was only provisional "pending the final determination of territorial questions at the peace settlement," the Soviet Government has, one-sidedly and illegally, incorporated that part of East Prussia into the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, naming it "Kaliningradskaja oblast."

Furthermore, it has completely Russified and bolshevized a territory which never belonged to Russia and was never inhabited by Russians. Having murdered, deported, and expelled that part of the original population which did not succeed in escaping the horrors of war and Russian occupation, the Soviet Government deliberately depleted the country of a population which had been living there for centuries and, as far as the population of Lithuanian origin is concerned, even since immemorial times. This population has been replaced by Russian soldiers and settlers, forcibly driven into a country to which they have no title except that of Russian inhumanity and brutality.

This is, of course, no final settlement of the problem of the northern part of East Prussia. On the contrary, a new human and political problem of particularly great dimensions has been created which one day has to be solved at the peace settlement.

Whatever the decision may be—the solution will not be found in the maintenance of the present status or in the restoration of the status prior to World War II. The conditions have already been changed—and probably will change—too radically.

Whatever the implications and elements of the decision may be—no solution will be just and definite which satisfies only one-sided revisionistic aims of one party concerned. The solution will have to take into account the interests of all parties directly concerned with the problem. The Lithuanian nation has so definitely the most vital concern in what the final settlement of the problem is going to be.

Since immemorial times, this part of East Prussia has been inhabited by the old Prussians—Borussians—and their kinsmen, the Lithuanians. It was conquered and subjugated by the German Knights of the Order of the Cross in the 13th and 14th centuries. It was under the vassalage of Poland and the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth for 2 centuries before it became part of the German Empire.

Through many generations the Lithuanian nation was a direct and active participant in the fight of the inhabitants for their freedom and independence. By united Lithuanian and Polish forces the knights were crushingly defeated at the battle of Grunewald in 1410, which stopped the German Drangnach Ostem for centuries. Subsequently Lithuania, under the leadership of its ruler Vytautas, settled her old border problem with the knights in 1422, drawing a kind of a demarcation line through Lithuanian territory which became the eastern boundary of East Prussia for 500 years until it, in 1919 at Versailles, was partly changed in favor of Lithuania; the territory north of the River Nemunas—Memel—was separated from Germany because of its still predominantly Lithuanian character and its close economic ties to Lithuania proper.

During centuries of their struggle for freedom and against slavery the old Prussians disappeared as a nation, leaving only their name to their conquerors. But the ethnic character of the northern part of East Prussia, now under Russian administration, remained Lithuanian until World War II. First in 1938, Hitler, under a supposedly final attempt to eradicate the most evident and significant proof of the Lithuanian character of the territory, changed the names of cities, localities, rivers, and so forth, into German ones.

The greater part of the territory surrounds the estuary of the River Nemunas flowing from Lithuania proper into the Baltic Sea. It connects Lithuania economically and geographically with the world. The economy of the country, its system of waterways and railway lines, is most closely connected with that of Lithuania and vice versa. It is the most vital part of Lithuania and its immediate vicinity as a geographic unit.

The problem of the northern part of East Prussia, therefore, directly affects

the vital interests of the Lithuanian nation by reason of its history, its ethnic character, its economic relations, and its geographic vicinity. The Government of the United States, as well as any other government responsible for the just solution of the problem of East Prussia, will be well advised to recognize these vital interests of the Lithuanian nation, and consequently her natural and undeniable right to actively participate in any consideration and decision concerning the political fate of East Prussia.

Schedule of Courthouse Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my practice to afford the residents of the 15th District of Ohio, whom I have the honor to represent, an opportunity to confer and talk with their Representative in Congress as often as possible.

In the past, I have established a schedule of courthouse visits and have announced that schedule as far in advance as possible. In so doing, residents of the district will know well in advance when they will have opportunities for such conferences.

Members of Congress receive many letters from constituents, and a great amount of assistance can be rendered through the use of correspondence, but there are some problems and some difficulties that cannot be adequately taken care of through the mails. I have found that these courthouse conferences not only permit constituents to bring their problems to their Congressman, but also the conference provides the Congressman with an opportunity to find out the needs and reactions of the people whom he represents.

After Congress adjourns I will be at the courthouse of each of the seven counties of the 15th District from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Perry County, August 6.
Muskingum County, August 7.
Monroe County, August 8.
Noble County, August 13.
Washington County, August 14.
Morgan County, August 20.
Guernsey County, August 21.

No appointment is needed, and I urge any individual or group to meet with me on the date most convenient. Of course, I shall be glad to meet with residents of the 15th District in my office in Cambridge at any time that Congress is not in session.

For those who are unable to attend the courthouse conferences, I should like to announce at this time that I will be present at each of the county fairs where those who wish to meet informally with me may do so. I shall be present at the fairs on the following dates:

Muskingum County Fair, August 16.
Noble County Fair, August 30.
Washington County Fair, September 3.
Morgan County Fair, September 6.
Guernsey County Fair, September 27.
Barlow Fair, September 29.

If Congress has adjourned by the dates of the Monroe and Perry County Fairs, I shall attend those fairs also, on the following dates:

Monroe County Fair, July 26.
Perry County Fair, August 2.

Alert in the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the article, "Billion-Dollar Gamble That Failed?", which appeared in the June 15 issue of the U. S. News & World Report. I ask that particular attention be given the closing paragraphs of this article, subtitled, "Alert in the Pentagon," which follow:

ALERT IN THE PENTAGON

Tito's game, whatever it is, has shaken the United States. Senators heard Yugoslav exiles testify that Tito has helped Moscow all along. The House banned all aid to Tito unless the President orders that it be continued.

The Pentagon's experts, when United States military aid first went to Yugoslavia, had trouble finding out just how the aid was used. Now, however, several hundred United States military men are moving about in Yugoslavia checking up on United States equipment and providing the United States with valuable intelligence on the whole area.

Yugoslavia's army, these observers report, now has so much United States equipment that it is dependent on a $50 million flow of parts and supplies from the United States to keep going. Tito, once again, would become completely dependent on Russia if United States aid ended.

Tito himself, in Moscow, coolly said: "Our relations with the United States will not suffer." And Tito's friends say he knows he will be in trouble with his own Yugoslavs if he breaks his United States ties.

In the weeks just ahead, however, American policymakers will be taking another look at Tito. They must decide whether Tito has enough independence left to warrant any United States aid, or whether he is back on Moscow's side after a billion-dollar buildup from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the foregoing statement that the United States has several hundred military men moving about in Yugoslavia were true. However, in the testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the Mutual Security Act of 1956, it is brought out that we actually have 55 people assigned for this purpose in Yugoslavia. Following is a transcript of the committee testimony:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder whether the question of Yugoslavia's cooperation in compliance with the law of inspection has come up. I would guess that came up for discussion.

Chairman RICHARDS. It hasn't come up, and it is a good question to raise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Last year that formed quite an important part of the legislative history.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MCGUIRE. That is right. General Waters, I believe, in the first week in February went out and made a complete inspection trip, which is the first time that has happened to our MAAG in Yugoslavia.

Mrs. KELLY. How many military are in our MAAG mission in Yugoslavia? I want to know that. I want to know how many are in all the countries.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mrs. KELLY, don't hold me to this figure, I am doing it from memory. That is one of the other questions, that we could have people in there. They did raise that ceiling.

I think, if I recall correctly, we had 45 and we now have 60.

Mrs. KELLY. How many have you in Turkey?

Mr. MCGUIRE. That I can't answer you. I will say you have a little different mission in Turkey; a substantial amount more. Because in Turkey you have a training mission along with the MAAG activity.

(The following information was supplied for the record:)

"As a result of the visit by Deputy Under Secretary of State Murphy last summer, the Yugoslavs have authorized an increase in the size of the MAAG to a total of 60 United States nationals. As of November 30, the following United States personnel were assigned: 27 Army, 8 Navy, 14 Air Force, 6 civilians—total 55.

"The strength of JAMMAT Turkey as of November 30, 1955, was as follows: 97 Army, 35 Navy, 51 Air Force, 34 United States civilians—total 217. These figures do not include 368 United States personnel engaged in training activities with the Turkish armed forces."

(Discussion off the record.)

Mrs. KELLY. Do you know how many personnel we have in the United States Embassy in Yugoslavia, and how many has Russia been permitted to send into Yugoslavia?

Mr. MCGUIRE. I don't know.

Mrs. KELLY. Will you find that out?

Mr. MCGUIRE. I think the State Department will have to answer that.

Mr. ELBRICK. I will find out. I am not sure that we have information here. We can give it to you.

Chairman RICHARDS. Will you provide that information?

Mr. ELBRICK. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

(The information requested is as follows:)

"The total number of United States Government personnel stationed in Yugoslavia at the present time is 172 persons, including Embassy and military personnel, ICA personnel, marine guards, USIA employees, etc. Of these, 55 are connected with the MAAG mission, 8 are stationed at the United States consulate in Zagreb, and the remaining 109 are connected with the Embassy in Belgrade.

"The exact number of Soviet Government personnel stationed in Yugoslavia is not known. The number of Soviet personnal with diplomatic status is known to be 16, which would indicate a total complement of approximately 50 persons. We have no information indicating that there are any Soviet military personnel in Yugoslavia in a status similar to our MAAG mission."

Chairman RICHARDS. Do you want to ask a question, Mr. BYRD?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mrs. KELLY. I was going to ask, Mr. Chairman, did you ever think—I am sure you did—of the other side of the equation, of their attitude of playing both sides against the middle. This attitude hurts the anti-Communist world to a degree where those nations we are trying to aline with the West become neutral. They can say, "Well, look what you do for Yugoslavia. Twice as much. We will do the same thing, play both sides against the middle." We are coerced into being blackmailed all along the line.

A Flag for Members of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a House resolution which would provide for a flag for Members of the House of Representatives.

All of us, particularly those who have been members of the armed services of the Nation from time to time and even more particularly those Members of the House who own small boats and pleasure craft, are conscious of the use of flags to designate the high civilian officials in a great variety of Government departments and to identify the presence of the flag officers in the military service on ships, on boats, on other conveyances, and over headquarters such flags are constantly used to indicate the presence of the persons which they respectively represent.

The conversations and suggestions of a number of Members of the House aroused my curiosity concerning the subject. I wrote to Mr. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and learned that there is no official flag for Members of Congress in existence. He suggested that if it were desirable to have one the purpose might be accomplished by a simple resolution of the House. I will include as a part of these remarks his letter to me of August 22, 1955.

At Mr. Griffith's suggestion I got in touch with the Heraldic Branch of the United States Army, which handles such questions for the executive branch of the Government. Colonel Laux and Mr. DuBois of that agency furnished me with a study explaining how flags for the United States Government officials are designed and including a statement concerning the background of the suggested designs for flags for Members of Congress. I will include, as a part of these remarks, the letter, dated August 9, 1955, which was written to me by Colonel Laux and the statement which he entitled "Schematic Philosophy in Creating Flag Designs for United States Officials." The flag suggested would have a red or blue background on which would appear the shield of the coat of arms of the United States, in the usual red, white, and blue, encircled by a wreath of oak and all surrounded by 13 gold stars. The finial piece, which is the ornament on the top end of the flagstaff, might be a reproduction of the Capitol dome in gold color metal.

Either red or blue as a background would be appropriate to either House of Congress. Having in mind that the House Chamber is decorated in blue and gold while the Senate Chamber is decorated in red and gold, I concluded to use the blue background in describing the color of the flag for Members of the House of Representatives in drafting the resolution which I introduced.

With his letter Colonel Laux also furnished me with designs and sketches of the proposed flags in color and of the proposed finial piece. These I will submit to the chairman of the committee to which the resolution is referred if such is his desire.

The resolution which I have introduced is based upon a draft which was furnished to me, at my request, by the Office of the Quartermaster General.

The drafting service was very much appreciated as the subject is a technical one, and I express my thanks therefor. It was, I should note, a drafting service only and did not necessarily represent a policy position of the Department of Defense.

The letters and documents to which I have referred above read as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
August 22, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Reference is made to your letter of July 19, 1955, concerning an official flag for Members of Congress.

So far as we have been able to ascertain, there is no such flag now in existence.

Regarding the appropriateness and symbolism of the proposed design which you mention; this is a fairly technical subject upon which we would prefer to refer you to a recognized authority. We suggest that you get in touch with the heraldic branch of the United States Army, which handles such questions for the executive branch. (Mr. DuBois, Code 131, Extension 52901.)

The third point which you mention concerns the necessity of legislative action for adopting such a flag. We have found no instance where a flag of a Government official has been adopted by means of a public law. The President's flag and that of the Governor of the Panama Canal are based upon Executive order. Those of the other officials are based upon departmental action. It would seem that comparable authority for a congressional flag would be found in a concurrent resolution (assuming that the Senate were asked to join) or by simple resolution of either House. Such authorization, however, would apparently not carry with it any legal obligation to official recognition by other Government agencies. If it is desired to insure official recognition, it would seem that it should be accomplished by a public law.

We are forwarding a copy of Lloyd's Register of American Yachts, containing a section in which the private signals of yachtsmen are reproduced, which indicates anyone or any group may adopt a private flag.

Sincerely yours,
ERNEST S. GRIFFITH, *Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
August 9, 1955.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Reference is made to your letter, 19 July 1955, and letter from the Office of the Quartermaster General, 1 August 1955, concerning a proposed flag design for Members of Congress.

Careful study has been given to your request, and suggested designs are enclosed for your consideration. (See enclosure 1.) Also enclosed is an explanatory statement concerning the concept of this Office in creating the designs for flags for United States Government officials. This statement includes the background of the suggested designs for the flags for Members of Congress.

It is hoped the proposed designs are satisfactory. If they are approved, action will be taken, at your request, to prepare manufacturing the drawings for the flags.

Respectfully yours,
RAY J. LAUX,
Colonel QMC, Executive Officer.

SCHEMATIC PHILOSOPHY IN CREATING FLAG DESIGNS FOR UNITED STATES OFFICIALS

1. DESIGN (STAR ARRANGEMENT)

(a) Circle of stars around central design of the flag is reserved for the President and Vice President of the United States.

(b) Four stars in bend direction appear on the flag for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(c) Corner stars on flags are reserved for civilian appointive Secretaries of Departments and Governors of States.

(d) Deputies, Under and Assistant Secretaries of departments use the same design as that for Secretaries, but the colors are reversed.

(e) Rank for naval flag officers is indicated on vertical center line or extremity of imaginary geometrical figures.

(f) Army and Air Force military personnel have stars on horizontal center line and extremity of a geometrical figure.

2. DESIGN (COLOR OF BACKGROUND)

(a) President's flag: Dark blue.

(b) Vice President's flag: White.

(c) Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff: Red and white; diagonally divided.

(d) Secretaries of departments: Various colors, with white stars.

(e) Deputy Secretary, Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary of departments: White with colored stars.

(f) Navy flag officer: Dark navy blue, white stars.

(g) General officers of the Army: Scarlet, white stars.

(h) General officers of the Air Force: Ultramarine blue, white stars.

NOTE.—Military grade is indicated on uniforms by silver stars; it is symbolically represented on flag designs by white stars.

3. FLAGS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND PRESIDING OFFICERS

(a) Vice President or President of the United States Senate (already adopted): White (Executive Order No. 10016, November 10, 1948.)

(b) President pro tempore of the Senate: To be determined.

(c) Members of the House of Representatives: Blue background, honor color from the flag of the United States, representing vigilance, perseverance, and justice.

(d) Speaker of the House: To be determined.

(e) Members of the Senate: Red background, color from the flag of the United States, representing hardiness and valor.

(f) Design: Inasmuch as the military ranks are represented by silver stars on the uniform and white stars on the flags, it is suggested the flag designs for Senators and Representatives have gold (or yellow) stars which will be distinctive to the legislative branch of the Government as distinguished from the executive branch. The shield of the coat of arms of the United States as described in RS 1793 (4 U. S. C. 4) is composed of 13 palys argent (white) and gules (red) alternated, a chief azure (blue). The 13 palys represent the Original Thirteen Colonies with the chief uniting the colonies and representing Congress. Therefore, this design encircled by a wreath of oak representing strength, all surrounded by 13 gold (yellow) stars, is most appropriate for use on flags of the legislative body. This central design would appear on both the Senators' and Representatives' flags. This central design could also appropriately be reproduced as a lapel

button for wear by Members or former Members of Congress.

(g) Sizes: The flags should conform in size to the normal Armed Forces systems and for private boat use they should be appropriate for the boat on which displayed.

(h) Finial piece: Inasmuch as the eagle is prescribed as a finial design for the President's flagstaffs (the gilt halberd ball, gilt star are used by the Navy, and acorn and spearhead by the Army and Air Force) it is suggested that a reproduction of the Capitol Dome in gold color metal be used by Members of Congress as their distinctive finial piece.

Appraisal of Air Force Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a most excellent speech entitled "Appraisal of Air Force Public Relations," which was delivered by our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], before the Air War College, Montgomery, Ala., on June 12, 1956.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate the thinking of the junior Senator from Arizona with respect to the problems of the Air Force in its public relations.

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

APPRAISAL OF AIR FORCE PUBLIC RELATIONS

(By United States Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, delivered before Air War College, Montgomery, Ala., June 12, 1956)

Boiled down to its basic requirements, public relations is a simple practice. It calls for a measure of clear thinking to develop the problem, the application of commonsense to its presentation, and a great deal of energy all of the time.

I would add one more dimension to this operation: a recognition of the faith and confidence of the American people in the truth. The greatest lie-detector ever devised is the American mind in its constant search for the truth and the facts that are involved in the truth. Be phony about solving your problem and 165 million Americans will point a finger at you, and your public relations explodes like a tattooed bubble. Be factual and honest and these people will buy your product.

Our product is our Air Force. Our problem is how better to sell it to our citizens. With your permission, I should like to apply the public relations approach I have outlined to this problem. We can break it down into its several parts; look at each one separately; and, then, reassemble them into a whole to find conclusions that will strengthen our position.

This effort, in my opinion, encompasses an understanding of, one, the proper role of the military in shaping national policy; two, the development of airpower as the dominant force in our national military strategy; three, the effectiveness of the Air Force in interpreting the potentialities of airpower; and four, the public relations measures which could and should be taken to develop better understanding and support of airpower as the dominant factor in modern war.

Proceeding, then, to a discussion of the next part of our problem for today, the obstacles to the development of airpower as that dominant force, it is necessary to recall certain fundamentals. These are, of course, familiar to you, but to the American people they are news; for we have been too busy publicizing the speed of our planes to tell the people why that speed is needed. We have been too busy selling the glamour of flying to explain the hard, strenuous, and back-breaking work that goes into creating an air force of which glamour is only an incidental byproduct. Having great faith in the fable of the tortoise and the hare, I shall now assume the role of the tortoise in attempting to develop this broader viewpoint for our people and, at the same time, to offer some thoughts as to how we can overcome the existing obstacles to our goal.

The role of the military in the conduct of our national and international affairs has, in the past, been confined to the actual conduct of the wars in which we have been involved. During periods of peace, when a nation should be building up and maintaining its military strength, and reviewing carefully the role of the military in the formation of any national policy, our military, until recently, has been subservient to the needs of peace. That relationship is a historic one in this country, and I do not argue at this time that it is wrong, or that it should be changed. Rather, my discussion today will be along the lines of reconsidering the historic role of the military in the United States, and its relationship to our national and international policies, to the end of determining how we can best approach the problems that confront the military today as it accepts its responsibilities in the formation of these policies.

Prior to World War I, the United States was not particularly concerned with the impact of wars that raged in other parts of the world. In fact, those wars had only an economic impact on the United States and we grew up in our history as an island, separated from the troubles of Europe and Asia. With the exception of the war with Mexico, our relationship with our neighbors in North America has been on an exceedingly friendly basis, so we have not had to be concerned over the possibility of conflict with either Mexico or Canada.

Because of our isolated position, we never considered the necessity of alliances with other nations far removed from our shores. In contrast to this situation, we know that in Europe it has been a long-established practice for the various countries to give assurances of mutual assistance to each other or to give direct aid by the signing of offensive and defensive alliances.

After World War I we began to be concerned about the international aspect of war and its impact upon our own country; and by the conclusion of World War II it was obvious to our leaders that alliances of the kind long practiced in Europe should be entered into by this country with friendly nations in order to combat the growing threat of communism.

Alliances involve international politics and hence strongly affect national politics. Consequently, there are signs of a growing awareness in this country of the true nature of war itself and of war's position in our planning and strategy. Despite alliances with countries far removed from our immediate proximity, however, the understanding of military force as an instrument of national policy has as yet been too slowly and too narrowly developed.

War enters the field of politics again when we realize the need for unity among our allies. This unity is achieved in a large measure by the machinations of politics; therefore, war is only a part of political intercourse and is by no means an independent and isolated thing in itself. It is important that we realize this truth at this point in our discussion, because we are concerned with what you, as Air Force officers, and I, as a politician, can do to bring home to the American people the place of the military in forming and promulgating our national policy. To my mind, it is of the utmost importance to tell the American people—and the sooner the better—that military force is not an isolated thing, as we have in the past considered it to be, but that it is an integral and intimate part of our national policy—in fact, an instrument of national policy.

Now I do not propose that we create an hysteria among our people in connection with this program of education. Quite to the contrary, I suggest that we follow sane and sensible methods to bring home to our citizenry the realization of war's position today and the fact that we must be constantly alerted to its dangers as well as to its potentials for peace.

Having recognized that military force is an instrument of national policy and, because of the need for unity, that war is only a part of political intercourse and, therefore, is not an isolated thing, we must recognize, too, that the business of war has become the business of everyone. We must also admit that the conduct of war has become the business of everyone. This does not mean, of course, the actual direction of the military in the field, on the sea, or in the air, but the conduct of war insofar as the citizenry works in unity with the military to create the continuing sinews of war and to provide the giant manpower pools needed by the military, and the understanding needed for unity. Since war is everybody's business, the military joins the team and assumes an active part in the formation of national policy in times of peace as well as in times of war. In fact, we can say today that the recognition of the proper role of the military in the shaping of our national and international policies might well be the instrument by which we can maintain peace.

We have been discussing the broad role of the military in the formation of national policy. We have touched briefly upon the definition of war which I feel is the chief part of the problem under discussion today. If there can be accomplished through education a broad acceptance of these definitions and the logical conclusions they give to the military's role in forming national policy, then we in this Nation will be fully receptive to the place of the Air Force as the dominant force in our national military strategy.

In order more fully to develop the role of airpower in this regard, it is necessary to revert to history—to that portion of the history of transportation and the development of weapons systems that brought about seapower. Great Britain, you will recall, mastered ocean navigation and likewise mastered the weapons system of the sea when, in 1588, she defeated Spain in the first modern naval battle. Great Britain continued to be dominant in this new field of transportation and to be dominant, also, in the utilization of this new weapons system. By the judicious use of both, she was able to maintain a peaceful situation for many years.

In the air age, however, Great Britain no longer dominates the world as she did when seapower was her strength. The thesis of Admiral Mahan is now only valid as it applies to a new element—the air. Great Britain was quick to recognize this change, and accepted the fact that, with this new dimension in the element of power, surface forces and surface strategies were vulnerable and obsolete. The Royal Air Force replaced the Royal Navy as the key to her military doctrine. History having overtaken the British Navy, that country's air force has assumed the dominant role. The reasoning of Billy Mitchell now applies. Just as it once was necessary to bring matters to an issue upon the broad sea, it is now possible to resolve

conflict only in the medium of the limitless skies.

We should now examine our military policies to see how we can best bring matters to an issue in the vast expanse of the sky and, by so doing, maintain peace throughout the world, as England so successfully did when following that concept by the proper use of seapower. On January 12, 1954, Secretary of State Dulles made a speech which I feel was not too thoroughly understood by the American people. It was entitled "The Evolution of Foreign Policy," and it became controversial because it stated that the President had made a decision to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing. What people failed to notice was the continuing statement which said, "Now the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff can shape our Military Establishment to fit what is our policy instead of having to try to meet the enemy's many choices." In the past, the enemy's many choices were reflected in such areas as Greece and Turkey, Berlin, Korea, and Indochina. In the past our actions have been emergency actions which, while effective, were inadequate because, as Mr. Dulles said, "What we did was, in the main, emergency action, imposed on us by our enemies."

One of the basic concepts of warfare as expressed by Clausewitz is that a defensive position is strongest particularly when the defense has strong means of retaliation. Following this concept, what Mr. Dulles' statement implied was that the United States had decided to place more reliance on deterrent power and less dependence on local defensive power. Mr. Dulles went on to explain this by saying, "What the Eisenhower administration wants is an * * * international security system."

I see in that January 12, 1954, speech of Mr. Dulles the first official recognition by any person in a position such as he occupies that airpower has replaced seapower and landpower as the dominant force for peace in the world. What Mr. Dulles said, in effect, replaces a Mahan theory for the seas with a Mitchell theory for air, in that air, having developed as the strongest means of transportation, and the United States being dominant in this field, we can well accept airpower as our national strategy and build around it the organizations of the land and sea forces.

Just as England, when she had control of the seas, maintained a highly mobile and effective sea force, so must we today maintain a highly mobile and increasingly effective Air Force. The truth of this doctrine cannot be doubted with the results of World War II and Korea freshly in our minds. We have seen that military operations on land and sea cannot proceed without air superiority. We know, too, that transportation can be denied on the surface of the sea and underneath the sea by airpower. We know that land transportation can be completely destroyed by airpower. Knowing these things, we can generalize as follows: "Airpower is the national strategy which relies for force on a weapons system in which the land and sea forces are organized around the air forces."

At this point, let us inject the thinking of Douhet so that we might see what one of the pioneer thinkers in aerial warfare had to say on the subject: "Viewed in its true light, aerial warfare admits of no defense, only offense. We must therefore resign ourselves to the offensive the enemy afflicts upon us, while striving to put all our resources to work to inflict even heavier ones upon him. This is the basic principle which must govern the development of aerial warfare."

His thesis was based on the argument that command of the air would be won very quickly in any war and that the side that obtained this mastery would then have little to fear from enemy airpower. We know from experiences in war that there never has been, nor is there any hope in the foreseeable future for a one hundred percent defense against enemy air attack. Therefore, we must ask ourselves what it is we resign ourselves to when we talk of the offensives of the enemy. What damage could 50, or 25, or even 10 Russian planes inflict upon the American economy and the American people were they the only ones of fleets of thousands to penetrate our aerial defenses and drop their hydrogen bombs upon strategic targets in this country? We would then be resigning ourselves to possible complete destruction, or at least a destruction that could seriously disrupt the lives and the economy of our people.

Even Douhet admitted that control of the air could never be complete; but the introduction of nuclear bombs into modern warfare, particularly those launched by aircraft, must cause us to wonder just how resigned we can become. It seems plausible to me, therefore, to argue that, in the absence of any complete defense against aerial attack, and with the admission of nuclear weapons into our weapons system, the only deterrent to war will rest in an Air Force kept at a level of proficiency, both from the standpoint of equipment and of men, that will forever deter an enemy from making an offensive move against this country.

That is true, I believe, because if a handful of Russian planes could inflict major damage on our country, certainly the Russians would realize that, their defensive abilities being no greater or no less than ours, a similar handful of our planes could wreak comparable damage upon their homeland. It seems to me, then, that massive retaliation is the deterrent power we must rely upon, at least for the foreseeable future; and I do not think that, in this discussion, we should get into the probabilities of what might be developed tomorrow weaponswise.

Thus, airpower becomes the primary manifestation of national power in war and in peace because of its direct influence upon the social structure and warmaking potential of an enemy nation. If we, as a people, are willing to accept this new doctrine that peace can be maintained through airpower, then we will not be like the professional soldier of old who was most reluctant to give up his particular weapon or his particular pet strategy. We will become, instead, a people fully aware of the problems of war and a people determined to support this kind of an approach to peace—psychologically, industrially, and in every other way that is incumbent upon us. Such an attitude will better enable us to understand the necessity of evaluating existing and contemplated weapons systems.

This is not a question of subjugating one service at the expense of another. Rather, it is a matter of obtaining the greatest possible return from our dollar investment in the military forces as a whole. Once this is done, the force requirements can be determined accordingly and phased to meet the time requirements of our strategy.

It is hardly necessary to remind ourselves that nuclear weapons and modern delivery systems have become the cornerstone of modern military power. We all recognize them to be the key to American security. Military tasks, therefore, primarily consist of maintaining armaments in such a state of readiness and in such quantities that the Communists will find it disadvantageous to solve their problems by the use of nuclear weapons. They must not only be faced with the impossible task of neutralizing our retaliatory effort, but also must be made to realize that should retaliation on our part be necessary, such an action will be instant and complete.

Unfortunately, many in this country, both military and civilian, do not realize the full scope of these military responsibilities. These are the people whose thinking is clouded by historical prejudice. These are the proponents of balanced forces, supercarriers, duplications in military effort, conflicting service roles and missions. These are the wearers of the old-school tie in a day and age when a new school has been founded.

It is not suggested that we do away completely with surface forces merely because we are in a nuclear air age. It is difficult to understand, however, why many still do not see the need to tailor service needs and requirements to conform with modern patterns of political and military reality. This is not simply a question of money—although I believe that billions of dollars could be saved if forces were designed around service missions—but, more important, it is a recognition that nations control war, and therefore peace, by their dominance in modern weapons and the expeditious means of delivering them. We must accept the influence of powerful air forces upon international behavior. An understanding of the implications of this new weapon is not a matter of choice—it is the very condition of national survival.

Now, having determined that the military has a definite role in the shaping of our national policy, and having traced briefly the development of airpower as the dominant force in our national military strategy, we have proceeeded through two of the four points in our discussion prior to setting forth a final conclusion.

At this point, we can peek under the tent to see how effective the Air Force has been in getting these two and related points across to our people. I am a salesman and in this profession we have always had a good axiom, "To sell the steak, sell the sizzle." If we apply this to the efforts of public relations in the Air Force, then I would say that the Air Force has done a better than average job of selling the sizzle. However, I don't think that the Air Force has done the job that needs to be done to sell the steak, which is the more important item in this particular instance.

We might liken the sizzle to the glamour of the Air Force, the speed of its planes, the drama of rescues, the excitement of air combat, and the other things which have always been readily associated with flying. The steak, in this instance, is airpower and what airpower means, as well as the two points that we have already developed in this discussion.

There certainly is a definite need for selling the sizzle of the Air Force steak and we must continue to do that, but the important thing in public relations at this time is to sell the meat, or the steak, of our whole problem, so that people will not so much associate airpower with beautiful formation flying or high-speed jets or rescues, as with its true nature and its place in our national strategy.

I am not critical of Air Force public relations when I recognize a failure in its past performances, because I don't believe that we can ascribe this failure to the Air Force alone. Rather, I think, it should be placed upon the entire Military Establishment, upon the Congress of the United States, and upon others in high position who can and should interpret for the American people the role of the military in shaping national policy and explain to them what war really is.

Much of the current misunderstanding stems from an historic general disinterest on the part of the American people in the subject of war itself. You and I know that war in this country has always been looked upon as an isolated thing. We have gone into them unprepared materially because in periods of peace between the wars there has been a general disinterest in the Military

Establishment and its upkeeping. We have gone into them unprepared mentally because the people of the United States, having a natural and understandable abhorrence of war, have never concerned themselves with the true relationship of war to our national policy. It is well to recognize at this point, also, that we have gone into these wars weak in manpower because of a general apathy on the part of the youth of this country to participate in military training during the times of peace. Washington said something about this when he remarked: "The American people never sense danger till the bayonet is at their chest."

Generally, I think we can sum up this portion of the problem by recognizing that the American people, at all levels, do not understand war and do not yet understand the basic reasons for airpower being the force around which we must construct all of our military strategies.

While these obstacles have been discouraging, and at times frustrating, there are indications abroad in our country today that are encouraging both to the military and to those of us who are not in the military, but who are concerned with national defense and the maintenance of peace. Most important of the encouraging signs was the statement by Secretary Dulles earlier this year which inferred that we had the ability to go to the brink of war and return. In that statement, we see the first general recognition by a man in high position that military force is an instrument of policy and a weapon that can be used for the maintenance of peace even without its application in the accepted form of the word.

At the outset of this discussion I said: "Boiled down to its basic requirements, public relations is a simple practice. It calls for a measure of clear thinking to develop the problem, the application of commonsense to its presentation, and a great deal of energy all of the time."

We have developed the problems as I see them, so it is now necessary to approach their solution in the most logical way possible. This I would like to do by presenting to you gentlemen a list of suggestions which I think will help to solve the problems we are discussing today.

The first of these should certainly be an intensive campaign of education starting immediately. This campaign should embrace the schools of our country from the high school level, or even lower, on through, so that the students might have a complete opportunity to study the relationship of military force to our national policy, thereby enabling them to better understand the problems of the military when they become voting citizens.

This same program of education should be directed at the personnel of the Air Force. It should likewise be spread to include citizens of adult ages who can be reached through the media of luncheons, club meetings, and visits to air bases. In other words, let's take the public in on what we are doing. Trained and intelligent officers and enlisted men should be sent to talk before these various organizations about the very problems we are discussing today.

One of the finest means of accomplishing this, in my opinion, would be to downgrade the classification of briefings of the various major commands in the Air Force and send them around to the organizations just mentioned. A person could learn more about the problems involved in global airpower by listening to one of General LeMay's briefings than by reading many books on the subject. These briefings would necessarily have to be changed to eliminate some of the necessarily secret material that is passed on to officers; but, nevertheless, if we started with the mere assumption that people today do not realize that the globe no longer is measured from east to west and west to east, but rather from north to south and over the poles, we would lay a basis for a better understanding of airpower.

Air Force personnel, from the privates to the generals, should be imbued with the idea that airpower is our dominant power and they should speak of it on every occasion; but they should speak of it intelligently and speak of it not in terms of the speed of our aircraft, or the accuracy of our weapons, but, instead, in terms of the true concept of airpower and how it has reached its rightful place as the dominant force in our military strategy. I understand that a dozen officers out of this class are scheduled to travel throughout the country after graduation and speak on airpower. This is a good idea. It is a healthy thing. I know you are qualified to do this great public service.

The second suggestion that I wish to make depends entirely upon the success of the first, in that I will suggest that public relations should "trickle down." I mean by this that the top brass of our Air Force must be thoroughly cognizant of the problems which we discuss and must be able to transmit this understanding to their junior officers, and on down to the lowest grade of enlisted man. You have a very valuable program in the Air Force called Commanders' Call. I understand that once every month each commander talks to his people about airpower. He shows them films of top Air Force leaders who cover the subject. Keep this program going. Use it to best advantage. It is necessary that, in the Air War College, we teach the officers the extreme importance of public relations. We take away, by so doing, the stigma that has always been attached in one way or another to the Public Information Office. That office should become one of great importance; it should be occupied by men thoroughly trained in all aspects of public relations.

A vital point to remember in discussing public relations, and particularly in discussing the people engaged in public relations, is that if a job is done properly, by properly trained men, many of the attendant problems are taken care of before they start. For instance, if the citizenry were fully cognizant of all of the issues that we are discussing here, and understood them, there is a strong possibility that the difficulties that have developed over sound around jet air bases would long ago have been overcome. Objections raised by some of our citizens to the high expenditures necessary to maintain an Air Force would likewise be eliminated if the people were told how this money is spent, not just in a general way, but in a detailed way, having explained to them the needs as they relate to airpower and as airpower relates to peace.

We long ago discovered that the glamour of flying has pretty much worn off—that it is looked upon today as a job, as a hard and arduous job to which dedicated men are attracted. If this is true, and we know it to be true, then public relations directed at the young, with the objective of educating them along the lines we have been discussing, will develop in them a patriotic fervor for the Air Force and for military service in general, and cause them to come into the Air Force in increasing numbers. It is not a healthy thing for the Air Force, or any of the military, to have to rely on draftees to build up its manpower. It would be a much better thing for this country if our youth were so imbued with patriotism that they looked forward to their period of service with the Armed Forces, and, of course, we would hope, particularly service in the Air Force. That, I feel, would be one of the results of a public-relations program following the course that I have outlined.

The third suggestion that I would like to make will primarily aid public relations people, and the public only indirectly. This suggestion has to do with the classification of material. When a national aviation magazine, or any magazine, for that matter, publishes a detailed account or report of a modern airplane or a modern piece of equipment, it is to be assumed by the public that the material is not classified. How many times, though, have you public relations men been asked by local newspapers for information based on these magazine articles only to have to say that you cannot release it because it is still classified. The newspaperman goes away with a peculiar feeling that the Air Force's right hand does not know what its left hand is doing. This, of course, can only be accomplished from the Washington level; but a thorough check on releases before they are made to see that there will be no conflict with existing classifications would certainly be appreciated by your public relations men, by the press, and, I know, by the public, as well.

The fourth suggestion that I make is one which I direct to all officer personnel, whether they be in public relations or not. It is this: Have an open-door policy toward the press, and particularly toward the public. Do not build a fence around your office through which citizens, or their representatives, cannot pass. Being in public life, and having been in the military, I realize that this is easier to say than to do; but remember that one unhappy customer can undo the good of hundreds of men working to better your position and the position of the Air Force. Particularly is this important as far as the press goes, because I can assure you that nothing makes a press man madder than to be continually denied access to an executive's office, whether that executive be a Senator, a general, or the president of a corporation.

The fifth suggestion that I make is a rather basic one, but I make it because I feel that it is not being followed too wisely at the present time. The public information officer must be in the know. He must sit in on policymaking meetings; he must be kept informed of the latest developments in air doctrine, air plans, aircraft, and everything about the Air Force. As a commander, include your information services officer on your personal staff. You write his efficiency report. Get a sharp, intelligent man who has some commonsense for the job. Give him free access to your office and your confidence.

Sixth in the list of suggestions that I make to you gentlemen this morning concerns a failing that many of our public relations people seem to have which does not show up in the corresponding efforts of our sister forces. This is the tendency of a public relations officer to seek to be a public relations person for his own particular outfit—that outfit alone—and not for the Air Force in its entirety. I know that many times this is the fault of the commander; so if any of you gentlemen here, going out to assume command posts, have the tendency to seek publicity for your outfit above the Air Force as a whole, you would do well to bury those feelings immediately and allow your public relations man full rein in his development of a better understanding of airpower for the total Air Force. I might say that this is a rather common disease among all new institutions, whether they be in the fields of economics, in the professions, or in the fields of the military, as we have witnessed in the last 10 years during the swaddling days of the Air Force. It is a weakness and a tendency, as I say, but it is one that must be overcome before the organization as a whole, regardless of what field it is operating in, can go ahead and assume its rightful place of leadership in that area. Remember you are selling airpower, you are not selling the glamour of any particular outfit.

The seventh suggestion which I offer today is that the Public Information Officer work closely with the aircraft industry. The aircraft industry has probably done more to promote the Air Force than the Air Force has done itself; and these people continue to do so, and their efforts can be coordinated with the efforts of the Air Force to a degree that the public relations of both the industry and the Air Force will greatly improve. The Air Force can very well tap the vast reservoir of experienced public relations men who are connected with the aviation industry and they can also enjoy the fruits of the large amounts of money spent by this industry to promote their aircraft, and, at the same time, airpower.

The eighth and last suggestion that I want to leave with you gentlemen today is that the Air Force should make a more concerted effort to educate the Members of Congress concerning the true meaning of airpower and airpower's natural position as a pivotal force in forming our military strategies. How can this be done? Of course, you will say that Senators and Representatives are busy people. Well, I would suggest that you bring the briefings of the various commands of the Air Force into Washington, into the Senate and House Office Buildings, and stay there 2 weeks if necessary so that each and every Member of Congress could have the opportunity of being briefed, not on the glamour of flying, but on the basic essentials of airpower. Remember, gentlemen, that Congress is the legislative body of this Government which decides upon your appropriations—the body that can be openly critical of you—harmful to you, or helpful to you, depending on the attitude that it holds.

I can tell you from experience that Congressmen are interested in airpower and the problems of airpower; but not too many of them have had the opportunities that I have had to become intimately associated with the subject, and I feel that if more of them have that opportunity one of the great obstacles in your path today will be overcome. The Navy and the Army have sold their concepts in a wonderful way, chiefly because they've been at it longer; and then, too, because they have been associated in the peoples' minds with power, and with power in war. Now, however, we are locked in an argument as to whether the pivotal force will remain on the surface or go to the air, and we are not going to win that argument by continuing public relations efforts that merely "sell the sizzle." We must, as I have said before, "sell the steak."

Lastly, I want to remind you again that public relations takes a great deal of energy all of the time. The job of selling is not one that is done periodically, or spasmodically, or with a half-hearted effort. Selling is something that you gentlemen will be engaged in for the rest of your careers; in fact, you've been engaged in selling all of your lives, whether you know it or not. Your very first cries as babies were selling arguments to your mothers that you wanted to be fed. Your attempts to improve your dress and your appearances as you reached the age when you began to look at girls were only an effort to sell yourselves to some particular girls. The things you do through your careers as airmen and officers are attempts to sell yourselves to those people who are above you or to those people with whom you associate.

Apply exactly this same technique, then, to the issues we have discussed today, and the problem of public relations in the Air Force will improve rapidly and the people of the United States will develop a better understanding of airpower and will give it the proper support which it deserves as the dominant force in modern war.

The Measure of Greatness—Address by Senator Symington at Rally Honoring the Dean of Missouri's Congressional Delegation, the Honorable Clarence Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, at the proceedings in Mexico, Mo., June 8, honoring the dean of the Missouri delegation in Congress, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, our junior Senator, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, made an address entitled "The Measure of Greatness," which referred to the outstanding contributions of the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. We all know Congressman CANNON as a kind, gentle, wonderful friend and person, whose experience and skill in parliamentary matters help all of us in innumerable ways in our efforts to serve our constituents.

Therefore, I know there will be widespread interest among Members of the House in Senator SYMINGTON'S remarks as they refer to our esteemed friend, Congressman CANNON, and I submit the text of the Senator's speech for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE MEASURE OF GREATNESS

The wisest of all teachers once said, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The lasting value of a civilization, a nation, a political party, or an individual is best determined by the simple test embodied in those immortal words.

By his fruits we know CLARENCE CANNON, of Elsberry, Mo.

CLARENCE CANNON'S entire life has been devoted to the service of people, and that is the most important service of all.

Today he serves as chairman of probably the most important committee in the Congress.

Highlight of that effort includes Mr. CANNON spearheading the 1945 postwar drive which returned to the Treasury $130 billion of unexpended wartime appropriations.

It was he who about that time also proposed that Congress require a minimum payment of $5 billion per year toward reducing the national debt.

It was he also who stated: "No agency should be allowed to have any funds for which it does not account to Congress annually and which it does not justify in hearings before congressional committees."

Mr. CANNON believes that Government money is public money; and therefore should be spent only in the public interest.

Would that we could say this basic policy of sound government was the policy of the present administration.

Many current top appointees in the executive branch came to Washington from private business.

Some of these appointees are mighty fine people. Some, however, apparently believe the Federal Government is just another big business corporation, to be run for their own interest, and that of their friends at the top, instead of the interests of all the stockholders.

Quite a few of the latter have been removed from the job; but only after a Democratic Congress disclosed their activities. The welfare of the stockholders in question, in this case the American people, appeared incidental to their selfish decisions.

Yes, there have been some surprisingly unbusinesslike operations on the part of this so-called business administration. As a result, all of us have been forced to foot the tax bill for such financial fiascoes as Dixon-Yates, the incredible deal in cheese, and the heavy and unnecessary increased interest cost on our national debt.

With respect to that last cost, the largest single component item of the $4 billion increase in the first 3 years of this administration outside of national defense, is the increased price for money this administration decided to give the bankers.

In contrast, CLARENCE CANNON'S policy of government for all the people is made completely clear by the record.

Since first elected to Congress in 1922, Mr. CANNON has been instrumental in the passage of legislation beneficial to every American.

Let's take a few examples.

For the benefit of the farmer, Mr. CANNON has supported legislation for parity prices, farm loans at low rates of interest, reclamation and soil conservation projects, REA, protection of crops from pests and livestock disease, construction of better farm-to-market roads, flood control, and improved scientific agricultural research.

In supporting the 1941 farm-loan bill, which provided for Government loans to farmers to 85 percent of the parity value of 5 basic commodities, Mr. Cannon said the bill "places a floor under farm prices similar to the floor already under wages. For the first time in history the farmer is guaranteed a parity price."

On this and many other agricultural bills Mr. CANNON fought long and hard for the farmer, against an opposition both you and I know is entrenched and powerful.

Nor has that fight ended.

As you also know, only last April, President Eisenhower vetoed a Democratic farm bill which would have been a start toward a fair share for the Nation's farmers.

In 1952, the average farmer had an income of 52 cents for every $1 taken in by his city neighbor.

By 1955 that 52 cents had dropped to 42 cents.

As a result, the 13 percent of our population which remains on the farm, and which today produces the abundance of food and fiber that makes America the best fed and best clothed Nation in the history of the world, nevertheless receives less than 5 percent of our national income.

And according to Department of Agriculture income forecasts for 1956, under the present policies of this administration, that already unfortunate situation is going to get worse instead of better.

Already this situation is being reflected in the small towns. As a lead editorial entitled "The Rural Towns Problem" in the Kansas City Star pointed out last May 20: "Rural towns or cities are the first to feel the effect of reduced purchasing power among farmers."

For that damaging effect to reach the large cities is certain, and only a matter of time.

This administration's answer to the plight of the American farmer has been, and is, lower price supports, less farm credit at higher interest rates, and less funds for REA.

Based on some of the statements made by those in charge, why should we be surprised?

As example, only last year an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in this Republican administration said: "Agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better some place else."

Well, 500,000 farm families have left the farm in the last 3 years.

But where have they gone and what will they do?

Is it good for America that these people and their children leave the field and pastures and woodlands of our countryside, to roam the concrete of the big cities looking for work?

What irony that in most countries of the world today 90 percent of the people work in the production of food—and their problem is famine, whereas only 13 percent of our people produce food—and our problem is surplus.

Shortly after Mr. CANNON was first elected to Congress, another Republican President, Calvin Coolidge, made this statement: "Farmers have never made money. I don't believe we can do much about it."

Apparently today, 30 years later, that is still the philosophy of the Republican Party.

But for many years the Democratic Party, under the leadership of such men as CLARENCE CANNON, has believed that something can and should be done to help farmers get a fair share.

Let's look at the record.

In the 20 years of Democratic administrations, farm income rose from $2 billion a year to $13½ billion; and the parity index rose from 58 percent in 1932 to 100 percent in 1952.

Since 1952 annual farm income has dropped nearly $4 billion. Parity during the last 6 months averaged 82, with a low point of 80. That is the lowest point and the lowest 6-month average in 15 years.

The reason is clear. It was Secretary of the Interior McKay who said, "We're here in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry."

If he was talking about big business, that is true; and the backs of little-business men and farmers this administration is riding are getting plenty sore.

Mr. CANNON'S legislative record, however, has much in it besides sympathetic understanding and support of the farmers. He has consistently supported measures for help to our veterans; and to our small-business men, and to our average citizens.

In 1932 Mr. CANNON was one of those who worked hard to preserve $400 million of veteran benefits.

In recent years he has been one of the leaders behind legislation to provide maternity care for servicemen's wives, and also better hospitalization for veterans.

For the average citizen, Mr. CANNON has supported such welfare measures as aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, day nurseries, nurses training, pensions, and unemployment compensation.

For the small-business man, Mr. CANNON has fought against monopolistic practices. He has worked steadily for a fair deal for small business.

When and if they make any money, these farmers and businessmen are also taxpayers.

Let's review for a moment the tax policies of this administration.

In 1954, President Eisenhower proposed tax reductions.

Out of every dollar of tax relief obtained, the corporations received 73 cents.

Families earning over $5,000 received 18 cents.

Families earning less than $5,000 received 9 cents.

The Republicans said they couldn't afford to give tax cuts to everybody—so they gave a $1 billion tax cut to corporations, plus an $850 million tax cut to corporation shareholders.

This administration's record on small business is equally in conflict with the country's welfare.

Since 1952 the profits of companies worth $100 million or more have gone up 27 percent; but the profits of companies worth $250,000 or less have gone down 39 percent.

Business failures since 1952 have risen 36 percent—in fact, during the past 3 years, there have been more than twice as many business failures as there were during the previous 10 years.

Unless we put an end to the current program of helping the big get bigger while the small get squeezed out, capitalism, as we know it, will disappear.

As you know, over 80 cents of the tax dollar you pay today goes for past, present and possible future war—and 65 cents of your tax dollar goes to the Defense Department in the Pentagon to pay for the current programs.

Now a story is being spread around that because some of us believe in better organization of our military defenses—an organization based on progress instead of tradition—we are asking for more money for national defense.

This is not correct.

If the Pentagon was truly unified, the American people could obtain more security for far less money than is being spent today.

In this field also CLARENCE CANNON is a recognized authority. His voting record proves that he is dedicated to adequate national defense; but only on the basis of maximum return to the taxpayer for every dollar spent.

Another prominent American once agreed with that position.

On November 16, 1945, over 10 years ago, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Military Appropriations the then General Eisenhower stated:

"You could develop a more efficient fighting force with unification, with 75 percent of the men that you would have if you had separate forces. * * * I am certain that almost any professional officer that has studied this thing would agree."

A 25-percent reduction in the current personnel of our military establishment would save the American taxpayer many billions of dollars each year.

In his later published book, Crusade in Europe, General Eisenhower developed his point further when he said:

"The accomplishments in Europe of the three United States services operating under unified command strongly influenced my determined advocacy of a similar type of organization in postwar Washington."

And on February 7, 1948, in his farewell report as Chief of Staff of the Army, the general carried on his thought as follows:

"But our position of 5, 10, 15 years hence is being determined now. * * *

"We must do everything possible now to assure ourselves that we will fight another war with weapons more advanced than those of the enemy. * * *

"The constant aim of those concerned with integration of the Armed Forces must be the goal implicit in the act—a security program in which all fields of responsibility will be covered but from which all unnecessary duplication will be eliminated and in which each arm will be a member of an integrated team. * * *

"Study should be given to the proposition that each year a number of officers of proved experience, knowledge and judgment be withdrawn from their respective services and given commissions in the Armed Forces. The existence of a body of specially chosen officers representing all three services would act as a spur to junior officers to qualify for such selection, indirectly decreasing traditional barriers between the services. Free transfer among the services, without loss of rank, would, in appropriate cases, be a valuable measure for promotion of the national rather than the service viewpoint. Developments of this sort will come with time and I am confident that each succeeding year of unification will bring closer the goal of a fully integrated establishment."

It was not until he actually became a candidate for the Presidency, however, that General Eisenhower really "poured it on" with respect to his concept of deficiencies in the Department of Defense.

In a talk in Baltimore on September 25, 1952, the general said that we must obtain "the most defense at less cost with the least dollar."

And he continued:

"Our defense program has suffered from lack of farsighted direction.

"Real unification of our Armed Forces is yet to be achieved.

"The running warfare between Congress and the White House has made such blundering even more costly to us Americans. Both must share mutual confidence and common purpose. The cooperation must be sparked by executive leadership.

"We have had little of such leadership. Special interests in the armed services have repeatedly been carrying their appeals to Congress—sometimes without knowledge of any of their civilian superiors."

Then General Eisenhower said:

"Supplemental appropriations by Congress have been vetoed, passed over a veto, and sometimes held back by the President."

But only last year, the Congress appropriated $42 million to prevent any further reduction in the personnel strength of the Marine Corps, this action being taken on the theory that it was wrong to discharge many thousand Marine volunteers at the same time tens of thousands of men were being drafted off of the farms and out of the cities.

The Administration impounded the money Congress appropriated for this volunteer force. The Marine strength was permitted to decline. Actually, the Secretary of Defense used much of the impounded money for his own Department.

Also in Baltimore in 1952 General Eisenhower stated:

"Service disagreements have become public brawls."

Compare any disagreement between the services in 1952 with those flooding the press, television, and radio today.

General Eisenhower continued:

"Stranger than this is the almost inevitable demand of each service to do the research, development, and production work on new weapons. Each believes that it can do the work better. In this matter prompt adjudication among the services is mandatory—otherwise you will find all three engaged in spending public money for a single need."

* * * * * *

"This brings us to the supremely important matter of unification of the Armed Forces.

"When I became Chief of Staff upon my return from Europe in November of 1945, I felt that all our war experience had rendered obsolete the defense organization then existing. I was convinced then, as I am today, that effective coordination of the services in war requires central planning in time of peace. This is the essence of unity in the Armed Forces. That unity must also extend to the procurement and administration of all the costly materiel and paraphernalia of modern warfare. It was the hope and expectation of all of us who worked to achieve the passage of the National Defense Act of 1947 that this kind of unity was in the making.

"This has not proved to be the case. Such unity as we have achieved is too much form and too little substance. We have continued with a loose way of operating that wastes time, money, and talent with equal generosity. With three services, in place of the former two, still going their separate ways, and with an overall defense staff frequently unable to enforce corrective action, the end result has been not to remove duplication, but to replace it with triplication.

"All this must be brought to as swift an end as possible. Neither our security nor

our solvency can permit such a way of conducting the crucial business of national defense."

That was over 3½ years ago.

Not a single change in the law has been suggested by this administration to correct the situation described by General Eisenhower on September 25, 1952.

Instead of any proposals to bring "all this to as swift an end as possible," the President's own people volunteer that triplication and waste has increased heavily since he took office in January 1953.

The former Assistant Secretary of Air Force Research and Development, Mr. Trevor Gardner, resigned early this year in bitter protest at the current disorganization in the Pentagon.

Only last month Mr. Gardner wrote in Look magazine as follows:

"We must junk the creaking, decentralized reviewing and re-reviewing machinery we now so foolishly look to for decisions. In place of this bureaucratic Noah's Ark, we urgently need a streamlined mechanism capable of responding to new dangers as quickly as they become known."

As an illustration of what Mr. Gardner is talking about, this country fought and won the greatest war in history—and at that time its military departments contained a total of eight Secretaries.

Today, despite all this talk about the importance of further service unification in order to increase security and, at the same time, cut expenses, there are 31 Secretaries.

And the President has just asked the Congress to approve 3 more, for a total of 34.

Because of the rising criticism resulting from the bitter interservice rows which have recently broken out in the open, it is reported that something will be done about the deteriorating situation in the Pentagon.

Last week Time magazine stated:

"It is the duty of Commander in Chief Dwight Eisenhower to insure that the machine—in all its countless parts—adds up to a single unit meshed for a sole purpose: to keep war away by its total retaliatory power.

"That aim no longer permits the luxury of the three services and their many subservices wrangling for power and heading in different directions. For this reason President Eisenhower has come to one of the most important decisions of his administration: to move for a truly unified armed service that will work in practice as well as on paper, as a single machine. Last week he ordered his White House staff planners to start work immediately on mapping out a unification plan for completion this fall. If he is reelected he hopes to present his unification proposals to Congress next year."

But we heard all that in Baltimore, back in September 1952.

Why should be believe it now, any more than we should have believed it then?

For many years some of us have stated and restated that if President Eisenhower would only carry out what he said should be done in 1945, 1946, and 1948—and what he in effect promised would be done in 1952, many billions of dollars annually could be saved in our national defense cost, at no sacrifice whatever to our military strength.

The saving could mean a balanced Federal budget; and should mean a heavy reduction in income taxes.

Apparently some people believe that emphasis on the importance of national defense indicates a certain narrowness of viewpoint; a failure to recognize that military power is only a part of that much broader struggle which is rapidly shaping up for the political and economic control of the world.

Quite obviously the Communists, dedicated to world conquest, don't want to gain control of a devastated country. There is no profit in acquiring a lot of smoldering, radioactive real estate. They want to take over a going concern, at the peak of its productivity. Therefore their approach now is political and economic as well as military.

But their political warfare rests upon a military standoff. Note they did not even begin their successful recent developments on the political front until they felt they were at least within reaching distance of military equality.

It goes without saying that the political-economic struggle is an even larger, more difficult, and more challenging problem than the problem of maintaining military superiority.

To put it another way, the problem of military superiority is in itself a challenge to our resources. But it is small compared to the vast challenge of the overall struggle, including the struggle for the minds of men.

If the present leaders of this administration have been unable to cope with the current world-wide political struggle from a position of military strength, how will they manage from a position of military weakness?

If, during the Korean War our choices of action were limited by fear the enemy would "enlarge the war" (don't dare bomb beyond the Yalu, don't dare use atomic weapons), how will our policy and program be restricted if and when the Russians have a superiority in arms?

This is an intensely practical problem, one which must be faced if we are to continue in a free world.

Some future administration may have the genius to deal successfully in foreign affairs from a position of relative weakness; but this administration does not seem to be able to exploit its asserted position of relative strength.

We have a right to expect our Government to deal effectively with the broader problem, handling the military problem in stride. But this administration seems unable to handle either without a succession of obvious failure.

We might forgive the mistakes in foreign policy; but management—with a capital M—was to have been the great talent of the crowd now in office. (If you once ran General Motors, you are equipped to run the country.)

Yet in the very place where we were led to expect the pinnacle of competence, we have seen bungling and shortsightedness.

Again, preoccupation on my part with the military-defense problem does not mean any lack of awareness of the broader political struggle now taking place all over the world.

But the military problem is elementary. If we cannot handle that, how can we handle something far more complex?

If we—the United States—cannot maintain a superiority of arms, apparently cannot even maintain a military standoff, how can we expect to win the larger diplomatic and economic struggle?

The argument is made that America cannot spend for arms at the expense of its economy.

Who says we should? This is to avoid and evade the real problem. The real problem—the real measure of the problem—is to obtain the necessary capability without injuring the economy.

It can be done; and it will have to be done.

If we don't enlarge our vision, broaden our concepts, and achieve a better comprehension of the total problem, our failures in this field are just a foretaste of the much larger failures in store for us on the international political front.

We have come here today to honor a great Missourian, to honor him for what he has stood for over the years.

To him we express the gratitude of his party, his community, his district, his State, and his Nation.

Several weeks ago in the bright morning sun, I journeyed through the farms of western Kentucky. On the train was Alben Barkley, being carried to his eternal rest.

As we went by, farmers were kneeling among their crops in the fields, paying respect to one they loved, because they knew this great Democrat had devoted his life to attaining a better life for them.

Fortunately for us, another great Democrat is with us today, with many years of public service ahead of him.

We know, CLARENCE CANNON, that at the same time you participate in our most important national problem—the insurance of a more prosperous and a more secure America—the problems of your friends and neighbors are always in your heart and mind.

It is for that reason you have our respect, our affection, and our eternal gratitude.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 14, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 11, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, we thank Thee on this national day of pledged allegiance to the flag of our Republic, for all the memories and the faith and the principles which its folds symbolize wherever it floats on land or air or sea, making tyranny tremble. As we bow in reverence this day, beneath the white-domed shrine of each patriot's devotion, with grateful hearts we come in this night of global conflict between falsehood and truth, light and darkness, with joy that our flag is still there—emblem of freedom's holy light, and that, seeing it, captive and enslaved peoples thank God and take courage. Though the road to a just peace for our time and for our children's children be tedious and toilsome, still lead us on, with patience following the gleam of the flag with clear heads and pure hearts, worthy of the trust the Nation has committed to our hands. 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 Wednesday, June 13, 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. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. DEMPSEY, Mr. DONDERO, and Mr. MCGREGOR were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.